

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, October 11, 2012

Call to Order

Council Chair Professor Tom Robisheaux (History Department): Let me welcome you to the October meeting of the Arts and Sciences Council. For those of you who don't know me, I'm Tom Robisheaux, the Chair of the Council.

Motion to Approve Minutes

Professor Tom Robisheaux: Our first order of business for today is reviewing the minutes from the September meeting and approving them if possible. There are minutes up here at the front, if you wish to pick one up. Are we ready to entertain a motion to approve and second? Are there corrections? Do I hear a motion to approve?

Professor Tolly Boatwright (Classics Department): I move that they be approved

Professor David Malone (Program in Education): Seconded

Professor Tom Robisheaux: All those in favor? So approved. Thank you very much.

Announcements

Professor Tom Robisheaux: Just a few announcements before we move to our first item of business for today. If members of the council have not signed the "sign up" sheet up front as you came in, would you please do so before you leave today? Just a reminder: if there comes an occasion when you are unable to attend a council meeting, please alert your alternate on the council from your department to attend in your stead. This can be really important, as it may be in November, for example, when the council may need to vote on some matter of importance.

Just a few announcements before we proceed to our first order of business. I want to announce that the subcommittee for online courses has been appointed. I understand it has met this week already. The Curriculum and Course Committees have already been working on a preliminary framework that would set up the way in which Duke students might take online courses. So the subcommittee is hitting the ground running with lots of

support from Arts and Sciences, the Dean's Office, and especially the Curriculum and the Course Committees.

Second, an ad hoc working group to review proposals for new teaching initiatives that includes myself, as Chair of the Council, and the Executive Committee of the Arts and Sciences Council, **Tolly Boatwright**, the chair of the Global Education for Undergraduates Committee, **Suzanne Shanahan**, who chairs the Curriculum Committee, and **Susan Wynn** and **Cary Moskovitz**, who co-chair the Course Committee. We meet on an ad hoc basis to review, give them a preliminary view, and find a proper way in which the council or its committees can handle them. We have started that process already and it seems to be working quite well. We look forward to some of the work coming up from these new teaching initiatives to make their way into our committees and into the council for further deliberation. Along these lines you'll certainly be hearing from some of these committees, the Curriculum Committee in particular, either in November or in December.

Finally, I have three exciting announcements involving new programs recently approved by our Committee on Global Education for Undergraduates. I'm very pleased to say that Duke has approved a new Study Abroad program in Barcelona. It's part of a consortium with the "Ivy Plus" schools. Tolly Boatwright or Margaret Riley could tell us which schools those are exactly. But it's a very exciting program because Spain is an important destination for many of our students who wish to study abroad, and this will be a part of the Center for Advanced Studies in Barcelona.

Second, this is for me personally a very gratifying announcement to make. We have approved, through the Global Education for Undergraduates Committee, a new Duke in Tuscany program. The old Duke in Florence Program closed at the end of December last year. Since that time, the University of Wisconsin has taken the lead in the administration of a new program that's worked closely with **Margaret Riley's** office in Global education to create a new partnership at the Villa Guicciardini-Corsi-Salviati that will begin starting in Fall 2013.

Finally, there is a new Study Abroad program in Paris: the Neuro-Humanities Program. This is a joint program between the Romance Studies Department and Psychology and Neurosciences. I think it sounds like a wonderful partnership between departments and I look forward to more such programs. This new program does not supersede the Duke in Paris program, which will continue as before.

Voting of New Executive Committee Members

Professor Tom Robisheaux: Let me proceed now to our first item of business: the election of two new members from Council to sit on the Executive Committee of the Arts and Sciences Council. The Executive Committee has a brief description of its functions, which, as you know, whenever something is described in just a few words, you know how powerful it is, and how hard it works. The fewer the words, the wider the room to assume responsibilities. In my experience on ECASC I can testify to how hard working the committee is. In a word, the Executive Committee of the Council sets the agenda for the Council, which means most of the things we talk about never make it to the floor here. ECASC sets the priorities for Council; proposals first come to it before they go Council. ECASC members are in constant contact with all the standing committees, so the liaison work is very important. And ECASC nominates faculty to the committees, so those of you sitting on committees right now can thank the members of the executive committee for those nominations.

We must elect two new members of the executive committee this afternoon. The executive committee has put before you a slate of candidates. One will come from the humanities and one will come from the natural sciences. The four candidates on the slate that the executive committee is nominating to you have agreed to serve if they are elected. We can also entertain nominations to the executive committee from the floor. I just want to remind members if you do nominate someone from the floor, that you are certain that that person will agree to serve if elected.

So let me introduce the four candidates that we have so far as nominees. Professor **Mark Goodacre** is an associate Tom of Religion who specializes in New Testament studies. He arrived in the Duke Faculty in 2005 from the University of Birmingham. I would congratulate him on his most recent book called *Thomas and the Gospels: The case for Thomas's Knowledge of the Synoptics*, which is a fascinating topic, and he's also the director of undergraduate studies in Religion, as well as being a member on the Council from the Religion Department.

The second nominee from the humanities is Professor **Wahneema Lubiano**. She is a professor of literature and an associate professor of African and African American Studies. She currently serves as the associate chair of the African and African American Studies department, and her interests are on race and multi-culturalism.

We have two nominees from the natural sciences. **Steffen Bass** is a professor of Physics. He works on

particle physics—I wish him all the best luck in getting as close to the Big Bang as he can. Many of us on the Council know Steffen through his steady and important work on the Curriculum Committee, and we have really appreciated that over the years.

Our second nominee from the natural sciences is Professor **Chantal Reid**. Professor Reid is an assistant professor of the practice in biology; her research is focused on plant responses to environmental changes, such as global warming among other things. She specializes in ecology and population biology, and is also a devoted and popular teacher.

At this moment let me see if there are any additional nominations to the Executive Committee from among members of the council . . . [pause]. There being no additional nominations, those members of the Council who are present are allowed to vote in the election. Shawna has made sure that ballots have been passed out, and she will collect them as you sign them. By the end of the meeting, I will be able to announce who the new members of the executive committee will be. So please fill out your ballots and pass them to Shawna [Kaufman].

Introduction of Professor Frances Hasso

Professor Tom Robisheaux: Our most important item of business today is among the most significant that the faculty ever consider: a proposal to change the status of International Comparative Studies from a major—without a permanent institutional presence—to a program. Were the Council to approve International Comparative Studies would be able to hire its own faculty. So this is a significant change to program status. Those faculty members who recall similar such stages for other units that became programs in their own right recognize that there is an lot of work behind such a request.

In this case, many of you probably are familiar with International Comparative Studies as a popular undergraduate major. You'll hear a little bit about its history in just a moment. But the ICS major ranks in the top third (in terms of numbers of students) of all Duke undergraduate majors at the present moment. This proposal began in the summer. It has been discussed and recommended by the deans; Dean Angela O'Rand is also here to discuss the proposal if needed. It then made its way to the Executive Committee for review. The Executive Committee has had two full discussions and additional meetings outside of formal committee meetings with the current director of the program, Professor Hasso. Following her presentation which proposes the change in status for International Comparative Studies the Executive Committee will make its recommendation to you.

Let me now introduce Professor Frances Hasso. Professor Hasso is an associate professor in Women's Studies, International Comparative Studies and Sociology. Her current research interests involve gender and transnational studies, particularly in the Arab world. You will recognize her as an energetic leader who also gets things done. It gives me great pleasure to introduce her to you and she will now make her proposal.

ICS Proposal for Program Status

Professor Frances Hasso (International and Comparative Studies): I want to thank the Arts and Sciences Executive Committee for helping me work through this process and also the deans.

I'm not going to take a huge amount of time so that we leave a lot of time for questions and answers. If you didn't get a chance to read the twenty-six-page history and proposal, I am happy to send you a copy. I also have forty copies of my PowerPoint in case you need that. I thought I'd start by talking about the major requirements.

Essentially, there are fourteen to fifteen courses required for the ICS major. Sometimes there are only 13 courses. I describe the major to students as a sandwich where with two pieces of thick bread. Those two pieces at the bottom and the top are: the Comparative Approaches to Global Issues course—which is taken at the freshman or sophomore level—and the capstone course at the senior level, or for a good number of our students, a yearlong honors thesis seminar.

The middle of the sandwich has three layers. One layer includes four region courses. We have seven regions right now, plus the students can propose a different kind of region that is structured around a body of water or a boundary or border. The second layer is what we call right now comparative courses, and I think of them as transnational /international kinds of courses. And the third layer is basically two years of foreign language study. Some students come into Duke already highly proficient in a language, but they still need to take three or four courses in a language associated with that particular region. So that's essentially the structure of the major.

I have learned how ICS works partly through experience since I became director last summer. I started teaching in the program in the fall of 2010 when I came from Oberlin College. In the spring and summer of 2011 I learned a great deal more about ICS. I essentially carried out an archival and an interview-based history, contacting as many people as I could find on campus, also from across the country who are involved in the program. This work is encapsulated in a long report I won't bore you with. Essentially, ICS was established as a major in 1973-74. We have had over 1500 undergraduates graduate with a degree.

ICS has encouraged and facilitated study abroad and cross-cultural knowledge and interaction from its beginning. It is unique in this way, not just at Duke, but also in the U.S. because of the way in which ICS deals with area knowledge and varieties of transnational dynamics. I think ICS is distinctive in its cross-disciplinary integration of the humanities, social sciences, biology, economics, and public policy. Courses in the middle part of the undergraduate curriculum are offered across campus, so ICS is vetted according to specific criteria.

ICS allows—uniquely within the curriculum—a range of questions related to transnational studies to be asked using different kinds of interdisciplinary approaches. If you look at our undergraduates' major curriculum, you will see where students can take these kinds of questions and I think this is why it's popular. It combines transnational foreign language and regional training and I

think it's a very nice balance between a vertical structure in assessment speak and flexibility.

I did research on similar programs, and I'm sure Duke is the first program of its kind. It used to be called Comparative Area Studies. Now it is International Comparative Studies. One of the largest programs is at UC Santa Barbara called Global and International Studies. It was established in 1999, has regional requirements, over 700 undergraduate majors, a core faculty and affiliated faculty appointments, and two years of foreign language. They have also recently established a Global Studies emphasis joint PhD [with other departments].

At Stanford there is no real comparable program: global or international studies come under the Political Science Department. Regional specialization is not required [for the major]. Foreign language proficiency students either test out of or take classes. And Stanford's program does not have a breadth in terms of interdisciplinarity. Princeton also has no comparable program. The Woodrow Wilson School has a departmental concentration. Sophomores can apply to it and it has a public policy focus. We do have public policy as a part of what we do, but Princeton's has a stronger public policy focus.

UNC Chapel Hill has a curriculum called Global Studies. I have learned recently that the state government has approved a major [in Global Studies] but this information is not on the website. So all one sees on the website is a curriculum in Global Studies. The program is very popular with 450 majors, foreign language requirements, and regional study requirements. It also has many sub-themes. Yale's program is similar to Princeton's Woodrow Wilson program; it comes under the Jackson Institute for Global Affairs. It requires application by undergraduates, foreign language proficiency, and coursework focuses mostly on social sciences and economics.

Today—and it has been like this for a number of years—Duke's ICS major graduates fifty to sixty student majors a year. Just arriving at Duke and working with my colleagues in ICS, the deans, and faculty in other departments who are part of our governance structure, I have instituted a variety of improvements in the major, among many other things we have done. For the first time we developed systematic criteria for vetting courses that fulfill region and comparative categories of the major and those are online. All four comparative courses now must be transnationally oriented. Once one could cover just two regions, so the emphasis has shifted.

To increase intentionality and verticality within the major no more than one introductory level course—among the eight courses that meet region and comparative requirements—and an additional course needs to be 400-level or above among these eight courses. We already a capstone course, but in addition in middle of the [major] sandwich, we ask that no more than one course be an introductory course and at least one course be advanced in the eight comparative and region courses.

To increase intentionality and verticality and to reduce administrative confusion—a big issue in ICS—the comparative approaches to global issues course is limited

to first and second year students. We make case-by-case exceptions [to the rule], usually involving juniors who petition. To increase intellectual approaches and integration [of the major], completing the gateway course is expected before a study away semester or research project. This encourages students to think ahead before participating in Duke Engage or Duke Immerse or a study abroad semester. We dropped the minor in ICS because I did not think it had curricular integrity. We renamed and updated the region concentrations, clarified and systematized policies related to study away programs, languages, and the distinction program with a focus on increasing academic rigor and limiting decisions about majors on a case-by-case basis. All of the core courses that we control, such as Comparative Approaches to Global Issues, the capstone seminar, and the distinction program, have been revised and improved in a collective process. For example, the capstone course now has a writing and a research designation. We introduced a prize for the best capstone research projects, a new prize that begins this year. It will be competitive. We have updated the website, really transformed the website, as well as the bulletin copy to better communicate all of these changes and expectations.

As Tom said, we have a large number of majors. We are in the top one-third in Arts and Sciences. ICS has intensive advising and administrative needs for students intending to major. We have many students who come to Duke because of ICS and they want to do it from the first semester. So even though they have not declared [a major], we handle a lot of advising questions related to them, our declared majors, and students with study abroad questions, because our students have such a high participation rate in study abroad compared to other arts and sciences students excluding the sciences.

ICS also does significant coordination and communication with a lot of faculty across campus. Not just me but any faculty member who teaches the gateway course coordinates with four or five faculty members who teach week-long modules. We direct eight honors projects this year. Each honors student has a faculty supervisor in addition to being supervised within a department. This [collaboration] requires negotiations, arrangements, and committees. I coordinate with faculty throughout the campus to come up with criteria for getting classes.

Finally, faculty members are very involved in our governance of the program through a committee. So for ICS to continue, our vitality and sustainability requires us to build a dynamic faculty in full, partial, and secondary appointments. Regular rank core appointments would facilitate intellectual leadership and prevent burnout among faculty.

For a small program that relies on a few people, it would allow faculty that are already working in ICS to be appointed within ICS. We have a few faculty members like this now, but we need to figure out where they are going to be appointed and negotiate with various people. Even though most of their work occurs within ICS, we need faculty to provide a high-quality core curriculum. We also need a faculty to fulfill SACS [Southern Association of Colleges and Schools] requirements. Our own faculty

would stabilize the administration. It would facilitate core faculty's ability to sustain research agendas, professional development, and contribute to larger intellectual and pedagogical projects.

Discussion

Professor Tolly Boatwright: This was terrific and very informative. One of the things I like so much about it is the obvious care with which you are dealing with each and every one of your students. So my question has to do with the number of faculty? And how would you... Is there core faculty? Can you say a little more about how many faculty are doing this? Because I think about the capstone course, for example, and if you have fifty to sixty majors a year—let's say half of them are seniors—that's a thirty-student capstone course. A capstone course is usually a seminar so that means two...

Professor Frances Hasso: To repeat the question: Who is doing the work? Who are the core faculty? In terms of teaching courses, we are teaching two [gateway courses], one each semester (Comparative Approaches to Global Issues). They are capped at forty-nine. I did away with undergraduate TAs, and negotiated hiring a TA and a grader. These courses are very writing and reading intensive. At the capstone level, we are offering three capstones a year, and we are also offering a yearlong seminar. So for the capstones, there are three kind of "core" faculty in ICS: Cheri Ross, Robin Kirk, and me. For this year, we were approved to hire a teaching fellow in ICS, and we were budgeted either to renew her or hire someone else for the following year. I am training this person, so she is teaching one of the gateway courses and one of the capstone courses. We negotiated with a colleague in Sociology to convince her to teach one capstone course.

We are constantly trying to get these courses covered. And we must train [new instructors] because a lot of coordination and revision takes place around these courses. Regarding advising, the three core faculty advise fifteen to twenty students declared majors apiece, sometimes more. I have worked on building more stakeholders [in the program] who can help from other departments, participate in governance, get reimbursed for their research accounts, and take on eight students each. So we have about six faculty members outside of core group who advise a smaller number of students. But one must meet with them, and in two weeks the craziness [around advising] will begin.

Professor Steffen Bass (Physics Department): This is a direct follow-up. I wanted to sharpen somewhat the previous question. I am very impressed with the work you are doing, and everything that went into this. But for me, this is a matter of resources, and somewhat of a hen and an egg problem. If I look at your website, you are pretty much the only regular rank primary faculty in this program. To change this now from a major to a program, it's almost like creating a department, in terms of what this entails. So you definitely need more regular rank faculty. There are two ways to get that; either you lure them from other Duke departments, and make them primary in your department or program once approved. Or there has to be a

commitment from the deans to hire real regular rank faculty into this department. I would like to learn more about what is the level of resources you can count on if this is being approved to be a program. As long as this is essentially a one-woman show, it's a very haphazard undertaking.

Dean Angela O'Rand (Associate Dean for Social Sciences): This program has existed for almost forty years. It is a popular undergraduate major that has basically survived on the love and devotion of faculty members committed to the program over this period, but it has changed. Before I came on as dean, a search was approved that ultimately brought Frances [Hasso] to begin to create a regular rank faculty core and it was done through a joint appointment search. This [search] brought Frances [to Duke] who has a joint appointment with Women's Studies and ICS and a secondary appointment in sociology.

So, when I [became associate dean] in 2009, and Frances was coming, we looked at this program and we realized that perhaps it had been under the radar for a while. [We] spent a year examining our options, and felt that if the program has sixty students a year graduating from it, there was demand there. We were all going through [the] SACS [accreditation process] at the time, and [concluded] there has to be something a little more, a little firmer, with respect to program commitment.

So, Frances has done a good job of summarizing this [change], so over the last three years we have tried to develop a sequential plan to add stability to this program. And, yes, it requires some commitment to adding regular rank faculty over the next couple of years by whatever means seems reasonable at the time. The first one really for us is a professor of the practice appointment, beginning with a visiting appointment, and moving towards a national search for someone to be a professor of the practice. It could evolve to another [appointment], it could evolve to potential joint appointments, like Frances's, with other departments. A program committee that consists of tenured and tenure track people from other departments is interested in the program so that is a future possibility.

We live with a lot of uncertainty from year to year now when it comes to searches, as you all know very well, and so again we're trying to move cautiously to add some firm foundation to the comparative studies program. Does that answer your question?

Professor Steffen Bass: I would have liked to hear a bit more about larger commitments, [such as] how many core faculty do you envision in four years?

Dean Angela O'Rand: We cannot commit a number to any department or program, but what we can commit, what we have tried to commit and need faculty response to, is shoring up this department with fundamental core over the next two, or three, or four years in order for it to serve the undergraduates.

Dean Laurie Patton: Just a very direct answer to your question. Yes, we have, barring financial disaster, committed one POP [professor of the practice] for next year. After that, it [depends on] the roller coaster of how we deal with resources, but after that, one of the things we have thought about in terms of strategy with Frances would be to work with other departments who have fewer

majors, [but] whose faculty is larger and remained interested in international studies. Among the many strategies [to add faculty], including hiring, we will be working on this approach as well. So [we foresee] at least one POP [professor of the practice] and continuing to build also with really creative collaboration that can help ICS.

Professor Steffen Bass: How many faculty do you envision—do you need in the core—to make this sustainable in the long term?

Professor Frances Hasso: I think we need at least one core [faculty member]. Angie and Laurie know that I am a fighter, so they will propose a POP, and if we come up with a great [possible candidate]—we are doing a national search right now for a two-year assistant visitor—I might get a POP, [but] I might get more than a POP. But in terms of the future, I think there is an open-endedness to it [the possibilities] because maybe there should be an M.A., [or] maybe ICS should be the space that works on a joint PhD in Global Studies with a variety of departments. I feel at that point, we're actually going to need the [additional] faculty. Then economically and intellectually [additional faculty] might make more sense. So I feel that it is hard to know.

Dean Laurie Patton (Dean of Arts and Sciences): Administratively, I want to clarify [that the] visitor [position] is only because the program cannot hire right now. As soon as, and if the program is approved, then it [the visiting position] would be converted.

Professor Frances Hasso: I am supposed to be on leave. We actually have a labor crunch

Introduction of Professor David Malone

Professor Tom Robisheaux: At this point I ask that further questions be held. I want to recognize David Malone from the Executive Committee of the Arts and Sciences Council, who will give you a report from the executive committee and its recommendation.

ECASC Recommendation

Professor David Malone: Hi, I'm David Malone and I represent the Executive Committee of the Arts and Sciences Council. As Professor Hasso has explained, this proposal seeks to convert the major in ICS to a program within Arts and Sciences with the capacity to hire faculty.

First, I want to thank Professor Hasso and other faculty members—Cheri Ross, Robin Kirk, and Sherryl Broverman—for all your hard work and thoughtfulness in putting together this proposal. The proposal was submitted in July 2012 and has the strong support and commitment of Deans Laurie Patton and Angela O'Rand. The Chair of the Arts and Sciences Council, Tom Robisheaux, has had several meetings this fall with the deans and Frances [Hasso]. ECASC [Executive Committee of the Arts and Sciences Council] has had two lengthy meetings with the deans and with Professor Hasso, and in these meetings we have asked what we think are tough questions, some of which are the ones we are beginning to ask now about resources, strategic planning, and commitment. At the end of these meetings, ECASC voted, and strongly supports this proposal, and I want to share four reasons why, many of which have already been spoken to.

First of all, there's a long-term sustained commitment among students in ICS. Since 1973, students have been voting with their feet, and over 1,500 students have selected ICS as a major. So it has proved to be a long-standing, popular undergraduate major. Currently, with fifty students majors, as Frances mentioned, ICS is in the top one-third of all majors in Arts and Sciences.

Second, ICS will benefit significantly from a sustainable administrative structure. Amazingly, for forty years, the ICS major has been held together without a faculty of its own. This is mostly out of the sheer devotion of faculty outside of the ICS major, which puts the major in the position of relying on the good graces of other faculty with primary commitments in other departments. ECASC believes that ICS can benefit greatly from a sustained organizational structure, which will allow it to hire faculty and use its own faculty to teach gateway courses, capstone courses, to do advising, and to mentor honors theses.

Third, I think we all realize that there are many faculty and students that are now energized around global issues and the emerging global intellectual mission here at Duke. We think a vibrant ICS program can provide a location, a place, and an intellectual community within Arts and Sciences where the growing interests in global and Comparative International Studies has a visible institutional presence.

Fourth, we think ICS has potential to add to our efforts to strengthen and deepen undergraduate education within arts and sciences. A strong ICS program can bring opportunities for intentionality, integration, and coherent pathways for undergraduates who wish to connect and integrate. These are just some of the things their academic coursework, study of a foreign language, their global immersion experiences through programs such as study abroad, Duke Engage, Duke Immerse, Global Semester Abroad, Duke health internship, global health internships, Duke Kunshan, and Duke Intense Global. I think we all understand the changing landscape of higher education, and we think this program has potential to help students integrate and connect their curricular and co-curricular activities in an intellectual way and a socially engaged way that will be very meaningful to them. For these reasons, the executive committee supports the granting of program status to ICS.

At this time, I think we should have a motion. Do we have a motion to change the status of this major to a program within Arts and Sciences?

Professor Tom Robisheaux: This puts the motion formally on the floor for discussion

Professor Chantal Reid (Nicholas School of the Environment): I motion that we recommend for a program in ICS

Professor Wahneema Lubiano (African and African American Studies): Seconded

Professor Tom Robisheaux: Thank you, David; we have a few more minutes for comments and questions. I would like to remind you, we have a microphone and if you would please state your name and your department for the record.

Discussion

Professor Abdeslam Maghraoui (Political Science Department): I would like to thank you, Professor Hasso, for your presentation. I just have one question. Do you have any information on what students do after they graduate? I want to have a sense of where they go.

Professor Frances Hasso: I want to have a better sense of where they go, too. We have been under-resourced in a lot of ways, including staff. We just hired a person, part of whose job is actually to work to gather the data that is related to [alumni], so anything I give you would be anecdotal, especially so because I am new [at Duke]. So I don't have a long history [with ICS], but this [alumni] is a big piece that we are working on with the development office.

Professor Tolly Boatwright: I seem to be the fly in the ointment, but just to go back to the other question about resources. It is a fantastic thing to get a POP nowadays, but ultimately you need tenure-track faculty. So I just want to put that on the record. If this is going to be a viable program that really does right by its students and also by the faculty who are associated with it, it will be much better for the workload, and the distribution of all of the things that we need, to have our faculty really thrive, and therefore students thrive, if it [appointments] could be tenure-track.

Professor Frances Hasso: Thank you, I agree.

Professor David Malone: To follow up on this resource question, has some thought been given to developing a five-year strategic development plan, and maybe having different versions of those? I know we cannot really predict what resources are going to be available, but at least have: "This is our A plan, this is what we really hope to have happen, and if that's not available this is our B plan."

Professor Frances Hasso: We are actually planning to begin working on that at the November program committee meeting. We are constantly working in that mode but much of the planning is about building enough foundational resources to be able to think that way. Although I naturally think that way, we're planning on doing looking forward in an intensive way. I like the Plan A, Plan B way of thinking.

Professor Leslie Digby (Evolutionary Anthropology): This is a question for the deans. What do you see as the ideal pathway for the creation of a new program, and perhaps ultimately, a new department? Do you like the way that this is developing from a major? Is that an organic way to create a new discipline? Do you see other ways in which you would like this to happen? Is this the most natural pathway for creating a new program? Would this ultimately go to the departmental level?

Dean Angela O'Rand: We have to think pragmatically, and I guess I am happy to use the term "organic." ICS is a major. It has been a major for a long time. It has had some resources put into it, [but] it needs more resources put into it. If it has a trajectory of developmental growth beyond that point it is going to be a function of our next step. So we are supportive of the program, and we are supportive of Tolly [Boatwright]'s recommendation to move towards more buy-in from

faculty who are tenured or on tenure-track. This [process] is not just hiring new people; it's also bringing a good person in, like Frances [Hasso], who can entice people who are already here to become more involved with this program. There are a lot of fans of this program in the faculty. We support it to move from a major [to a program]. There is no single way to do this at Duke any longer. The program exists, it is popular, it is a good program, and it has a strong person leading it now, and we're trying to help that person move it along.

Dean Laurie Patton: That's a wonderful question [about creating a new department]. There are various ways that departments can come into existence. One, speaking of the direction of the conversation, they come as ideas from administrators with some response from faculty. Two, they come into existence because faculty do not want to be with other departments. Three, they [faculty] decide later they want to return to other departments. Fourth, is very much what you described. I have a lot of faith in faculty governance and from ground up initiatives. If there are faculty practices that look like they have been on the ground and part of the intellectual life for a long period of time such that they need elegant and minimal support without bureaucratic blockages, this is the kind of combination that I am most in favor of. I think that is the way departments should emerge. That is my number one favorite way to create a department.

My least favorite way to create a department would be the first, which is that some administrator has an idea, and gets a response from some of the faculty, but it never really takes root. Roots are absolutely essential. My answer therefore looks at the large picture.

Dean Ingeborg Walther (Associate Dean of Trinity College): This is not a comment; it's just a simple question. I do not understand, and perhaps while you are on this topic, could you explain the difference between a program and a department? Because we have [the] Literature [Program] which is a program but acts like a department. I have never understood the difference [between program and department], and if someone could explain I would appreciate it.

Dean Angela O'Rand: They are all legacies of the past. Women's Studies is a program that acts like a department, but it does not award a PhD. Literature is a program that acts like a department and it awards Ph.Ds. Education is a program that offers an [undergraduate] minor [but] that gives a master's degree. All of these are institutional legacies. We have discussed carrying out a change across the board. We will get there sooner or later.

Dean Ingeborg Walther: Intellectually, what is the difference in your minds?

Dean Laurie Patton: At this point, given my [recent] arrival at Duke I notice that there is some slippage between the different definitions. Right now, instead of giving a larger centralized [or official] view of what a department or a program is, I have my own ideas about it. I would prefer first to get some clarity, institutionally, so then we could move forward with more elegant definitions [of units] because I don't think this is going to be the last time [that] this question comes up. In this context, if I make a declaration it will have an official air that I don't intend.

Professor Tom Robisheaux: This concludes our first discussion of the proposal to change the status of International Comparative Studies. Members, you have copies of Frances Hasso's proposal. Study it. We will return to this next month for our second discussion. And if we have a member of the council who wishes to call a question we can then vote or continue our discussion depending upon the will of the council is. Let me recognize briefly Dean Patton for a footnote to this discussion.

Dean Laurie Patton: It was only to say that Angie [O'Rand] and I wanted to clarify exactly why we were supporting it. Just to give you a little bit of the Dean's perspective.

First of all, I think the question of global studies, more broadly, given that we have a robust [Global Education] office with Steve and Margaret [Riley] and everyone else at Global Education, to have an intellectual grounding and a counterpart in global studies [in ICS] is really important from our perspective.

Second, intellectually there was a rationale for this in the 1970s and 1980s, as Frances mentioned, in Comparative Area Studies [when there was] a different kind of intellectual landscape based on the idea of a nation-state. Now we have an entirely different context in which the need for thinking globally and comparatively not centered on the idea of a nation-state is even more of a *desideratum*.

As all of you know, I have been talking with each department, also with programs like Literature and Education, Women's Studies, about how departments can be intellectual leaders at Duke. I think that this particular configuration of ICS can be a leader around the critical discussion of global studies. Finally, as a dean, I feel a moral obligation to support faculty who have been working on the ground for thirty years with very little support.

Introduction of Professor Edna Andrews

Professor Tom Robisheaux: Let me turn now to our final item on the agenda. We have often heard about the new teaching and learning initiatives at Duke over the last couple of years. ECASC and I thought it would be a good idea to hear from a faculty member who created one such initiative.

Today I would like to introduce to you a colleague from linguistics and cultural anthropology, Professor Edna Andrews. Professor Andrews was the very first colleague to create an entirely new program with a different concept from anything else we have seen at Duke for undergraduate students learning languages, cultures and histories and also, hopefully, studying abroad. She has brought all of this together in a program called Duke Intense Global. You have heard about it before. I know that Duke Intense Global has been supported by Steve Nowicki and his office, and, of course, Provost Peter Lange. But we thought it would be important to hear how it actually works from the vantage point of a faculty member. I understand, Edna, that you have brought a student, too, to explain how this has worked [from a

student's perspective. It gives me great pleasure to introduce to you our colleague, Professor Edna Andrews.

Duke Intense Global in Russia

Professor Edna Andrews (Slavic and Eurasian Studies): Thank you. This [student] is Jordan Frasier, one of the students who participated in one of the two inaugural programs for Duke Intense Global. Let me first give you a quick background.

Because of my extensive [experience] teaching abroad and the mandate I have as principle investigator for two federal grants to be innovative and come up with new ideas, also because of my teaching in the focus program off and on for the last twenty years—which certainly changed all of us [teaching in the program]—and, finally, because of my experience working with John Simon and David Malone in the assessment committee, I wanted to think how to do something that is exciting and different and that might change the way that students remember their undergraduate education. This includes learning that extends beyond a single semester.

Since I have been involved with doing research with undergraduates, I realize that robust research doesn't usually happen in a semester. It's a good beginning, but it needs to go on. Duke Intense Global is the result of this experience and these influences at Duke. There's one other thing that comes out of the Focus experience: sophomores often are unhappy with their post-Focus life. They wonder: What happened? Because Focus was such an enriched environment for them and [then] in sophomore year, they are just like everybody else. So that was another idea: what can we do to enhance the second year experience?

The Duke Intense Global program involves a minimum of three semesters. The first [programs] included Russia and India. The idea of the structure is that Duke Intense Global would move all over the globe based on faculty interest and the infrastructures that currently exist. One of the things I am happy to say is that I did not invent any new structure for this program; I used existing Duke structures. So it was not an added program, but took what we already do and used it, including our center resources, study abroad resources, and intellectual resources on campus.

The Duke in Russia program begins in the fall semester, and, this is key, the first semester of Duke Intense Global is a no substitutions experience, the reason being that students have to spend part of it away from Duke. The entire program—the faculty and students together—then leave and go together to the cultural site as part of the learning experience. In this case, the program involved a neuroscience course, a linguistics course, and intensive Russian. [Because] we used our exchange program with St. Petersburg University we were very economical and students had the same instructors. So the good part about this program is that students worked with multiple instructors within the country and they then worked again with them in the [following] summer in a 120-hour intensive experience. During the academic year, one instructor anchored language instruction and was with students on both sides of the ocean, that is, one of the five language instructors in the program.

Once again, we used what was already in place. Students, that is, all of us, spent three and a half weeks in October and November in St. Petersburg at St. Petersburg University. In the Spring Semester students were required to do one only one thing: to take an accelerated second year course and then [take] 120 contact hours in the summer program. Duke Engage was an option, [but] no one actually ended up doing it. Jordan [almost did so], he was accepted, and [but] then he re-evaluated.

Some of the outcomes, as I mentioned, were better than I had hoped. One of the outcomes that is empirically undisputed is that these students, within the first semester of their intensive experience, plus the in-country experience, were able to pass the B1 [language] proficiency level of the European Union. In case no one knows what this means, let me translate. It means that students were able to reach a level of proficiency making them eligible for enrollment in a university. This is an unbelievable [achievement].

But the scores got a lot better, and by the summer, they were [doing even better in] reading, speaking, writing, listening comprehension, and grammar. By the end of the experience, taking a proficiency exam, you are not supposed to make 100%, but his [Jordan Frasier's] score, I think, was 99% in a couple of the categories. So this was really exciting.

We also have a post-Duke experience which I consider part of [the program]. Peter Lange wasn't sure that anyone would agree to do this but many of them have [done so], that is, they continue work in the language and culture of the program that they were involved with. I think the key to success is the core idea of multi-disciplinarity. Our program had a natural science, a social science, and then language and culture. If you want to know more, we made a movie about the program, but I didn't bring it today.

Jordan Frasier (Trinity College): My name is Jordan Frasier. I'm a junior studying linguistics with a minor in cultural anthropology. I want to say that this [program] is one of the defining experiences of my Duke career so far. It was an exceptional opportunity. I feel that this program was made for me. I don't know if Edna [Andrews] had me in mind [in creating the program]. I was a Focus [Program] student and I came to college with the goal of learning a language each year. It's a difficult goal.

So I started off slowly with Italian. I already had some background in French, and I managed to accomplish that, and I thought: What can I do next? This [program announcement] popped into my [email] inbox and it was perfect: reaching not fluency but pretty strong proficiency [in a language] within a year. The program also incorporated my interest in linguistics. I was also considering a neuroscience major at the time, so [the program] also [included] neuroscience. I had already taken a class with Edna [Andrews], and I loved it. The program just really fit, and I'm so incredibly glad that I have taken it. It's the type of opportunity that I came to Duke looking for.

Professor Edna Andrews: Tell them where you're going next.

Jordan Frasier: I'm going to India next. Hindi is my next language.

Basically, this program has helped me to figure out what I want to do, [how] to structure my goals and how to achieve them. This program was so well thought-out. It wasn't just a language program; it was also about the culture and immersion [in the culture]. But the language, in particular, hit you on all sides. We also had the interdisciplinarity [of the program]. We studied the neuroscience background to understand how people learn languages and what your brain [learning a foreign] language is like. We studied linguistics which allowed us to cover a lot of topics that normal language classes just don't have time for. And then we had the intensive language on top of it. We had the immersion [experience], and I think our progress was incredible.

Now I have these other goals that I want to achieve, and I know the things that I need to get there. Especially in my Junior year I'm trying to re-create this program with the resources that are available at Duke. It was a fantastic experience, and I'd be happy to answer any questions you have from a student's perspective.

Introduction of Dean Steve Nowicki

Professor Tom Robisheaux: Before we open the floor to questions for Professor Andrews and Jordan [Frasier], let me recognize [Dean of Undergraduate Education] Steve Nowicki who will say a few things about Duke Intense Global within a wider context.

Dean Steve Nowicki (Dean of Undergraduate Education): Actually, I have very little to say. I was thinking I might talk before Edna and I don't need to say much now that Edna has talked. There were a couple of points I just wanted to clarify, though, because I know that there's been some confusion about Duke Intense Global and Duke Immerse, which are really fundamentally different programs.

Duke Intense Global is Edna's brainchild and she just described it very well to you. Duke Immerse was actually the brainchild of a faculty committee led by Susan Lozier three years ago, a great committee that included David [Malone], Dan McShea, Priscilla Wald from English and others. It was really a faculty group effort.

The Duke Immerse concept was similar in that it takes a cohort of students who have four registrations worth of courses that they are all enrolled in. But the goal is to immerse the students in some common problem or issue across disciplines involving that topic for a full semester. It was not conceived as a global program. In fact, it explicitly was not. It just so happens that the first two pilot [projects] of Duke Immerse took the opportunity to connect the pedagogy with going someplace else. Other programs now in development are non-global.

Edna's program is about language and culture immersion, once again, [it is organized] around a topic. But the focus, the emphasis is on language and culture. Another defining difference is that it has an arc of several semesters that allow students to go in and out of country a couple of times. I've heard Edna very clearly articulate the fact—which came to my mind immediately when she said it—that the first time you go to a new place, you're a

tourist. The second time you can start to experience it in a different way. And so the idea of going in and out of country at least twice is brilliant.

Another point I want to make is about the cost of these programs. Where does this money come from? Well, Edna's came from federal grants and some money from the provost's office to support teaching innovation. Duke Immerse was similar: some [funds] came from Duke institutes and the provost's money to support teaching innovation. In the long run, working with [Director of Global Education for Undergraduates] Margaret [Riley] and her team, these [programs] will be sustainable if they work more on the model of a study abroad [program] if there is a global component. We realize that sustainability is a big part of it [the challenge], and Margaret [Riley] and her team is working on it. I have talked with Edna [Andrews] and others in the Development [Office] about this. Thank you.

Questions

Professor Tom Robisheaux: Thank you Steve, thank you very much. Let me open the discussion, if I may, with a question to you Edna. I have taught [courses] and also directed a study abroad program. Such a program has all sorts of problems, putting it neutrally, that can occur when students go abroad and live in another country. What are the challenges with this kind of program? Because you work with students in the latter part of the semester, the whole group leaving in November, or the end of October, and then they go back again. What were the real challenges or problems that you encountered along the way? How might you do it differently were you to do it again?

Professor Edna Andrews: Well, actually, it went pretty smoothly because we already had the infrastructure in place. In the summer nothing new had to be created. In terms of the three to four weeks in the fall, this required a lot of prior planning. Of course, both Russia and India require visas, so [getting] visas is a big challenge, and they take a long time. So we had to start the process very early, I believe we began in May or June before we left . . . ?

Jordan Frasier: We got the paperwork done and then we sent it in, I believe.

Professor Edna Andrews: Right, so the paperwork had to be completed at the end of the spring semester, which means if you are to accept people, you have to [plan ahead]. Right now programs for next year should be ready to advertise at the end of the year or January, and then have a closing date that allows enough time if you [travel to] a country with a visa problem. The good news is our relationship with St. Petersburg University. We have the longest [standing] faculty exchange [program with St. Petersburg University] in the country. And they are wonderful partners. So we are using what we already have.

Professor Tom Robisheaux: Having that infrastructure in place obviously makes a big difference. Let me recognize David Malone.

Professor David Malone: I wanted to ask Jordan, just so I'm clear, you went in fall 2011?

Jordan Frasier: Yes.

Professor David Malone: Then in spring 2012 you took . . . ?

Jordan Frasier: We took just the one Russian [intensive language] course.

Professor David Malone: And then you returned in summer 2012?

Jordan Frasier: Right. So it I involved my entire sophomore year from September through to the end of June.

Professor David Malone: So when you go for those three and a half weeks, are you [living] in a dorm? Where do you reside when you are in St. Petersburg in the first semester?

Jordan Frasier: We were living in both cases what they call university dorms. They are like an apartment complex. It is two metro stops away from the university. Edna [Andrews] has a long [standing] relationship with the university and I guess students have stayed there for a long time. We were just placed into empty rooms.

Professor David Malone: But you live together as Duke students?

Jordan Frasier: Right, yeah, we had two or three apartments.

Professor David Malone: So my final question is: Do you agree that two immersive in-country experiences have value? Have you ever had just one . . . ?

Jordan Frasier: I actually have. I had the opportunity to spend the summer in Italy after my freshman year. I have to say it [two immersive experiences] definitely makes a huge difference. I would say I was further along in my study of Italian when I went to Italy than I was in Russian. But language learning takes a lot of motivation. It's not easy. You really have to put a lot into it. I think going to Russia in November was the best motivation you could possibly have because, first of all, you have something to look forward to, so you feel compelled. You want to cover a certain amount of material before you get there so you can survive. Then beyond that, once you get there, going to a country that speaks a foreign language is an incredibly stressful situation. People you don't know and cultural norms that you don't understand constantly surround you. It's exhausting.

At that point in the semester if we had decided to stay there all the way through [to the summer] it would have been way too much. Having three weeks was enough to sort of see where we were [located] and where we had to get to. There was a certain amount of immersion while we were there that helped propel us forward. It also gives you a benchmark. You know you are coming back in May and need to [understand the language] at a certain level and know certain things, linguistically.

So that [the initial experience] was extremely helpful. The second time there were the seven of us who had already been and the rest were study abroad students who had never been to Russia before. It was incredibly nice to get there and know where you were, to know the geography of the place. You also know when going to the grocery store that you should probably bring exact change or people will yell at you. You have more of an understanding of how things work so that when you come

back the second time you can dive into your studies and things go a lot smoother.

Professor Edna Andrews: Can I add one thing? David [one of the students on the program] was on the evaluation committee this summer for the study abroad program, and the university tried to enroll him in classes! He came to the university and before he could ask for "Edna [Andrews]" they took his passport and had him filling out documents to enroll him in school. He almost matriculated! Then he said "Edna" and they went and got me.

Dean Ingeborg Walther: Thanks so much for this presentation, which I've heard before, and it's just as interesting this time. Jordan, I have a question for you. I know there are some programs now, such as the program I am familiar with, our study abroad program in Berlin, that take the fall semester and students can go with no knowledge [of the German language]. They can take an intensive course in Germany for the entire semester and not just for three weeks. So I want to ask you [Jordan], and, I guess you, Edna, did you ever consider doing that? Or would you, as a student, have been more reluctant to do something like that than start out at Duke first, and then go? I was just wondering because I am a total believer in learning languages through immersion, and the more the better, as far as I am concerned. Could you address this?

Professor Jordan Frasier: I think in my case that would have been too much. I think my concern would be burnout, because as I said before, [learning a] language takes a lot out of you. Being in an environment speaking a language that you don't speak is exhausting all the time. Even with the foundation that we had by November or October when we went I felt it was still very difficult. I would be concerned that I would take one semester and then be done with it. The way that this [program] was structured allows you to ease into it without compromising the amount of material we could cover in a semester.

Professor Edna Andrews: Also, Berlin and St. Petersburg are cardinaly different places. The winters in the far north of Russia, for example, when we left [for Russia], it was already quite dark. There was [also] no snow last year, however, which is unheard of, and we left at Thanksgiving [time] and there still had been no snow. The first snow of the year came the day after we left. So it [St. Petersburg] was very dark, and this is very hard to handle. We do not allow anyone who has not already been on a study abroad experience in Russia to take part in a semester program in Russia through Duke University. That's the answer to the question about Russia, it [going for a semester without prior language experience] can't [work]. I think that the cultural context makes a huge difference in where you can and cannot do that.

Jordan Frasier: Can I just add one more thing? Another difference in the context between Germany and Russia is that very few Russians speak English. So arriving and being a tourist, you can actually function in only certain locations without having a basic knowledge of Russian. Most places in Europe this would not be an issue. But throwing people in with no [background] would be a concern.

Professor Tom Robisheaux: May I ask the last question? How difficult is it to recruit students to make a commitment to a three-semester program? I know from past experience Duke students largely think in terms of semester units, and even getting a student to take a two semester sequence is difficult.

Professor Edna Andrews: It wasn't a problem. We mainly advertised through the Focus list-serve, that is, we wrote to Focus students. That's how you [Jordan] found out. Jordan was in [the Focus Program] "Exploring the Mind." We suggested [this program to students] if they were interested [in the topic]. We had more people apply than we accepted. I accepted seven [students]. Leela [Prasad, Religion Department] had six [students]. Leela's program was slightly different from what we presented here. But no, it wasn't a problem. Again, it's all about timing. Students need a lot of lead-time. I think I had twenty-five or thirty interested [students]. Seven was a wonderful [number]. We talked about accepting as many as ten [students], but [seven] actually worked out perfectly. They were a wonderful group. The students self-selected in a sense, but, of course, I picked them over some of the others. But this was a wonderful group, all seven of them. It was a blessing.

Professor Tom Robisheaux: Thank you Edna. If you have suggestions about what should be priority items on the council agenda I want to invite council members to please mention them to me, David Malone, Dalene Stangl, Bill Seaman or Charlie Becker, even though I think it's hard to reach Charlie right now as he is somewhere in Central Asia. We want the council meetings to focus on issues that involve you, the faculty, and the challenges that you are facing. Just send me an email, give me a call, or grab me in the quad.

New ECASC Members

Professor Tom Robisheaux: Finally, let me just announce that we have two new members on the executive committee: Wahneema Lubiano and Steffen Bass. I thank you all.

Meeting Adjourned