

Duke University

DURHAM
NORTH CAROLINA
27708-0928

ARTS & SCIENCES COUNCIL
102 ALLEN BLDG
CAMPUS BOX 90029

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Arts & Sciences Council

Thursday, April 11, 2013

Call to Order

Council Chair Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History): If you are a council representative, let me just remind you that we would like to have a record of your attendance. If you have not signed in, Shawna is going to be passing [the sign-in sheet] around in just one moment; please sign up, or if you are an alternate, let us know. I want to welcome all of the members of council, our ex-officio members, and [our] usual guests. A lot of you are here and welcome as guests of the council. The council meetings are open to the whole university community, so I am delighted to see all of you here and taking part in our meeting today.

Approval of Minutes

Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History): Our first small item of business is the approval of the minutes from February and March. I apologize; I was running a little bit behind in February and March and was only recently able to get them posted to the Arts and Sciences Sakai site. I am going to ask for motion to approve them, but let me say if you have not had a chance to review them, that is okay. The minutes can be corrected at any time if you notify me, and it does not require a subsequent motion and approval on the part of the council. We will just bring it to the attention of the council at our April 25 meeting. Council representatives, have you had a chance to review the minutes? Do I hear a motion to approve them?

Professor Steffen Bass (Physics): So moved.

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

Professor Tolly Boatwright (Classics): Seconded.

Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History): All those in favor? [Would you] signify by raising your hands? So approved.

Announcements and Updates

Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History): [I have] a couple of updates and announcements for council members. March is the month of elections to the council; there are some units whose representatives [have] ended their term of office. We have two units whose representatives are finishing their term right now, and we have three new members to welcome to our council. Let me introduce them for you very briefly. We have held the elections within these units. In the military units, there are three of them combined together to elect one representative, I would like to thank Lt. Col. Peter Oertel for his service to the council over the last several years. He will be rotating out, and will be replaced by Lt. Col. Michael Martinez (Aerospace Studies/Military Science) who will be here in July, if I understand it correctly, and we will welcome him to the council when it begins at the end of August and/or the beginning of September. In Women's Studies, I want to welcome Professor Ara Wilson who has been elected to be the representative for the next three years. Ara, I know, is a little bit late. I would like to introduce her, but she is not here. We have one other member that I would like to introduce. Last meeting when the council approved the new co-major in Global Health, we were also implicitly approving representation on the council from the Global Health Institute as a unit outside of Arts and Sciences, which we also have in the case of Public Policy. An election was held among their faculty, and I am pleased to say, and I am sure many of you would agree, that we are happy to have Gary Bennett join us; welcome to council. Thank you all for your service to council. We look forward to working together in the coming year.

I have one other update for you, and it has to do with the ad hoc DKU Joint Committee (Duke Kunshan University). As you know, this committee was formed in December at my request. It was formed as a combination of the Global Education for Undergraduates Committee and the council's Courses Committee. It was given the charge of reviewing and approving courses proposed for DKU. I want to especially thank the members of the Courses Committee and the Global Education Committee. These colleagues have worked so unbelievably hard this year on triple duty in some cases. Members of our Courses Committee have served on the DKU Committee; some of them have also served on David

Bell's Committee on Online Courses. I want to recognize Susan Wynn, in particular, who has had quadruple duty as the liaison between all of these committees. It has been an immense amount of work that has been done on the behalf of the faculty of Arts and Sciences by those who formed the DKU Joint Committees this year.

There were proposals submitted to the committee; these were reviewed in advance by the members of the ad hoc DKU Joint Committee. The committee met twice in the last month reviewing the proposals, responding to questions, and giving some advice to Nora Bynum, the Vice Provost for DKU and China Initiatives. In the end, the committee, at its last meeting, approved thirteen courses for the opening year at DKU. Two other courses were approved, but contingent upon some revisions. Announcements will be going to those faculty members directly from the Liberal Arts in China Committee, which is overseeing the whole liberal arts initiative for DKU. I also just learned that the establishment proposal has been received and approved by the Jiangsu Education Bureau. This is a preliminary step, if you will. Once they have reviewed it, it will then go to the Ministry of Education in China. Our work as the Arts and Sciences Council through the DKU Joint Committee is now complete and it made it possible for this proposal to go forward as hoped.

Online Courses Policy Proposal

We only have one item on the agenda for today. The Executive Committee decided to set aside some other pressing business in order to give faculty time to deliberate and discuss a proposal that has come before council. Dean Patton has relinquished her fifteen minutes in updating the council on the dean's initiatives. She has been in regular contact and communicating regularly, and I thank her. She wanted to make sure that colleagues have enough time to deliberate and discuss today.

Let me introduce [this item] by saying that the proposal that comes to you has gone through several stages of faculty governance and engagement, some of it incredibly intense, long, tedious, and complicated. It began in May 2012 at the level of the university. Susan Lozier and Peter Lange together consulted with each other regarding all university initiatives involving online education. Between them, they appointed an Advisory Faculty Committee on Online Education at the university level and they began their work last May. At the beginning of September, I met with Dean Patton to begin discussing a subcommittee of the Courses Committee to consider any type of policy recommendations that might come down to Arts and Sciences were a consortium agreement approved and entered into; that happened in October.

The Curriculum Committee reviewed [it] and made sure that any further consideration of online courses would be subject to the normal faculty governance process; that has been very carefully, I would say even scrupulously observed. David Bell was then asked by the Dean to chair this subcommittee of the Courses Committee; I think there were sixteen members of the subcommittee on Online Courses. When they completed their recommendations, it then went to our Courses Committee where an entirely different group of faculty read over the recommendations and made some modifications, which you will hear about. From there, the Executive Committee reviewed it and made some additional comments, but no changes. We are going to be recommending a follow-on monitoring committee, for example.

The process is not done yet; this is still open and ongoing. Before any policy governing online courses can go into effect, it requires this council's approval. Council representatives, the matter now lies with you. When and if a motion comes before the council, the voting will be done by council representatives by secret ballot. This was decided by the Executive Committee to ensure that council representatives can take full measure of their own views and the insights that they are gaining from their colleagues through this discussion.

[I want to say] a brief word about our deliberations today. I want to remind our guests that you may be recognized to speak to the business matter before us, and we encourage you to do so, but I want to remind you that only council representatives may make motions, second motions, and vote. I am going to ask that comments be kept to the question or the proposal that is before us today. Be mindful of the fact that there are going to be many voices who want and need to be heard. The Executive Committee, in discussing this issue, and to make sure that the faculty have plenty of time to deliberate and think through all of the issues that are involved in this proposal, we have decided to have one more called meeting of council on April 25. There is no need to rush through the matter. Today I do not anticipate voting, but of course this lies with the council representatives to decide when they have had enough of a discussion. I am going to introduce the speakers who will report to you on the different aspects of the background of this proposal in just a minute. I want to ask you to hold your questions for them until all have completed [speaking], and it is my hope that we will have these various reports completed by about 4:15 or so, so they are going to be crisp and to the point. Let me turn first to Provost Peter Lange and ask him to report to the council on the background to the 2U Consortium.

2U Consortium

Provost Peter Lange: Thank you Tom, I welcome the opportunity to talk to you all about semester online. I think my role today to identify the broader framework in which this initiative is being composed and the context of this specific proposal. So let me begin. Higher education, in this country and around the world, is facing many changes, challenges and opportunities created by the digital revolution and the vast improvement in the quality and types of transmission of digital media online. This seems to me, undeniable. We have seen enormous changes in how our students learn, in their habits of learning and in their access to factual, and often not so factual, information through the online medium. All of us who have children certainly know that our children do not learn at home and do their homework the way that we did. In fact, I would say in general, they work in ways that we find deeply mysterious.

We have seen changes in the ways we can, in the right settings and when the subject being taught is appropriate, teach in new, more engaging and possibly more effective ways, subjects, which we may have taught for years in a different way. And we are seeing, most recently, enormous changes in the opportunities for access to higher education, and to the

teaching of faculty at the finest institutions, of students who never could otherwise have had such access and thereby an expansion of the ability of our faculty to reach many more students. These changes represent challenges to what we have traditionally done, and they represent opportunities to do things better, taking advantage of what the new environment offers. To do so, however, requires that we recognize several things.

First, we have always known that different students learn differently at different paces and in different ways. It would be good if we could teach to those different learning styles. Think how often in planning a class we have stood before the prospect of a class and thought, “Do I teach to the top of the class, or to the bottom of the class, or to the middle of the class? Am I going to leave some kids bored because they are not learning fast enough, and am I leaving others behind?” Not surprisingly, therefore, it is also to be expected that students will be differently affected by the changes we are seeing: one of the great opportunities, in fact, is that some of the new modes of teaching that are available will enable students with these differentiated learning styles to gain and retain more from their courses through the way their course is delivered and therefore to the students’ ability to self-pace.

Second, different subject matters are likely differently to be affected by these changes. Many courses across most departments may not be taught much differently than they have been although this too may give way to the creativity of instructors seeing new, untapped potential, even while we are already seeing some of the teaching of the sciences deeply transformed in some cases by the availability of these new methods of teaching.

Third, the size of classes will greatly affect whether and how we want to use the new tools and opportunities. One of the special qualities of Duke and a Duke education is the amount of small group, highly interactive teaching that we do. Approximately sixty-seven percent of all of the classes that we teach here at Duke have eighteen or fewer students, and eighty-two percent of our classes have thirty or fewer students. Only 7.2 percent have more than 50 students, and only 2.7 percent have more than 100. These are data that are drawn from the last eight semesters of teaching. Clearly, whether and how the new digital teaching tools are used at Duke they should leave largely untouched things we do very well now. My anticipation is that they will not deeply affect most of these small classes, although we have seen that some professors are really changing the nature of their small classes, even though they are still only teaching sixteen students, for instance, by flipping the classroom using digital materials in a different way.

Fourth, across higher education, how institutions will be affected by these challenges and opportunities will vary dramatically, and not always for the good. We see severe pressures from the regents and legislatures on the large public institutions to transform themselves through the use of digital technology in ways that we find, and they find, pedagogically and educationally inappropriate. Fortunately, Duke is relatively insulated from external pressures, but this does not mean we can, or should, stand at the sidelines and watch. Instead, we believe, and by “we” I mean all those administrators and faculty members, including those who are already teaching in the online format, who have been involved in the process of developing our online presence over the last year, we believe we should engage this challenge. To do so, we need to identify through experience, assessment, reflection and iterated improvement what we can do better in our differentiated environment here at Duke.

We also believe we should act to shape our specific opportunities and those of our peers. We should not let the agenda be set by others about how this new technology will be employed. We should identify how we, across the diversity of our offerings and of our students on campus and of those we might reach beyond our campus, how we can learn from and best use the new tools to improve what our students learn, how we teach, and how we can improve and extend ourselves as a premiere institution of higher learning. This is the context in which our proposed relationship with 2U in the for-credit arena is offering, just as our relationship with Coursera in the non-for-credit MOOC arena also has been.

Now let me turn to some more specific details. First, what is semester online? As it says on the slide, it is an online curriculum of courses for credit. It is not going to be a huge number of courses, probably less than 100 coming from no more than twenty institutions. I will come later to how many institutions will be delivering the courses. Those courses will be delivered by a consortium of top echelon universities and colleges from around the country in partnership with 2U, which is a for-profit course delivery company, about which I will say more in a minute. As I indicated, each school will be delivering something like one to three [courses], perhaps eventually more courses, up to five are what have been discussed. 2U, and I will stress this, is not a Johnny-come-lately to this space. They are already delivering several masters programs, and I will come to that in a moment. All of the courses delivered through this platform will have a combination of pre-recorded materials, and live section-like elements. That is, sections of twenty or fewer students taught by TAs online with each student having access to the section through his or her video camera on their computer.

What are the goals of our broad effort? We wish to supplement and thereby enrich the curricular offerings for our students. No university today, and this does not just apply to Duke, this applies to Harvard, this applies to the large public [schools], none of us can deliver the diversity of curriculum, which our students have the right to ask for, given the other experiences and other kinds of classes we are teaching. This is an effort, and an opportunity, to thicken up that curriculum [and] supplement [it] through additional courses. We can expect the opportunities for our students to take courses when not on campus; this is an important thing. We have students who are away, among other things, they are away in the summer, and right now in the summer they tend to go to their local community college or something of the sort and take a course there for which we generally offer transfer credit. These courses can substitute for that, and these courses will come from faculty from far more prestigious institutions with more teaching like we are used to.

We can promote teaching innovation. We have seen already that Coursera has had the effect of promoting teacher innovation. We have faculty in this room who have been teaching Coursera courses and now are drawing on their

experience from that into the classes that they are teaching on campus. We can extend the intellectual reach of our faculty by teaching more students at more institutions the kinds of things that our faculty wants to teach. We can enhance the access to for credit teaching of Duke faculty [members] to students [who are] not on our campus, thereby supplementing their curriculums. Some of those students would never have access to the quality of teaching that we can offer.

We can possibly generate revenue, and I do not want to dismiss this. I did get the first Coursera check last week, I almost was going to bring it and hold it up for you, \$7,335 dollars. There is a possibility for revenue, although nobody is quite sure how it is going to arrive.

What is 2U? Let me say something about the other programs they run and provide some metrics about that. 2U is a for profit company that partners with universities to seek to deliver quality education at a scale. "Quality education at a scale" are the critical terms. It is the only company with this model and with this target audience in this space at this time. It is different from MOOC. It is planning to teach for credit courses and all of the courses have sections, as I indicated. It is a very different pedagogical model. 2U now partners with eight other universities and various masters programs. I will not go into all of them, but I will tell you that they have master's programs with USC in teaching, education, and social work. They have masters programs in nursing. They have a master's program in business administration and public administration with UNC Chapel Hill. The point I am trying to make here is that this is a platform, because all of these master's programs use this platform, which has been tested and used. The next question you might say is, "Great, it has been tested and used, but how good are the courses? What do the students think of it? How do the faculty [members] feel about it?" I can give you few things.

Let me first say this. In these master's programs, it had 6,400 enrollments over the time they have been teaching them. The average section size has been ten to fourteen students and they are using the same format. The number of weekly class sections currently offered, that is in the spring 2013 semester, is 1,146 across the range of master's programs. The number of courses that have been built is 143. This is not some new thing. This is a platform that has been tried and used at the master's level, which would now be extended to courses, not degrees, at the undergraduate level.

What are the student retention rates for these courses? The average is well over 85 percent in all of the master's courses, which I think is more or less the same level in our own master's courses. Students successfully complete well over 85 percent of the mandatory and optional course activities that are associated with the courses; successfully, do not just take. They have very high rates of student satisfaction, I have some data but it is hard to describe here.

What is the 2U consortium? The consortium schools that would potentially offer fall 2013 courses, and I stress the word "potentially" because Duke is on this list, and obviously we know there is no Duke participation in the fall of 2013. As you will have noticed, these schools are not all thought of as highly as Duke. Certainly, by all measures, Duke has a stronger research record and reputational standing than many of them. 2U is still in discussion with several schools that are more like us. However, this does not mean that we need to be wary that the teaching our students would have access to will be inferior to our own, or to other courses our students currently have access to.

First, how often do we, ourselves, deride and dismiss the accuracy of rankings. Anytime the rankings come out and we go down, we think they are hokey, if we go up, they are great. The administration is just as guilty as the faculty. We know how foolish these point estimates are. This does not mean that there are not differences in overall quality across these institutions, but there is also substantial overlap if you take the distribution. The reputational rankings are notorious for their failure to capture the quality of teaching. Most would agree that courses from these member schools would constitute transfer credit at Duke. In fact, we have regularly granted transfer credit from every one of these schools. In addition, many of the courses that will be available from these schools will be at or, more likely, above the quality that we currently allow our students to transfer in for credit, and sometimes for their major through study abroad or summer school at other institutions. Recall it is a strong commitment in the recommendations that the Courses Committee and the DUSs whether these courses meet Duke standards and whether they meet the standards of majors.

On this chart I have tried to show you the structure of course delivery and the responsibilities at each level. I will just highlight a few things, and I am happy to sit around [for questions] afterwards. The first thing that you need to know is that 2U has responsibility for marketing, for administration, for course production, which means they pay for the production of the courses, and other services as well as helping us with assessment by gathering all of the data and doing the testing that we ask of them. They have no impact on content; the content belongs to the institutions and their faculty. If we go down [the slide], the consortium will have curriculum management to try to array and allocate courses across the consortium in a way that meets needs, and it will set general academic policy. It, too, will be deeply involved in assessment.

At the Duke level, and at all of the member school levels, there will be course management. We control administration and academic administration. We, as you know, control the rules governing student course-taking, we control the rules governing the granting of credit, and we try to coordinate the courses that we deliver across our campus based on what we think are the appropriate ways in delivering courses to people. The lead professor will have control of the course content, and I should not that as the faculty handbook makes clear, the course content belongs to the faculty member. That is a Duke policy in the faculty handbook. The lead professor will determine the sectioning and grading responsibility. He or she will have ongoing engagement with the course; that is something that we can require of ourselves, and that is something that we can ask the consortium of the courses that we are going to authorize. We can say, "Well, if the lead professor is not going to have engagement with the course over time, we are not going to allow our students to take the course." That is perfectly within our prerogatives in giving the courses.

It goes on in terms of the lead instructor, who is really like the head TA in a large lecture course, and then the section leaders who may be some combination of graduate students. Believe me, many of our graduate students are going to want this experience because they know it is going to be something that will be asked of them when they go on to their first academic job. Then, section leaders that will be hired by the course leader. I should say with regard to section leaders and to the lead instructor, it is our anticipation that they will be hired on an annual or semi-annual basis with a salary for a body of work. If I could put it this way, it is not a piece rate. There have been questions about faculty consultation. On this slide, you are going to see a count of all of the meetings that have happened in last eleven months with regard to semester online. Tom went through the sequencing, so I am not going to do that.

How do we move ahead? What is being asked for is a three year trial period; that is long enough to see what the patterns of usage are, how good the courses are, how good the learning outcomes are, at least to do some initial assessment. It is long enough to assess the education and curricular impacts, and it is consistent with the 2U contract. At the end of three years we could determine to withdraw, although there would be a two year period during which we would have to engage that withdrawal. Furthermore, I know that in discussion with the Arts and Sciences leadership at the faculty level, there will be the creation of an Arts and Sciences advisory committee on online education. It will be responsible for oversight and for assessment of the trial. We are working with as many faculty and administrators as we can in a systematic and serious assessment exercise, hopefully also with faculty and administrators from other schools that are also teaching semester online. There are vast opportunities for learning more about how kids learn here. There will be advice on changes and improvement in the program, the membership will be set by ECASC in consultation with the dean and with me, as is true for most of the committees that we have. It will be an advisor to the dean, the provost, and to the Arts and Sciences council and its committees. With that, I will leave the podium to Tom, thank you.

Advisory Committee on Online Courses

Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History): Thank you, Peter. I will ask you to hold your questions until the general discussion period. Let me now introduce David Bell. David was asked to chair the Advisory Committee, a subcommittee of the Courses Committee to draw up a set of policy recommendations that could govern participation in online courses. He will be followed by the co-chair of the Courses Committee.

Professor David Bell (Romance Studies): Thank you Tom. As you heard earlier, Professor Robisheaux, as the chair of Arts and Sciences Council, and Dean Patton and Dean Lee Baker appointed an ad hoc faculty committee to reflect on the place of online learning and online courses in the curriculum of Duke undergraduates, the Online Learning Advisory Committee. The members of that committee represented a broad spectrum of opinions on a fairly complicated matter. From the highly skeptical, and I think I would put myself in that category at the beginning of our deliberations, all the way to a committee member who had already offered a MOOC when he began serving.

That variety of views led to a rich discussion about the developing online learning world. It was certainly not easy to come to a consensus about what Duke should do in the context of online courses. This is, after all, new territory for most of us. Ultimately, the consensus coalesced around the notion that there needed to be a pilot space for experimentation for two reasons. The first is that Duke faculty needed to be able to experiment with the creation of online for credit courses in addition to the non-credit MOOC space provided by Coursera, and we needed to give Duke Undergraduates a mechanism for experimentation as well.

The promise of networked learning is only beginning to be explored, and we felt that we needed to allow creative faculty members to work on developing that potential, and to allow creative students to experiment with how this might enrich their undergraduate studies. At the same time, we realized how fast the online world is changing, and therefore how we needed to propose a framework that would not necessitate the creation of a whole new set of undergraduate regulations. We accepted the fact that this would be a transitional moment, and what we do in next two or three years, how we might modify the present approach, was extremely difficult to predict. The comfort of being able to control all of the variables is not really possible in the present online learning world, and we think this means that we need to experiment to collect important information about what online learning brings to the learning environment at Duke University.

We ultimately came to a consensus on a modified version of the inter-institutional agreement framework as the best available mechanism; since it operates well in the context of our agreement with our UNC system partners. This is what we proposed to the Trinity College Committee on Courses, and then they discussed it in detail, amended it from the perspective of their broad curricular oversight experience, and forwarded it to this body's Executive Committee. I am going to give the microphone to Susan Wynn to present the details of the proposal.

Courses Committee Modifications

Professor Susan Wynn (Education): The Committee on Courses received recommendations from the Online Learning Advisory Committee on March 5, and then our charge, the Committee on Courses was somewhat narrow in scope. We were looking only at the 2U online consortium courses, and we were focusing on the policies and procedures that would allow Duke Undergraduates to take a limited number of 2U online courses for credit. I think my committee members would agree with me that we took a very conservative approach.

One general modification that the Committee on Courses made is that we distinguished between Duke online courses and the consortium courses offered by faculty at Duke's partner institutions. We then made five modifications, two

of which apply only to the partner institutions, and three of which apply to Duke and the partner institutions. We felt, and if you will notice on the left [of the slide] we have the language from the Online Learning Advisory Committee, and on the right in bold we have what the Courses Committee recommended to ECASC.

If you look at the bold, you will see that we felt it was important to increase DUS oversight, and we recommended that the DUS or Program Director would determine whether a course counts towards the major, minor, or certificate, or qualifies as a pre-requisite in that department. Also, the DUS or Program Director would determine when a course is actually offered. Also, for partner institutions, we recommended that because modes of inquiry are specific to Duke's curriculum, that these courses not carry modes of inquiry.

For Duke and partner institutions, we felt, and this was actually based on feedback that we received, that students who are enrolled in Duke or Duke-approved study abroad programs may not take online consortium courses. [Second], students in their first semester may not take online consortium courses, and finally students who are on a leave of absence should be able to take one approved online consortium course for credit per semester. Those are the modifications that we made to the Online Learning Advisory Committee. Thank you.

Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History): Thank you, Susan. It sounded so simple and direct, but I can promise you, having sat through those meetings, the process was intense, long, careful, and full of lively differences of opinion. Let me now turn to Charlie Becker, my colleague on the Executive Committee of the Arts and Sciences Council. The final recommendations came to the Executive Committee and all along we had been getting updates and reports from David Bell. This gave us a chance to see the final recommendations and decide whether they were ready to go to council. Charlie will report on our deliberations.

ECASC Recommendation

Professor Charlie Becker (Economics): The following comments are based on the Executive Committee's recommendations, and since I am fighting a severe cold today, I will go over them quickly and emphasize a couple that I think are particularly important. First, as we know, online learning is already a reality, and experimentation is important; it is how we learn. The 2U platform appears to be the most sophisticated one that is available to us right now without creating our own, which we do not want to have the capacity to do until we have experimented for a bit.

This will affect different departments differently. I think in the next few years there will be very modest impacts on any department but we will get a sense as to how they will matter going in the future. In some departments online learning is going to reduce service course constraints and allow faculty to devote more resources to working with students, and in particular I think will enable us to increase the proportion of undergraduates who are engaged in research projects. This has been an objective of this university and it is an expensive one. This is a way that will hopefully reduce some severe constraints that some departments face. Elsewhere there will be increased richness of course offering options.

When I first heard about this, I thought this could be a tool to attract under-represented minority graduate students from other institutions to get a look at people who we may wish to recruit to our own graduate programs and have much greater information about their capacity than we would have otherwise. I would hope that this would be a useful recruiting tool for graduate programs in the future. Finally, the entire Executive Committee agreed that this is a technique and a tool that is really important for Duke's graduate students themselves to gain expertise in. Therefore, we would be remiss in not participating. To emphasize a few other topics, the experimental nature of the project is something that...it is hard to imagine us not learning by experimenting. The program as it is outlined has respect for established policies that Provost Lange has outlined. There remain several questions that we cannot answer, and we do not know what kinds of courses are going to work; we do not know which departments will be most enthused, which ones will take to it like a duck to water and which ones will find that it is not practical. I personally believe that the vast majority of departments will ultimately buy in. We do not know to what extent the restrictions we are opposing now are excessively binding or whether they need to be strengthened. My own belief is that we are probably erring on the conservative side now, and being much more binding than we need to be.

The recommendations from ECASC are for the establishment of a follow-on faculty committee for monitoring and review, and we anticipate soliciting nominations from across the faculty. We will recommend a slate [of candidates] to the dean of the college of Arts and Sciences in consultation with the chairman of ECASC. This committee is one that will be charged with reviewing the ongoing process, and also considering proposals for modification. We further anticipate that this committee will make annual public reports to the entire college of Arts and Sciences faculty. The bottom line is that we, "we" in a broad Arts and Sciences faculty sense and ECASC, have reviewed the process by which these recommendations have been drawn up, and they have been done with, what to me, seems to be exceptional care and with due consideration to the many complexities and uncertainties. On a personal note, I would say that since I was the lone dissenting vote in the last public vote that we had here that my endorsement is not taken for granted, but this is one that I support wholeheartedly. I think the provost and dean have done a spectacular job. With that, I am submitting a motion on behalf of ECASC to accept the recommendations of the Course Committee as a three year pilot project to be monitored and reviewed by and Arts and Sciences faculty committee in collaboration with the Provost and the Dean of Arts and Sciences, thank you.

Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History): You do not know, but Charlie caught that bird flu on way back from Kyrgyzstan. Thank you very much, Charlie, we appreciate your service above and beyond since coming back. Let me say that the motion does not require a second as it is put on the floor by the Executive Committee itself, and that now opens the

floor to discussion. Before we get into that, I am going to ask Shawna one more time to pass around the sign-up sheet for council representatives. If some of you have not signed in, would you please do so? If you wish to speak, would you please identify yourself by raising your hand? We want to get a microphone to you; it is not that we distrust how much your voice can carry, we record this for the minutes and when it is done directly in the microphone it is much easier for us to transcribe. I ask that you also stand to ask your questions, make your comments, and make observations. I also ask you to identify yourself by name and department if you would. The floor is now open to discussion.

Discussion

Professor Jocelyn Olcott (History): I will be brief because I know that a lot of people have questions. I have a lot of logistical and strategic issues because of my role as DUS, but I wanted to focus today on the two concerns that I felt were most pressing about this, the one of governance and that of pedagogy.

On the question of governance, it is twofold, one is the question of Arts and Sciences and university governance, and this is an honest question, how is it that Duke comes to sign a contract with such far-reaching curricular concerns prior to securing the premature either by vote that is, of either of the two bodies of faculty governance? President Brodhead recently gave a frankly inspiring annual address to the Academic Council about how the faculty owned the curriculum, and I think we all take that seriously. In that list of meetings that we saw earlier, most of them were closed-door meetings, two were Academic Council. I serve on the Academic Council, and I can tell you that [at] the September 18 meeting of Academic Council, Provost Lange did present on online education. He presented entirely about MOOCs, and the question about for credit came up and it was brushed off as not really something that was on the horizon. It clearly was already at that point. Really for something of this importance, it should have been voted on by at least the Arts and Sciences Council.

My second concern about governance has to do with departmental governance and the extent to which departments are meant to control their own curricula. The proposal indicates the courses will be offered in collaboration and consultation with DUSs and program directors, but that, at least in the case of history, has not happened. Of the twelve courses offered for next semester, four of them are history courses, so one-third of the courses. Had I been consulted, I would have told the Courses Committee that of those four, three overlap almost exactly with courses on the books, and two are scheduled to be offered in this coming academic year. One of courses listed as a history course is called "Baseball in American Culture." It is listed as being taught by an English and Creative Writing professor, which raises the question, at least to me, is why is it not listed as an English course? My guess is that it was a decision made my 2U, and not something that we could affect.

I think there are a lot of questions about what happens when departmental courses are being offered without any consultation with the departments themselves, even if we can then go back and say it cannot count towards the major that seems kind of after the fact. I think to me, in some ways, the more critical issues and the ones closer to my heart are actually about curriculum and pedagogy. Two of the more compelling justifications that I heard for this program were that students would have access to specialized courses taught by illustrious faculty, and secondly that students would not be deterred from studying abroad because of their needs to fulfill pre-requisites for their majors. The courses that are offered for next semester, at least, through 2U are neither specialized nor pre-requisites. The faculty [members] teaching them are not, with all due respect to them, particularly illustrious. I mean that in the nicest way. I do not see it, to site Peter Lange's language, supplementing and enriching our course offerings.

As an aside, of the twelve faculty listed, nine of the twelve are men and there are no faculty of color. The promotional materials for 2U really show overwhelmingly older white men teaching people of color. I think given our administration's efforts to undo that imagery, and the efforts they put in to hiring more diverse faculty here at Duke, I just think that is not the sort of thing that we want to buy into.

The other thing, of course, in terms of the study abroad question is that page four of the proposal on the table specifies, as we heard earlier, that the students enrolled in study abroad programs may not take online consortium courses. That does not solve that problem of students who want to study abroad, but cannot because they would not be able to take a pre-requisite. It is also not the case that we give credit for community college courses, at least not in the history department. That was a little bit specious.

The second justification that I found pretty compelling is the idea about creative pedagogy, but 2U actually seems like a regression from really the quite creative and effective pedagogy that Duke faculty already employ. This language of flipped classrooms always surprises me because most of us have been flipping our classrooms with and without technology for a very long time, and more recently, with considerable support for the Center for Instructional Technology. I would want to hear more about why this is an improvement. The three level structure of courses described here includes faculty who provide content, and then lead instructors who provide logistics, and these instructors who serve as discussion leaders with up to twenty students participating by webcam that are tiled on the screen in a fashion that could be compared to the Brady Bunch. I do not see how this allows students to learn at different paces, which is one of the recommendations. I do not see this as more creative pedagogy; I see it as less creative than what most of us do in our classrooms.

It seems contrary to Duke's commitment to a liberal arts education with its emphasis on engaged pedagogy and faculty contact that we would go in this direction. I suspect that most faculty, and I would certainly include myself in this, are quite open to the possibilities of online education, but one clear lesson from the recent history of online enterprises is there are serious risks to being an early adopter. We do not want to be on Friendster and MySpace when our peer and benchmark institutions are lining up behind Facebook. I do not think it makes sense to make guinea pigs of our students in

this so-called experiment. I am not a representative, but I would strongly encourage the Arts and Sciences Council to table this proposal and to see if we cannot find an online opportunity that more closely matches Duke's own mission.

Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History): Let me ask if I can turn to Phil Costanzo who is the Vice-Chair of the Academic Council Executive Committee. Susan Lozier wanted to be here to answer questions that may come up about faculty governance at the university level. Phil, could I ask you to talk about that? As I hear it, Jolie, there are two other issues, one having to do with DUSs and departmental sovereignty and review of courses and approval, and the third has to do with, pardon me for being so brief, pedagogy in general. Thank you

Professor Philip Costanzo (Psychology and Neuroscience): What I can speak to from Jolie's comments is the history of the faculty involvement in this from the very outset, which was really with the Coursera program and ACOE (Advisory Committee for Online Education) with committees framed through the collaboration of the chair of ECAC and the chair of the Academic Council, Susan Lozier, and Peter Lange, then representatives selected to consider the steps as we went through this. What we recognized in doing this, and what Susan and this committee with Peter did do, is this is a fast moving set of issues. I do believe the faculty, and I have been on the ACOE committee as well as the Executive Committee of the Academic Council, did consider very carefully what these courses would be from a faculty perspective.

A lot of the questions you are raising are very good ones, but the idea is really to put a little rubber on the road; having individuals who do pedagogy suggest what they might do in this format. [The Executive Committee of Academic Council] would update the full body of Academic Council throughout these deliberations about what was occurring, and ECAC would continue to meet on it. We had very little way to evaluate this except from some of the individuals who are here today who have given some of these courses and gave us some feedback. We had data that Keith Whitfield collected, so that there was a preliminary set of information that would let us know what worked, what might not work so well, and how we might proceed to the credit circumstance.

Further, I do think that it has always been the understanding of the Academic Council, at least ECAC, that credit for these courses came from departments and would be the purview of the DUS. Whatever internal committees those departments [had] would decide if a course counts or does not count [for credit]. It is up to the student and one of the deans to decide whether it counts towards one of the distribution requirements. In essence, it was always the case that none of these courses would be forced onto departments, as I understood our deliberations on ECAC, simply because they were given in this framework. The departments would have to approve it and the student would have to apply for credit through that department in the same way [as transfer credit]. Maybe community college is not a good example, but certainly people go to their homes during the summer and take courses at Penn State University or other universities. Then we, in our departments, receive transcripts from those universities and student descriptions, and we approve or do not approve the course. I think that pertains here.

We thought it was a low risk experiment; that was the view of ECAC, that we needed data, this is a low-risk experiment, and the train was there to get on. Without information it would be very difficult to make the kinds of decisions [that need to be made]. I am not sure, we talked about tabling too, and things moving rapidly, [but] we are part of the same faculty. We felt that it was a good time to begin, and it seems to be a modest beginning.

Professor Jocelyn Olcott (History): Can I ask one point for clarification? You are saying the student would have to apply for credit or counting towards major?

Professor Philip Costanzo (Psychology and Neuroscience): You could actually say this is not a history course, but I suspect that counting towards the major certainly the departments would have a say in that.

Professor Jocelyn Olcott (History): What about credit?

Professor Philip Costanzo (Psychology and Neuroscience): I would have to ask somebody more expert in that, but my understanding was that if it was to be credited as a history course or a psychology course from our department, the department would have to agree it was [a course].

Professor Cary Moskowitz (Thompson Writing Program): [I have] two particular points and I will begin by saying I have a mixed mind about this as well. One is my understanding is that for the course to count for a Duke undergraduate student for credit period would have to go through the Courses Committee and the dean's office, and basically be approved as a course that they could take separate from any requirements for programs or certificates.

The other thing that the Courses Committee and Susan you can tell me if I am getting this right, felt strongly about is that there are courses that will be offered broadly by this group, but we would want to restrict our students' ability to take any particular of those courses for credit depending on overlap with existing courses. For instance, somebody in the history department could say, "We teach pretty much that course here now", and therefore students would not be able to take that course simultaneously.

We also pushed for an annual rather than a semester look at the schedule, because oftentimes courses are offered on an annual basis, and we thought even to maintain reasonable expectations for enrollment we would not want a course that is taught well by one of our faculty members in the spring to be undermined by a course that is offered in the fall. During the course of the whole year, if there is a course that seems to be a reasonable overlap [with one that is already offered], then basically that course would not be approved for our students to take, even though other institutions students' could take it.

Professor Philip Costanzo (Psychology and Neuroscience): I just wanted to add one other thing. The only thing I am communicating, the only thing I am capable to communicate to you, because I do not have the answers to all of your questions, but I do want to mention that this was not suddenly foisted upon the faculty that there have been ongoing

deliberations inclusive of faculty going back to May of 2012, and these have been followed over time through committee deliberations of multiple faculty [members]. What I am basically saying is that, to your first point, that this was just foisted on us, I do not think that is true if we consider the Academic Council to be a body that is also representative of us as well as this for those of us, as well as this one.

Professor Jocelyn Olcott (History): I just wanted to clarify that academic council did not vote on this. I am on the Academic Council and we did not vote on this.

Professor Philip Costanzo (Psychology and Neuroscience): ECAC voted on it, and it was presented to the Academic Council, and we voted to proceed. I can only report what happened.

Dean Ingeborg Walther (Associate Dean of Trinity College): I just wanted to say that the reason you have not seen these courses come through your department is that they have not even come to the Courses Committee, because this body has not voted yet. The courses that are advertised now on the 2U website have not yet been approved for Duke students. I just want you to know that. Just a clarification.

Professor Mark Goodacre (Religion): [I have] one bit of feedback from colleagues in the department and one question. The bit of feedback is the one thing that I think makes colleagues most anxious in my department, and I think it is true of other humanities departments is the issue of enrollment. It comes up practically every single department meeting, I am sure other humanities people feel the same. The worry about this proposal is it is not addressing that fundamental issue as we see it. If it were the case that we were the kind of faculty with a department that would be offering these courses, it might address that, but most of my colleagues said to me they did not think they would be likely, at least in the first few years, to be offering one of these. There is genuine anxiety about that.

I realize they have not been approved formally yet, but of the courses that are currently advertised, two of them overlap directly with things that we do in the department. Although we might have a veto as a DUS for things counting towards the major, departments like the department of religion tend to be service departments. In a course of 100 plus students, we will have two or three majors. In a sense, vetoing something for the major would not be relevant. We would be much more interested in the issue of, is there a course on, say, "The Rise of Christianity" being taught as part of this and will it compete directly with what we are doing?

That is the bit of feedback, the question is, with all of the bodies that have been mentioned, I have not noticed any mention of CIT, OIT, ITAC, or anyone that is involved in IT. Given that presumably these bodies will be at least helping us out in this proposal if it goes ahead, first of all, what kind of consultation has gone on with them so far, and should we think about asking them what their views are, especially about 2U and so on?

Provost Peter Lange: I will just say very briefly, OIT and CIT are direct and tight collaborators with this, so there are no questions about that.

Professor Steffen Bass (Physics): I want to speak to the issue of pedagogy. One professor's wastepaper basket is another professor's goldmine, so the pedagogical tools that are being employed in this kind of framework for teaching online courses are very similar to tools that we have to use when we want to flip the classroom and do team based learning. In physics, where we have a lot of introductory courses with enrollments in excess of 200 students, the mode of lecturing to this huge anonymous cloud of students is not the best mode of delivering knowledge for teaching.

Using the kind of tools that we are getting experience with in this venture, or that we are being provided for our own purposes, helps us tremendously improve the quality and the way that we teach big introductory courses. By going to a team-based learning approach where the students essentially get to view a video of the instructor at their leisure as often as they want prior to coming to the team sessions, which are there for them to do problem solving under the instruction of a host of instructors including the main lecturer, so to speak. If you have any questions about that, I can refer you to Mohamed Noor who is sitting over there, who has done this in one of his biology classes with more than 400 students to great success. These are tools that for us carry high relevance. Not necessarily in the context of, "Yes, we are now going to teach everything online to all of the other universities," but we need to learn these, and we need to gain experience in order to do a better job in the classes that we teach here at Duke.

Professor Tolly Boatwright (Classical Studies): We have been talking about Duke, and Duke is a wonderful idea, but there are many different sizes of departments, and we are one of the smaller sizes of departments. Just as Mark was saying, enrollments are a very important part of what we think about all of the time, how to make more attractive courses. A small department like ours cannot repeat things every year, it is a much longer cycle of [perhaps] six semesters. The logistics of thinking about who is going to be offering what are a nightmare. We have a lot of questions, being a small department, and also a little bit of paranoia as often happens in a tiny department. What happens to departments that cannot, for whatever reason, offer one of these courses? Are they going to be left behind? Our students will not even be taking them; maybe, this does not work for somebody taking third year Greek. Then when the resource question comes up, what happens then? Our final question, although there are many more that my colleagues would like me to go into, would be a better understanding of the resources that will go into 2U. This is absolutely fundamental, thank you.

Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History): Before I recognize Wahneema Lubiano, council representatives I remember Tolly put up on our council website forum a long list of issues, only some of which she has mentioned here. I urge you to go back and review those if you want to think about those particular points.

Professor Wahneema Lubiano (AAAS and Literature): I am speaking now as the literature representative, but also as the DUS for AAAS. I agree with everything that Jolie, Mark, and Tolly have raised, but I also wanted to bring the particular responses of the literature program, which is another small program. The opposition organizes itself roughly in

four areas, and despite the number of times that I have heard us reassured about faculty involvement, the point is that much of that faculty involvement would take a Sherpa to find, because these are individuals in committees who are not publicly available in any open forum. You have to be guided to it, so that the kind of large discussion that literature, for example, is unhappy about has to do with departments, chairs, and faculty as a group knowing very much about this process as it was being put together. I am in the weird position of knowing less the more I hear about it.

I want to say more about literature's response. The opacity of the process was one of them, the lack of a formal consultation of departments, the unclear benefits, especially for humanities departments, and I would venture to say the interpretive social sciences as well as small departments, and the undermining of liberal arts pedagogy. We offer very few courses that would even meet the threshold of twenty-five students. Within the terms of the courses that we offer, we are very particular about our TAs and about our graduate students. We do not use adjuncts, so we have some concerns about the general casualization of labor that is going to necessarily be a part of this, not just at Duke, but as this spreads to the larger academic world. I am not sure why early adaptation is an urgency that I should feel, or that we should feel. I am not sure why doing this sooner rather than later is a good [thing]. I hear people say, "We need to do this, we need to get in on this early" but need has not yet been articulated in a way that makes sense to me as an argument.

Professor Andrew Janiak (Philosophy): I actually wanted to ask a question about the sense to which this is an experiment, because what I have heard so far dramatically underrepresents the intellectual capacity of this campus. We have people who can systematically run experiments in educational arenas, [such as] psychologists, people in the Program of Education, statisticians, and so on. It seems to me we have to answer a fundamental empirical question: do students learn more by taking classes online than they do in a bricks and mortar class? It is obviously an empirical question, and anyone who thinks they know the answer to that systematically on the basis of operating principles is surely deluding himself or herself.

How do you answer empirical questions? You run experiments, but you are using the word "experiment" very loosely, I think. It is a pilot. It seems to me that what we want to do is have a systematic campus-wide collaboration. I guess I am making a suggestion in which people around campus from nursing, who actually run online courses for credit, to people who study educational innovation, to statisticians and people in psychology, to Fuqua, and say, "Why don't we systematically study how students learn online?" [We can] compare it to bricks and mortar courses and compare apples to apples. [We can] give them the same tests, for example, maybe randomly assign students if that is allowed, and figure out how to systematically determine whether you learn more online or in a course.

It seems to me that might correlate with all sorts of things, intellectual content, the level of difficulty, the background of the student, native English speakers, gender, who knows? We want to know the answers to these questions. Shouldn't we systematically figure out the answer to the empirical question first? Then DUSs, faculty members, and deans can rationally determine whether credit should be given for any online course once we have empirical data to answer the empirical question to which we now do not know the answer.

If someone says to me, "Do you count this course taught online at Vanderbilt [for] Philosophy 101?" I would have to say, "I do not know how to rationally answer that question," because it is an empirical question whether those students have really learned anything. You surely cannot give me their grades, because if you think about it, that is going to be determined in a different way with online courses, maybe, I do not know that [for certain]. To rationally answer the question of credit, we need empirical evidence. It seems to me [that] we want to have a campus wide collaboration to garner that empirical evidence. I hope that was relatively clear.

Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History): Let me just list some of the issues that are on the floor before turning it over to our colleague Mohamed Noor. I am just keeping a rough list of some of the important issues that have been discussed. Some of them, I think, have been answered adequately. University governance, the role of the departments and DUSs, pedagogy is a big concern for a number of colleagues, particularly enrollments in humanities departments, which is connected to this, but it is not directly part of the proposal itself. Also, a suggestion for something that goes beyond the recommendation of the Executive Committee to assess, monitor, and review, which is a systematic study of online learning. Let me turn to Mohamed Noor.

Professor Mohamed Noor (Biology): I am not a representative for my department, so I am just speaking on my own behalf. I just wanted to speak to two things that came up. One of the issues that came up was, "What is the urgency?" In the last couple of weeks, I have met with many prospective students during Blue Devil Days or people just coming through with their parents. Let me tell you, at least within the group that I see, which admittedly are interested in the sciences and Biology, one of the very first questions I get is, "How are you using technology? What are you doing that is innovative? What are you doing that is different?" That is where I think some of this comes to be a bit [urgent]. If I went back there and said, "We get up there and we lecture." I think that would have completely fallen flat. They would say, "Fine, I will go to Stanford, or I will go to Harvard." They were very interested in hearing [about that]. As Professor Bass mentioned earlier, we are doing some experiments within some classes in our department utilizing online tools, and it has largely, not universally, been met with extremely positive response from the students and interest from the prospective students. We can put it off, but we will do so, at least within my sub-field, to our detriment.

The other issue, which I heard coming up several times, is the issue of small departments, and I completely sympathize. We are not a small department, but I understand what you are saying. My understanding though, based on our Provost's presentation is that for any sort of credit [to be given] it has to go through the dean's office. Presumably, that is where a stop can be put in, then. If there is concern that, "I do not want any sort of credit in this because there is a class that

is similar to it,” it can be stopped, even if it is not specifically credit for majors. That is where the stop can come in. Those are my two cents. I will say personally, I am very supportive of this. It seems to me, if anything, it is somewhat conservative compared to what we already do with respect to transfer credit. You can get transfer credit for Introductory Physics even while that is offered here right now. If anything, this is conservative.

Professor Chantal Reid (Biology): While the biology faculty agrees that Duke should be ahead at least in the way of doing online courses, the faculty raised a few questions and concerns about the proposal and recommendations. I will start with the first one, because it is relevant to curricular discussions.

The first one had to do with the course overlap among the institutions in the consortium, and there was a question raised whether there was a determination made of how many courses and what courses overlap among the different institutions. Whether the online courses would be newly developed courses or existing ones, what is the potential for overlap, and how is that going to be addressed. We heard a little bit about this, and there was mention of curriculum management at the consortium level, so I would like to have a little more detail on that, if possible.

I will give you another issue that was related to faculty compensation and resources. There was some confusion about lead faculty and lead instructor, particularly as the university is trying to engage faculty in doing the flipped classes. Biology is doing several experiments with flipped classes, so we are on board with that. In the frequently asked questions document there is a statement, and I quote, “It is not generally expected that the lead instructor will be a regular rank faculty member at Duke, but if they are, their compensation for this activity will be mutually determined based on whether this activity is addition to or replacing a course.” That indicated to the faculty a lack of strong commitment to encourage faculty [members] to participate in this effort. If the university is really serious about this effort, they would be, to quote a colleague, making it financially appealing to the best lecturer of the regular rank faculty and would actively recruit these individuals. For staffing the section instructor, we already have trouble getting TAs for our courses, so I do not know how we would be recruiting even more section leaders. I have a few more comments, but I will stop at those.

Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History): I am keeping a running list of all of these issues, and we are addressing them in a piecemeal fashion. Let me go on to our next speaker, and then I will sum up some of the key issues I see, and please correct me if I am missing anything.

Professor Dick MacPhail (Chemistry): I have a broader philosophical question that this has raised in my mind. Currently, we offer two credits for pre-matriculation, we offer two transfer credits, we have potentially four study abroad, and here is another four. I am not sure about the overlap between study abroad and these, but that is twelve credits out of thirty-four that could potentially be coming from other institutions. I do not know if that is a bad thing or a good thing, but somewhere there might be a line as to what constitutes a Duke degree in terms of courses taken with Duke students and Duke faculty. I am not putting a judgment on that, but I think it is an important thing for us to think about as we look at these kinds of proposals.

Professor Janet Ewald (History): I am definitely from the rank-and-file, and probably more file than rank in the department of history. First of all, I would really like to split off the issue of using technology in the classroom, which I think is a great idea, it is wonderful, I loved blackboard, Sakai is a poor substitute, therefore I am a little suspicious about so-called innovations, maybe steps back, a regression, as my colleagues said rather than an advance. Specifically split off the use of technology, which is good, from this particular plan or what some people have called an experiment.

I do not think this is a very good experiment. It seems to address only a certain type of class, that is a large lecture class taught by a lead instructor, a head TA, and some TAs of sections. Many of our classes are simply not taught like that. Secondly, it is not a good experiment, because if we are going to have a good experiment we have to be a little more creative about the scope of classes that can participate in that experiment.

It is not a good experiment because we are locked in for five years. We can evaluate it after three years, but we cannot withdraw until we have participated for five years. I have a second point in that I am not confident in the role of 2U or the consortium to conduct pedagogical business in a way that is good for our university. I am really not impressed that a course that has not been approved by the history department is being used as advertising by 2U. That tells me something; they have a bottom line concern. When I looked at their website and that advertising, and being at Duke maybe we are sympathetic to that, we use it all the time, but they were not thinking about our curriculum and our autonomy in determining what courses get approved or not.

I looked at the website and the first thing they said about Duke was “home of the blue devils.” We all know that our applications go up when Duke has a good basketball season. Still, again, it indicates to me that 2U’s concerns are not the same as our concerns are. I saw on the board that the consortium considers issues of curriculum management. I am wondering what is curriculum management? What do you mean by the consortium? The consortium is the participating schools, but who from among the participating schools considers curriculum management? How much does 2U itself influence that? [I had] lots of stuff about pedagogy. The evidence we have of 2U being successful with MA students in social work, nursing and business does not speak to the issue of undergraduate education, especially undergraduate education in the liberal arts. A twenty-three year old taking nursing courses is very different from an eighteen year old in his or her second semester at Duke, because that is when they can take these courses. I was very impressed that Peter Lange spoke about different learning styles, but may I add that we discern our students’ different learning styles in a fairly small setting when we can speak with students before and after class and watch more of them than their face. What are they doing with their feet? Is this a kinetic learner? All of that kind of stuff, so I see no advantage from the pedagogical level that the proposal is a good one. Thank you very much.

Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History): Let me sum up a couple of the issues, and we are just about at the normally scheduled end of time. Let me ask representatives for your agreement that we extend the meeting for fifteen minutes. Would you be agreeable to that? Thank you. [I have] some of the issues, and I am trying to cluster them. If I miss one, would you please come up and let me know because we want to have them addressed. I know in the time between this meeting and the next there will be time to answer some of these, as well as address some of them today.

Professor Micaela Janan (Classical Studies): One point that has spoken of, but not really addressed is that yes, we do accept transfer credits, but we do not accept them with an effect on GPA. That is a difference between this proposal and what currently practice. It is a dis-incentive to the students to take many of those transfer credits, and it is also a way for us to make it not have an impact on the major. That is a big difference that needs to be considered.

Also, to expand upon my colleague Tolly Boatwright's point about our being a small department that subsists on a three-year rotation, the ban on a one-year moratorium would not be enough for us. We would have to have virtually every course that was listed in the undergraduate bulletin be out of limits for an online version otherwise, it would eviscerate our possibility to offer it in a rational fashion on the rotation. I have also seen the language shift back and forth as to whether a course would be banned if it duplicated or if it substantially overlapped. It seemed to narrow from overlap to duplicate. If a course is on mythology, and it encompasses some but not all ancient mythology, it is still going to eviscerate our potential population for taking that course who will not be our majors.

I also had an opportunity during Blue Devil Days to talk to several prospective students and students who were current majors, and without telling them why, I did an informal survey listing the universities in the consortium saying, "Where would you rank Duke in this list?" To a man and to a woman, they said Duke was at the very top by a wide margin, and also a few of them wondered, "Why are you even combining Duke with this list?" I think one of the risks in this experiment is to harm the Duke brand, which I have heard much about protecting, and therefore lowering the number of high quality students who would want to join us.

Finally, this is a particular point in regard to the proposal, it was said that the professor owns the content of the course, but in the proposal it says that the exception to that is content to which 2U has made improvements, and listed among that are videos and lecture materials. Therefore, I do not understand how the professor can own those materials if that is the case.

Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History): Let me sum up a few of the issues that I have identified: faculty governance, controls over courses at the department level, pedagogy, which is a very broadly conceived issue, some enrollments in humanities, resources including labor, adequate teaching assistants, and compensation, assessment, the management of the consortium, the overall number credits towards graduation and whether we are pushing the limit there, and whether this experiment is right for us or not, and 2U as a consortium.

Professor Walter Sinnott-Armstrong (Philosophy): I am new to Duke. I found this fascinating, it is the first of these meetings that I have been to of the faculty in general, and I have learned a lot from this. I wanted to speak to a few things. First, I wanted to say that I totally agree with Mohamed about [the fact that] Duke needs to do this to attract students. I say that not because entering students have been talking to me, but my own kids. I have kids who went into college recently and this kind of thing means a lot to the students out there. If Duke wants to keep attracting the best students, it is going to have to do something in this area. That does not speak so much to tremendous certainty in that it has to be this year, but it has to be very soon. If the opportunity is here, I am supportive of grabbing it in a modest way, which I take this proposal to be.

I also wanted to say something about the experiment. We have to do an experiment, but we do not want to experiment wildly, obviously. We are not going to find out if online courses work do or do not work, that just is not going to happen. Some of them do, and some of them do not. The point of the experiment is to find out which ones do and which ones do not. There are a lot of studies out there that show that some modes of online teaching are just not good, but there are other modes of online teaching that work a lot better than in-class. There was a recent study last week in P&AS that found out to my shock and horror that when they tested students during lectures, their minds were wandering over fifty percent of the time. It does not look to me like that when I look out at the class, but it turns out that that is actually true, and so there are ways to fix that. These can be used in an online environment and we can find out through the experiment which ones work and which ones do not work.

That is going to help not only with making online courses better, but also help on campus courses by starting to take those tools from the online courses and use them on campus. That type of experimentation is a lot easier and will be a lot more productive by using the online resources. It seems to me that this is something that could help on campus pedagogy.

The last thing, and then I will sit down, is to say something about departments with small enrollments. There is this assumption that there are only five people out there that want to take the course. I do not think there are a stable number of people that want to take the course. I think that if there are online courses that are offered in a certain field, say classical studies or whatever, that there might be a lot of students who maybe cannot take that course because of scheduling problems, but they take another classical studies course online, fall in love with classical studies, and end up taking more classical studies courses. It is not obvious to me that offering courses in classical studies online means there are going to be fewer people taking them on campus at Duke. It might mean that there are more people falling in love with that material, and then end up taking more courses at Duke. I do not know; until we do the experiment, we are not going to know that.

That is why it seems to me that it is a good experiment to get involved in. Of course it has to be done carefully, but I think we need to do it well and do it soon.

Professor Thomas Pfau (Germanic Languages and Literature): I primarily have a couple of questions. The first one is a question of fact. I understand that an agreement was signed sometime in the fall between Duke, the other schools in the consortium, and 2U. If, hypothetically, the vote on the proposal that is before us and on this motion were to turn out negative, would we be in violation, or would we in a certain sense have failed to live up to implicit expectations of this agreement? This is simply looking at it this entire very genteel assembly here and [asking] in somewhat Machiavellian terms, do we really have a choice?

That is my first question. The other one is that I like the idea of an experiment, but let's take this a little bit more carefully as a concept. Normally, if you produce a new commodity or let's say a drug, you do not immediately proceed to human trials. The equivalent of which I suppose would be that you do not initially give credit. You might create a group of students, ask them perhaps to volunteer, and say, "We are trying to test something out," but you do it on a limited scale.

I say this for two reasons, primarily. I do understand in the number of fields, and I think it is notable that those in support of this proposal have largely come from the sciences, than in fields in which learning involves the imparting and the subsequent analysis of information. This kind of venue makes eminent sense, at least to an outsider like me that seems intuitively plausible. As someone who has worked in the humanities for more than twenty-three years at Duke, I find that this medium is very problematic for students who are engaged in what I would call interpretative learning. The dialogic dimension, this before the classroom, after the classroom kind of thing that Micaela mentioned, and the way in which the learning requires really the presence of the student inside and outside of the classroom, the sitting down and going over papers, this is surely unreasonable to suppose that that would be enhanced by this proposal.

Here is my other question, the point that I really wanted to echo was morals. Namely that, who in the end, this is my Machiavellian question, will actually make the determination of overlap? If the Courses Committee makes that determination, would it not be appropriate for them to check their understanding of whether there is or is not sufficient overlap with the people in the department in question before they make that determination? If someone comes in the German department and there is a course offered, let's say, out of Notre Dame, "German Culture, Society, and Literature from Bismarck to Hitler," we have no such course here, but we have two or three courses that substantially overlap with it. Whether substantially is what I say, or whether it is someone on the Course Committee who says "Well, it is not that substantial so it is actually good." Then my question is quite simply, should it not be formally specified that the Course Committee, when it has to make a determination about overlap, contact the DUS and the faculty in the departments that are likely to see their enrollments impacted before it makes that determination? That is already in there? The enrollment impact will be severe on departments that have large numbers of non-majors. Is it also understood that they have to be in agreement for this to go forward?

Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History): The language of the recommendation is that the Courses Committee, in consultation with DUSs, determines that.

Professor Thomas Pfau (German Language and Literature): Then my question is, "consultation" meaning that it has to result in a shared assessment...?

Dean Lee Baker: DUSs have final authority on overlap.

Professor Thomas Pfau (German Language and Literature): I am not speaking about courses for which one gets major credit, but which ones get institutional credit, so it is not a question of simply the DUS. What is the answer to that question? I am not speaking about majors, but about general courses, which would sap enrollment from small departments in a significant way.

Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History): A couple of these questions should be answered. Let me ask Lee Baker if he would talk about these questions, about overlap and credit. Then [I will] turn to Peter Lange, if I could, to answer questions about the agreement, Duke's participation in it, and questions about the consortium itself and management of courses.

Dean Lee Baker: I know this overlap issue came up quite a bit, and this is something that David Bell's and the Courses Committee did not grapple with, but discussed. What we decided was, and this went back and forth, we wanted to invest both authority and responsibility on the DUS to determine first whether it would be a credit for the major, and second, the DUS determines overlap or not, period. That is within one calendar year, I do not know if we made a special exception for classes for certain. The way it is right now, is it stands for one calendar year. Now, the Courses Committee gets to decide whether it counts for general education requirements or not, but if it is an overlap, that is determined each year. They could say, "It is not an overlap this year" then it might go for a general education requirement, but if it is an overlap this year, no one takes it at Duke. The DUS has that authority.

Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History): We are approaching the limit of our time, but for some of the questions involving the consortium and the agreement, I want to ask if Peter Lange would address those questions, and I think that will bring us to the end of the time for today.

Provost Peter Lange: I would like to address a few things, but let me start with the question if the Arts and Sciences Council does not endorse the rules for the implementation of the program, then Duke will not participate in the program. It is as simple as that, and 2U is well aware of the conversations we are having, and [saying] "no" is a potential outcome. The notion that somehow, "Machiavellian" is one word, "conspiracy" would be another, but the notion that we have somehow maneuvered the Arts and Sciences Council into a conversation without any real bite is not correct.

Second of all, there is a question about revenue. There is a business model for the entire program that will produce revenue sufficient to support the costs of program over time. It will probably be some initial investment that will be necessary. The initial investment will come from the million dollars, which the university has raised from an outside donor to support online initiatives in the area of online education. I do not want to use the word “experiment”, and I will come back to that in a second. This will not come from money that would otherwise be available for other units, because the money was raised for this purpose.

I would like to come back to the word “experiment.” I did not use the word “experiment.” I believe that this is not an experiment. This is a pilot. The experiments will happen within the pilot, and although I greatly respect Andrew Janiak’s background in Newton, the fact is if we do not have the data, we will not be able to run the experiments. The point is that within the pilot we can run experiments around assessment. In fact, working with the other schools, we can work on ways to deliver the same material to students that we think are relatively similar. This is a main problem with all of these experiments; you have difficulty controlling the sample. The only way we can do that is either by ramping up the number, or by trying as best we can across schools to differ the treatment across students who will not be exactly the same.

We cannot run an experiment outside [of credit]. MOOCs are not an experiment about for credit courses. You can know that from looking at the fall off in the rate of students who sign up under a course for a MOOC, and who finally complete the full exercises. In order to experiment, we need data, and in order to have the data, we need to run a pilot.

I would also like to add something about the small departments. I fully understand the concerns of the small department. I think that what Walter said is also correct, in that it is possible that there will be students who will be drawn into fields by taking a large class, which is more of a survey class that is offered by another school and realizing that actually there would something quite fascinating in taking a 2nd or 3rd course here at Duke.

As I tried to indicate at the beginning, about eighty percent of our courses will not be touched by this in any way. I think that when we get into a mode in which we say, “Well, our departments enrollments will be so damaged if we cannot control the curriculum over three years,” what are we saying to our students? Then, what we are saying to our students is the only opportunity you will have at Duke to take a course will be once, because we only teach it once over three years. That is the other side of this equation. We may be protecting enrollments in that year, but we are also impeding our students from access to certain kinds of material except once in their whole life as an undergraduate, and if they cannot fit it in, then too bad. It is a tradeoff, I admit, and I better understand some of the dynamics of the small departments today than I did before, but it is a tradeoff. There are arguments on both sides with respect to what we offer to our students, and how our departments respond.

Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History): We are a little bit over time, and I apologize to those who wanted to speak. [I have] just one reminder to colleagues, especially representatives, that the motion that is before you has to do with the recommendation for the policy guidelines involving participation in the consortium [and] online courses for credit. There are a lot of other related issues, but I want you to bear that in mind. We will follow up, if colleagues who have additional questions, comments, or concerns, I have been taking notes, but would you please send any additional questions or concerns after you have learned things today to me, if you wish, and members of the Executive Committee, and we will follow up with more communication. We will see you on the 25th.

Meeting Adjourned