

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, January 10, 2013

Call to Order

Council Chair, Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History Department): Let me call this meeting to order. Welcome colleagues back from your holidays. I hope they were relaxing, productive or restful, whatever your goals may have been over the holiday season. It is great to see you all back. Your Council has a full agenda for you, not just today but this entire semester. I know you have been longing to do work of very substantive nature, and I promise you the Executive Committee is going to fulfill that longing, starting today and throughout the whole semester. So thank you, and welcome. Welcome also to all of our guests. Just a reminder to our guests and representatives that they be sure to sign in up at the front; these documents are archived and become part of the history of the Arts and Sciences Council for us.

Motion to Approve Minutes

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History Department): I first want to turn to our minutes from the December 4 meeting. They were circulated in advance, and you have had a chance to review [them]. Does anyone wish to point out corrections, changes, or amendments to the minutes from last December? Do I hear a motion to approve?

Professor Tolly Boatwright: I move to approve the minutes.

Professor Steffen Bass (Physics Department): Seconded.

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History Department): All those in favor? Thank you, we can leave them in the archives now. I would urge you to review them, especially Tim Walsh's report and the lively discussion about Duke finances. It was an enlightening session in December.

Announcements and Updates

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History Department): First a few updates and announcements. I

am only going to bring you in on the most important things that are currently going on that will probably, in all likelihood, come to your attention soon for deliberation and decision, perhaps in the next Council meeting. The Executive Committee is very excited about a number of them.

After a long period of preparation, the Executive Committee has received a proposal for new a major. I am not going to say which major that is, but I do want to say that it is a path-breaking proposal that raises intriguing questions the faculty of Arts and Sciences. It also will open up possibilities for integrating learning in and out of the classroom in ways that are quite innovative. The proposal is still with the Executive Committee. The Curriculum Committee has worked on it, and when it comes out of the Executive Committee it will come to your attention. Stay tuned for that, perhaps as early as February.

A second update involves the Online Course Subcommittee. As you know, David Bell chairs it. It was charged by Laurie Patton last fall as a subcommittee of our Course Committee, [and] David brought [it] together. A group of faculty, some of whom are here in this room, are looking at the question of how Duke is to offer credit, if possible, for online courses. I have asked David to come to the Council meeting, perhaps in February, [but the timing of] his appearance depends upon where the subcommittee is with their work. I know that they are moving expeditiously, and they will report to us about their proposal for a framework for online courses and the possibility of offering credit for them. I know that you are eager to hear about it, [and] I am as well.

Third of all, an item will come to the Council next month for advising and consultation. At this point there is no decision or approval necessary. For a couple of years, a group now under Vice Provost Keith Whitfield has been looking the possibility of migrating our course evaluation process onto the web so that we would no longer distribute paper [course evaluations] at the end of the semester. Instead our students would be doing direct online course evaluations. The group has completed a pilot study [that] you are going to be learning about for our next Council

meeting. The results are already under discussion by the Course Committee. It has been sent to the Assessment Committee as well. The Executive Committee will be discussing it, too. At this point, Council has no decision to make, but the group is seeking faculty feedback. So if you sit on one of those three committees, please take notes [and] send back comments. I am going to be bringing the different streams of advice together shortly after our next Council meeting, and pass it back to the group as faculty feedback and advice in our capacity as a consultative group for the administration.

Finally, I saved the most important announcement for last. You will be hearing a lot about this in the coming weeks, as well. Just before Christmas, the Liberal Arts in China Committee decided that it is time to put together the first Liberal Arts Curriculum at the new campus in Kunshan. I was at the meeting on December 17 with the committee. It is an impressive committee of faculty members chaired jointly by Dean Patton and Nora Bynum, Vice Provost for Kunshan and China Initiatives. There was a lot of discussion about the process, and how we are going to move forward. Of course, you colleagues, the Arts and Sciences Council, through your committees is responsible for reviewing and approving all courses offered that come under our responsibility as Duke faculty. The Executive Committee was consulted—some members of which had already gone on holiday. I want to thank Dalene Stangl, in particular, who was right there throughout all of this and helped me think through the process. We decided to put together a “Course Committee Plus”—formally called the DKU Joint Committee—which will be charged with reviewing and approving the courses that are proposed for the first semester at Kunshan.

First, a little bit of background as I know that the faculty received the call for course proposals before Christmas. This involves an accelerated timetable. However, our committees are well prepared [to take on the job]. They have the expertise to handle this request. There are a number of interesting issues that [the course approval process] raises for us as faculty. Thinking about this unique situation, I put together the ad hoc committee, the DKU Joint Committee, by combining our two standing committees that deal with courses and programs in other countries: on the one hand, the Course Committee and, on the other, the Global Education for Undergraduates. There are *ex officio* members, such as **Inge [Walther]**, who is *ex officio* on the Course Committee, and **Margaret Riley** on the Global Education Committee, [who] will also be *ex officio* members of this Joint Committee. It is a large committee, but in our first meeting [we had] a stimulating and interesting discussion about the task that lies before us. It is just the right group of faculty to tackle the issue. It will have a narrow charge: to review and approve courses proposed for the first semester of DKU, [that is] not to review the overall [liberal arts] curriculum.

The discussion about the overall liberal arts curriculum at DKU is an ongoing discussion that runs parallel with this [process]. Dean Patton [and the Liberal Arts in China Committee] has this overall responsibility. So when and if some of you propose courses to be taught

at DKU for the first semester, here is how the process will work.

Course proposals go first, on January 15th, to the Liberal Arts in China Committee. The committee will read them, vet them, and put together an overarching idea about the courses, [and] about the offerings of courses that they would like to see. Then they will be passed to the DKU Joint Committee which is tasked with the job of reviewing them in the normal way we do for any Duke course. I want to underscore this [point]. *Our goal is to guarantee that we mount courses we are proud of as Duke faculty. These are standard Duke courses.* This what is wanted for DKU: high-quality undergraduate liberal arts courses that Duke is known for. This standard is well understood by the members of the Course, Global Education, and Joint Committees, and all of the others involved [in the course approval process]. They will be reviewing and approving the proposals. I am sure there will be information-sharing with the faculty who are proposing [them] before the final choice is made. I also want to make it clear that the committee will come before Council and be held accountable for its work. [They will] explain to you the process, and what is being approved.

I shall serve as the chair of the Joint Committee. Before Christmas it was difficult to imagine asking a colleague to interrupt their holidays and take this [task] on. Since I was at the center of many of the discussions, I realized I was the right person to pull the process together. You will be hearing more about the DKU [call for proposals] shortly. In fact, one of the information sessions takes place here in this room at 5 o'clock.

Introduction of Andrew Janiak and Duke IDEAS

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History

Department): Let me now turn to our first item of business. Throughout this semester, the council is shining a spotlight on the new and, in my own personal view, exciting teaching initiative coming together called Duke IDEAS. A number of you, in your capacities as department chairs, DUSs, DGSs, or interested faculty members, have heard presentations about Duke IDEAS. The Executive Committee has been most interested in finding out how it is going to work [and] how colleagues get involved. Andrew Janiak, who is going to be making this presentation, will also discuss the possibilities for faculty feedback and [involvement in] shaping the program before it gets up and running beginning in the Fall of 2013. So, we thought the best way to do this is to have at least a couple sessions of the Council focus on Duke IDEAS this semester.

We start today with Andrew Janiak, one of the faculty leaders [of] Duke IDEAS. We will return to this, however, in March or April. I have asked Andrew to put together a group of faculty who are actually going to be teaching one of the themed clusters of courses. This [session] will involve faculty members who are teaching [courses], who have been working on developing them, and who are collaborating with each other, and also department chairs, DGSs, and DUSs who are involved in one of the clusters. The reason: I find it helpful for us as

faculty to see how our colleagues are actually putting together something new and innovative. It is not just the ideas that are driving it, but how [the program] actually works. We want to understand how our colleagues are managing [a Duke IDEAS cluster] and marshaling teaching resources, how they are thinking about involving graduate students, what are the long-term goals and what they might be doing for other undergraduates, whether it is for a major or a certificate program.

Let me introduce Andrew Janiak. All of you know him. We know our colleagues primarily through our formal academic contexts, but I want to introduce Andrew as a colleague who is a specialist in a field near and dear to my heart, that is, early modern philosophy and the history of science. When we get a chance we can talk about Newton's understanding of causation, space, and time, for example, or about colleagues in Italy who are sharing some interesting new work. I think we might forget that when we see a colleague up here responsible for one of our innovative teaching programs that they are also first-rate scholars in exciting fields of scholarship. Andrew is the Creed C Black Associate Professor of Philosophy. It gives me great pleasure to introduce him, and then turn it over to you for questions and answers, and discussion of Duke IDEAS. Andrew, thank you for coming to Arts and Sciences Council.

Duke IDEAS with Andrew Janiak

Professor Andrew Janiak (Philosophy

Department): I hopefully will not take up too much of your time. We gave you slides [in advance], I believe, in electronic form and also to ensure the truth of the statement of the myth of the paperless office, we have also printed them out. You will see from the slides the basics of this initiative, and I would like to spend most of the time on your questions and answers.

Duke IDEAS is a campus wide initiative involving students and faculty at all ten schools, so if it is not unique, it is very unusual. Unlike a lot of the new initiatives that we have seen, this will involve medical school students, undergraduates, law school students, nursing, etc. What I will talk about today will probably focus on Arts and Sciences for obvious reasons, but keep in mind that this will also apply to all of the schools at the university, and faculty and students at all of those schools.

There are five themes at present to Duke IDEAS. These are all basically focused on problems in society or issues in society, such as the use of energy and the environment, global health (something Duke has a lot of strength in), information and technology, etc. These are the five initial themes of Duke IDEAS. They are organizing intellectual themes for the teaching and research that will occur within this program. The basic idea is that undergraduates will join with students from the other schools in project teams that we are now currently trying to envision. The project teams might exist for a year, so for an undergraduate, it might be in their senior year. For a medical student it would probably be in the third year, etc. The teams would focus on various aspects of some problem to do with an energy usage issue, for example, or an issue in global health, etc.. That is one of the novel

elements of Duke IDEAS, and probably the only brand new thing that we are trying to bring.

In addition to that, what we are really doing, and Lee Baker has been very good at explaining this in many contexts, is we are basically using existing elements within the curriculum. We are giving students a path through their curriculum, bringing together things like study abroad, foreign language study, study in the traditional major, and giving them a focus.

Let's just give an example. Let's just say you were a student interested in energy. You might take a gateway course that has an energy focus. It could be taught in Pratt, it could be taught the chemistry department, or it might be taught elsewhere. You loved the course, and you say, "I am really interested in studying more about energy problems." What you do then is, in addition to choosing a major, which may or may not be related to energy, is maybe take an energy certificate. I know there is a discussion of a new energy certificate 2.0, so you might take a number of courses that have an energy focus in different departments at Duke. Most of these courses already exist, so we are just pulling them [all] together. However, we might create some new courses in addition to the existing ones, and the student would do all of that.

Then, if you can see, there are a huge number of options for the student to continue her interest in energy. She might do a summer internship in Washington, a study abroad program, or a Duke Engage program that has an energy focus of one kind or another. As you can tell, the concept of energy and the concept of global health; they are so broad that many things will fall under them. That is deliberate; we want them to be broad, [and] we want this to encompass many aspects of the Duke experience. You can see from this example of the things the student might do to continue her interest in energy. Then, if she chooses, she might spend her senior year on a project team run by faculty members from different parts of the University; uniting with students from all the ten schools, potentially, at Duke. [They might be] working on some issue to do with something about energy, maybe some little slice of one problem that you could characterize as a problem concerning energy usage, efficiency, the environment and so on.

That is the basic notion of Duke IDEAS. So, mostly we are bringing together things that already exist, and trying to make a student's life at Duke, both curricular and co-curricular, more coherent. These basic organizing principles, like energy and global health, help us to make their curricular and co-curricular lives more coherent, we believe. Each of the five themes has a whole series of questions that teams or courses might deal with, or that faculty and students might engage with at one time or another. I will not go through them all; there is a huge amount of material here, and you can look at those slides if you are interested and let us know what you think.

Tom said one of things he would like me to talk about is how faculty might participate in Duke IDEAS. There are numerous ways, as you can tell from what I have just said, that faculty might participate. First of all, in some sense you might already be participating, because you might already teach a course that is related to one of the

five themed areas. If so, in a sense you are participating without knowing it, and we are probably going to be calling you and saying, “We know that you teach this course related to something in Global Health, would you mind if it is part of Duke IDEAS?” and presumably you might say yes, so that is the first way.

Another way in which faculty might participate is they might show an interest in developing a project team in the future that falls under one of these five broad cluster areas or broad themes. If you have an interest in that, all of the theme leaders who are listed here have committed to answering your phone calls and your e-mails. I have warned them there might be hundreds of faculty that are interested, [but] they said they are ready to hear from you. If you have an interest in one of these themes, you can contact them, and start a discussion about how a project team is going to be formed. The idea of the project teams is partially novel, but it is partially something that relates to things that already exist at Duke University. Some of you may already run multi-disciplinary teams, some of you may already have teams that are vertically integrated, for example in your laboratories, in which case you might have a step-up on other faculty, and you might already have an idea about how to do this. In any case, whether you do that or not, you can contact a theme leader and they are ready to talk to you about what they are interested in.

Later this semester, after this program becomes official and is announced, then we will have a lot more to say about faculty participation and logistical details. For now, that is something you can do today, if you are interested. However let’s suppose you are not really sure whether what you do falls into these categories, because you are not sure how they are construed. Then you can contact me or **Hallie Knuffman** in the Provost’s office. [She] is the first person hired by Duke IDEAS, she is the Director of Administration and Communication, so you can communicate with her and she will be paid to communicate effectively with you. You might have suggestions, or questions, and you might say, “Brain and Society does that include X, or Y or Z?” It will be our job to try to help you find a way to get your question answered. There are various ways you can engage with the program before it even exists.

I am not going to take too much more time, and I wanted to tell you a couple of things that you will not know from [these] slides. They are highlights of what has happened in the past few months. A couple of you know this, but most of you do not. We have had our first recruitment success, although Duke IDEAS does not exist. A couple of months ago, a prospective student came with her father and she talked to **Tom Nechyba**, who is running the Education and Human Development theme, which is also a new initiative at the University, and she had a lot of interest. He thought, “You know what? I’m going to tell her about Duke IDEAS”. So he did, and she wrote an essay that talked about Duke IDEAS, she was admitted, and now she is coming to Duke. So we have already done something that we have been hoping we would be able to do, even before the program exists, which is use this to excite students, and to get them to come to Duke because maybe this program will differentiate us from all of those

peers that we like to talk about; all those other institutions who are taking some of those great students that we admit away from us. It sounded totally hypothetical, but it has actually happened now, so I am extremely happy about that.

The other thing you may not know is we now have January 22nd as the date of the launch of Duke IDEAS. It will be announced. You will hear that it will have a new name. We did spend a long time working out wonderful acronym. After that date, more details will be available. A web site will go live that we have been working hard on, etc. You will be able to engage with the initiative in a more direct way. We have had to be a little bit circumspect over the last few months until that date because certain things have to be announced. There is a major gift associated with it that you will be hearing about. So that will be an exciting time, and this whole spring semester will be a chance for faculty to engage in a conversation about what this initiative will really be like in the future. I think that is probably sufficient. You have all of the slides if you want to get into lots of detail, but I am very happy to answer your questions, or listen to your opinions.

Discussion

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History Department): Thank you, Andrew, that is just splendid and I have learned some new things, too. Why don’t we turn it over to the Council for questions answers, comments, and observations? I ask you to speak into the microphone and first identify yourself and your departments as not all colleagues may know each other.

Professor Randy Matory (Cultural Anthropology Department): I am wondering who determines what combination of seminars, new courses, or short courses taken by any given student counts for certificate. Second, if I heard you correctly, each team lasts only for a year and I wonder what the rationale for limiting the longevity of a team to a year is.

Professor Andrew Janiak (Philosophy Department): Those are good questions. I did not mean to imply that, I meant that a senior might spend one year on a project team, but the teams might exist for multiple years. It might be like a research program in a lab sponsored by a grant that might exist for three, four, or five years, we are not sure of the exact timing. But a student might cycle in for a year, a graduate student might cycle in for two years, and a post-doctorate fellow might cycle in for one year. It really will vary. We have not yet, with respect to the first question, decided. This is really something that the faculty needs to work out, whether each team will have its own certificate. Global Health has one plan, Energy does have a certificate, I believe, so Energy will have an official certificate for graduate students and undergraduates. There is some discussion now amongst the people working on information about having an Information certificate, but it has not been officially determined yet, whether that would be the way that it works curricularly. Who determines what will happen? Each theme has a whole faculty advisory board of one kind or another, some of them have two; they have a research component and an education component. The faculty discussing it [will decide] what is

the best way to organize all of these curricular elements, the courses, and so on into one coherent program. If you have thoughts or advice about that, we would appreciate it.

Professor Terry Oas (Biochemistry)

Department): I wonder: what is the motivation or the inducement for post-docs and graduate students to get involved in these teams might be?

Professor Andrew Janiak (Philosophy): Ah, that's a good question. What we hope is that the inducement will be intellectual, primarily. They will say there is some fascinating group of faculty members, or fascinating issue that they would like to tackle that may be related to what their dissertation is or was about, but perhaps takes them in a slightly new direction. It is more interdisciplinary, [or] brings to bear various questions that they are interested in but have not really studied. However, we know that there might be financial barriers, or other kinds of logistical barriers to participation. So, we want intellectual excitement to be the reason somebody wants to participate, and then there will be various kinds of funding available from the endowment that will be created that will enable students or post-docs to participate. How that will work exactly we don't know yet, but it is one of the things we are working on this semester. If you have ideas let me know.

I should say, there is now a faculty council that is advisory to the Provost that was created by **Susan Lozier**, the Academic Council and **Peter Lange**. It has faculty representatives from all ten schools, and a student representative who is right here, Nicolai, and a graduate professional school student as well. I am the chair of that committee. That committee has to help us figure out how is the School of Medicine faculty and students are going to participate. Caroline Haynes gave a great presentation about how nursing students, Pratt students, and law students are going to participate. Clearly, there will be different problems for different schools and students, and different barriers, but we hope the intellectual excitement might really be in common. I hope that that answers your question.

Professor Carol Apollonio (Slavic and Eurasian Studies): I teach Russian Literature. This is a fascinating set of ideas and themes that you have gathered; it really is exciting to think about. One of the things that I have noticed, being involved pretty intensely with undergraduate education, is a sense among various communities at Duke including the advisors for example, the CAPS people, and residential life, that students are very active at Duke, as we know. But they are not very reflective about their experiences. We hear it from Duke Engage as well, even the Career Center, which I think is wonderful. I wonder if there is a way to provide an opportunity for reflection across the board in these programs, not just with little questions like, "Can stories and literature shape responses to disasters?," not just by putting in a course on literature, or something like that. but on a higher level?

Professor Andrew Janiak (Philosophy Department): Yes, I think that is an excellent question. We have examples of research questions that were generated by faculty. If you have an example or another

research questions that might organize an activity, a course, or project team. We would love it, if you could give us examples of research questions you think we should consider. That would help us greatly, and it might be that the ones we have come up with really do not turn out to be the most important. Maybe that will happen in the conversation that occurs over the course of this spring amongst the faculty.

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History)

Department): We have time for one more question or comment. I am particularly curious and keen to know if there are Directors of Undergraduate Studies [with a question]? You folks know the curriculum inside and out, you live with it on a daily basis, and you know how it works and does not work for the students. I wanted to be particularly aware of questions, comments, and observations that you might have as DUSs. There will be more opportunities later in the follow up later in the spring, too.

Dean Laurie Patton: I just want to underscore Carol's comment. I understood you to be saying something a little bit broader than just the research question as well. Which has to do with the fact that, if in fact this is a coalescence of trends that are already emerging at Duke, also nationally, of course, and we can see that in a number of different ways, but at Duke in particular because Duke is really good at these kinds of things, and wants to make itself even better. I think this would be an extraordinary opportunity to do something that I think we don't do as well as we could, which is really give students an opportunity to reflect at the beginning about why they chose this option, as well as at the end in terms of how their education was transformed. Then we would have even more integration with the Arts and Sciences curriculum.

Professor Andrew Janiak (Philosophy Department): Yes, I strongly agree with that, and I think the example of the student that I gave earlier shows that this can happen. I think she was already reflecting on what a Duke education might be like if Duke Ideas were a part of it, even though it does not exist, and she is not a student here yet. That is the start of that process, and I think we would like that. If you think about it, students know how to take classes, they know how to play the violin, and they know how to do all of those things that get them in here in the first place. Maybe they don't know how to do some of these things, which means maybe it's an occasion for being more reflective.

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History Department): In the discussion in the Executive Committee, a light bulb went on for some of us when we realized that this is not an add-on initiative. That is, there are some components of collaboration, some of which are already going on, but actually, it synthesizes things that we are already doing. Especially from the vantage point of faculty, graduate students, and undergraduates, and bringing them together. So, it is not as if Duke IDEAS is creating something else on top of other things that we are doing. You are beginning to get the possibility of bringing things together. Thank you very much, you will be hearing

more from Andrew, and from Duke IDEAS later in the semester.

Introduction of Suzanne Shanahan and the New Certificate Proposal

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History

Department): Integration synthesis is a theme for today in many regards today in our Council meeting. Our second item of business involves a variation or an expansion of our current policy governing certificates. When I first heard about this certificate proposal, I recognized how much work had gone into it, starting with the Curriculum Committee, and then making it all the way up through the Deans. Lee Baker has been intimately involved in this [proposal] as well, and then finally the Executive Committee. What began to become clear to me is that this might be a way to make Duke IDEAS work in [the curriculum] some new [integrated] ways because one can create new certificates that will integrate learning in ways that are not being integrated right now in our current curriculum, as it works.

I want to introduce our next item by first telling you a little bit about your colleagues on the Curriculum Committee. First off, I think many may not know how hard they work on our behalf as faculty members. Do we have some Curriculum Committee members here? Your kind of an alumnus, **Bill Seaman, Steffen Bass, Inge Walther, Scott De Marchi is not here, Tommy DeFrantz, Leslie Digby** is also here from the Curriculum Committee. These committees have faces. These are your colleagues. Among us on the Executive Committee, the Curriculum Committee has a reputation as tough and rigorous, insisting upon very high standards. I know that proposals come to them, and they do not hesitate to send it back to colleagues and say, "This won't work." I am sorry The Curriculum Committee worked very hard on this [proposal], and I am personally very excited about it.

Let me introduce to you **Suzanne Shanahan**, who is the chair of the Curriculum Committee. Many of you know her. This year I think she is especially busy as the acting director of the Keenan Institute for Ethics. She is also a research professor of sociology, and, in her spare time, she leads Duke Engage in Dublin, among many other things. But I want to underscore something that many colleagues may not know about Suzanne, not only how hard she works and the attention she gives to proposals that come up and make their way before the Council, but also her leadership, which is exceptional among our colleagues who working on our behalf. Suzanne it is great to have you before the Council.

New Certificate Proposal with Suzanne Shanahan

Professor Suzanne Shanahan (Sociology

Department): Thank you so much for that, Tom. Now I am a bit embarrassed quite frankly. I think it is also really important to say that as I look out on this particular room, there are probably a dozen people here who are really the inspiration behind this. I think there were a number of groups really trying to think through how to integrate

curricular and co-curricular experiences on campus. The Curriculum Committee came in to this process only about 18 months ago, and I know there are folks in this very room who have been working on it for a very, very long time, Lee Baker's office, the Center for Civic Engagement, etc. So there are a lot of folks on campus thinking this through.

Our objective was to try to find an institutional mechanism to do this that would work well with the existing curriculum. We came to what was, and I think the Curriculum Committee members will agree, a sort of a crazy frenzy brainstorming meeting, that our existing certificate program might be a really great mechanism, institutionally, to use to rethink how we bring the curricular and co-curricular experiences together. I know everybody has the proposal. What I want to talk a little bit about, but super quickly, is the why of [the proposal], and then the specifics of the what, then open up to any kind of questions.

Again, this is about an institutional mechanism to bring together curricular and co-curricular experiences. I think most people in this room, and lots and lots of people on campus, have come to realize that the Duke experience for undergraduates is no longer about eight semesters. It is about four continuous years. We now have Winter Forums, summer internships, Duke Engage, research experiences. This is a continuous learning experience that happens over a four-year process.

Secondly, I think lots and lots of folks have realized that much learning is going on outside the classroom. We now have so many different kinds of experiential opportunities for students. There is a real need to figure out how to bring them into the classroom and have some reciprocity between what happens inside and outside of the classroom.

The other point involves how [understanding] the continuous learning [process drives us] to really re-envision the liberal arts education at Duke, to recognize this fact, embrace it, and find a form that captures it. What are we in fact proposing? Most faculty probably have a sense of what certificates currently look like. Students typically take six to eight classes: a gateway [course], a capstone [course], and [courses] in between. They vary widely by field and topic. [For example,] the Ethics Certificate has a gateway, a capstone, a set of elective courses, and a two-semester half-credit course. Each certificate varies in terms of requirements between the gateway and the capstone [course]. This new type of certificate allows students to take four classes, a gateway, a capstone, and two electives, but then they partner the [courses] with two [structured] experiential [activities]. These are two experiences of significant duration and thought. That is the basic difference [from current certificate requirements].

The proposal has five goals. The first involves timing, [i.e. when work on the certificate commences]. This [type of certificate] is meant to be a deliberative experience for students. So we want students to reflect on [their plans] and to think through [their activities] as they experience, so that the timing of engaging the new certificate requirements becomes really important. The

first piece of it has to do with students declaring [their intent] to take one of the new certificates. Regardless of whether it is a new certificate in sustainability, innovation in entrepreneurship, or civic engagement, we want students to declare [their intention] by the time of midterm grades in the junior year. This is not meant to be a certificate that in the senior year one says, "Well I have now taken all of these classes, I might as well get this extra certificate on my transcript." This [new certificate] is meant to be a lens through which students view their experience over as much of the four years as possible. The timing [for declaring] is therefore important.

We have also designed it so that the declaration is done in a thoughtful way. An essay is required, much like Program II. Students must then create an e-portfolio to manage their materials, and they must have a faculty committee to advise them throughout.

The second piece has to do with the set of thematically related experiences. We require two experiences, one of at least 300 hours. Imagine a student working as an intern in [Washington] D.C. for eight weeks, forty hours per week. [This work] gets them close [to the required 300 hours]. The second experience is about 150 hours. These [activities] can include an internship at a theater, writing a symphony, performing in a ballet, [taking part in] Duke Engage, an SOL project, lots and lots of opportunities. One can imagine that these are easiest done during the summer, but I think they also could be done during the [school] year. We want these experiences to match the themes of the new certificates in highly flexible ways decided by the certificate programs themselves.

The third piece is a foundations or gateway course. I think the Curriculum Committee was agreed and we thought it important that if we were going to give an academic credential to something, there must be an academic [element] there, and as such, there needed to be some foundation for what students were getting out of it. Again, we wanted this to be fairly flexible. We imagine this [requirement] could be a Writing 20 course, it could be a course in a Focus cluster, or it could be an existing introductory course of some sort. We wanted to use the foundations course as an opportunity to build on existing Trinity [College] strengths.

The fourth piece involves two elective courses. So again, a gateway [course], capstone [course], and two elective courses in the middle, much like other certificates. We thought it important that these certificates perhaps have a more restricted list of elective options. The current certificates vary wildly in terms of how big that current list is. Some [certificate programs include] dozens and dozens of courses and some have fewer. We wanted this to be a fairly limited list.

The final point is a capstone experience. We thought the capstone experience important both for collegiality and cohort building etc. but also as a way to reflect on the [student's] experience, summarize the experience, and build upon the experience that there is some sort of capstone. These could vary greatly. One can imagine the entire capstone [group] doing a single project, some sort of team-based research, it could be a team-based

service experience, whatever makes most sense in the context of a particular certificate. We give two examples [in the proposal] of how this would work in a student's curriculum.

Two bureaucratic requirements are important. The first is that these [new certificate programs] need to be housed in academic units. While these certificates integrate curricular and co-curricular experiences, we do not foresee the debate club as a home for a certificate. These [certificates] must be housed, like current certificates, in academic units.

The second requirement is that certificates are imagined to deploy resources currently in hand. There are no new resources available for these programs in any way, shape, or form. I think if you look at the landscape in terms of the panoply of experiential opportunities, there are lots of ways to connect them already. We really hope that people look at the current landscape and creatively put it together in new, different, and exciting ways. So again, [the certificate is grounded in an] academic unit and no [additional] money, ever [will be provided to support it].

I should mention the e-portfolio. This becomes part of the declaration process. Students must write an essay as in Program II and they must maintain an e-portfolio so they have continuous reflection [about the certificate process]. This is really meant to be a lens through which they experience four years at Duke in fun, engaging, and intellectually inspired ways.

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History department): Why don't we pause at this point. We are going to hear the recommendation of the executive committee in just a little bit, but I wanted to make sure that colleagues understand what is being proposed. This is not a different certificate. We will still have only one certificate that will appear on a transcript, for example, but [the proposal] enables one to create a new certificate [that integrates academic and experiential learning]. Let me see if there are questions before we go on.

Discussion

Professor Tolly Boatwright (Classical Studies Department): Can you say a little bit more about the capstone? The various examples that you give seem to suggest that it would be something akin to a senior thesis in so far as thinking about faculty time. So these are each to be an individual one-on-one?

Professor Suzanne Shanahan (Sociology Department): I am sorry if I was unclear. These are not meant to be capstone *projects*. These are meant to be *capstone seminars* in the way we have with current certificate programs. It would be a cohort of maybe a dozen students working together or independently. It is envisioned very much the same as existing certificate capstones as a class that students take and not involving inordinate amounts of faculty time.

Professor Tolly Boatwright (Classical Studies Department): So it is a class already on the books that might be tweaked?

Professor Suzanne Shanahan (Sociology): It could be tweaked, or one might imagine a new one if a faculty member or unit wanted to do it that way. I think we

want to really encourage the use of existing programs, but also give really extensive opportunities to what the different certificates might want to choose to do.

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History

Department): Before we go to our next question, I just want to make it clear for colleagues, and it may change some of the questions or observations you make. This is a proposal that Council members have to decide on. We will have to have a formal motion at some point and take a vote. The Executive and Curriculum Committees are not just looking for your advice or feedback, we are hoping for a motion to approve this and see what the council wishes.

Antonio Arce (Assistant Director Center for Latin American & Caribbean Studies and the Director of our certificate program): I am curious about the gateway versus the foundations course. If a student is going to declare their intention for this new certificate in their junior year, then they may still need to take a foundations course, like a Writing 20 [course] or something, but that would have been something offered during their freshman year. It is unclear to me how it will relate directly or thematically perhaps to the certificate itself if there is not an established gateway course. An issue that we have . . . In that we are a Center we are fortunate that the History Department owns our gateway course. So, there are faculty that are committed in every academic year to offer the course, which is one of the struggles otherwise to get faculty in one year interested in teaching a gateway or capstone, and there is no continuity in year two or three.

Professor Suzanne Shanahan (Sociology

Department): A couple of things, when I talk about a foundations course, I really mean a gateway and so could be very similar. I think the same mechanisms people use to enlist faculty to teach those [courses] would be applicable here. I do think that we wanted to leave a little bit of wiggle room should people want to deploy perhaps multiple ways to enter the program. If the Center for Civic Engagement wants to use something in the knowledge in the service of society as a gateway to a particular certificate, that may be one gateway. I think what we wanted to be sure that there was a foundational opportunity even if you missed that first year of class.

The other important thing to think about is that given the way the proposal is conceived, we can imagine there may well be new certificates introduced. These will have the same transcript designation [as other certificates]. We also imagine that perhaps some existing certificates would prefer to shift into an experiential form. There may be Duke Engage programs associated with it that facilitate [a certificate program] or there may be study abroad opportunities, etc. This may be one change. We are also leaving open the possibility that existing certificate programs may decide to have two tracks. Within Latin American Studies one could imagine saying, "We will use one gateway, but we are actually going to have two tracks, students who want an experiential certificate, or students who want the non-experiential forum." I think we are trying to create as much opportunity for variation as possible while still having a coherent forum.

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History

Department): I am mindful of our time, and I can see by the questions that we are probably going to need to have this discussion carry over [to the next Council meeting] and let colleagues think about the certificate proposal. It is something very important that is being proposed here, and faculty will want to understand the issues fully. Then maybe when we come back in February to this, David [Malone] can give the Executive Committee recommendation and its thinking about this.

Professor Ken Rogerson (Sanford School of Public Policy): My question was exactly what you said before. Do you envision a certificate program having two tracks that could share the courses?

Professor Suzanne Shanahan (Sociology Department): Absolutely.

Professor Ken Rogerson (Sanford School of Public Policy): So the capstone course that we already have for one of our certificate programs, we could just bundle the students into the same capstone course. We already have a professor who has a seminar size class.

Professor Suzanne Shanahan (Sociology Department): In some sense when you think of the six to eight [courses] versus four, we are thinking of the two experiences in lieu of the other two, so there could be a lot of overlap. The staging [of courses and experiences is] really critical.

Margaret Humphreys (History Department, School of Medicine): As I think about this, I think of all the ways that our very creative Duke students will try to count something that we might not have anticipated. I have lots of questions. Why [are there] three people on a committee instead of just one advisor for the certificate? Who will say that a summer project in the Bronx counts toward their environmental studies certificate? Who decides that any given experience counts? Do you envision new certificates, or just a new kind of certificate within the existing certificates? What if they did a global health course in their sophomore year, but then decide to do a certificate in their junior year. Do they get prior credit, or does it have to be after they declare the certificate program?

Suzanne Shanahan (Sociology Department): One thing about the advisory committees. We imagined in all likelihood that three faculty members would be associated with any given certificate, and they would be the adjudicators of what [counted for credit], in some sense. There might be some variation, but this was meant to give leeway to the people imagining these certificates. We imagine this applying predominantly to new form certificates. [For example, a certificate in] sustainability, we do not currently have one. Now suddenly one may create one.

[Regarding] the question about sequencing, we ended up being fairly firm about sequencing because we thought that if this is supposed to be a reflective, deliberative experience that shapes a long period of time at Duke, then the sequencing was really important. There are sequencing caveats here. One of them is, say you have an experience in your sophomore year. One experience prior to declaring [a certificate] can in fact count, and then a

student can follow on with the foundations course. You can't take electives, however, until you have the foundations course. We do realize that this means some students who develop a passionate interest early in their senior year...this is not going to be for them. It does not mean they cannot participate in elements of the program, but the certificate is meant to be a deliberative lens that shapes student experience over time.

Professor Owen Astrachan (Computer Science): Here is a hypothetical [case]. Does this meet what you have in mind or not? Students come in and say, "Wow computer science! I want to do this, and I want to get a certificate in entrepreneurial software design." You take Computer Science 101, you get an internship at Microsoft and Google, and you take the other courses that we say. We have a couple from economics and a couple from computer science, and you have a capstone at the end where you get together and talk about all the stuff you learned. Yes, no, why?

Professor Suzanne Shanahan (Sociology Department): Yes, this addresses Margaret's point a little bit. These are not meant to be some student imagines, "I feel like doing astrology."

Professor Owen Astrachan (Computer Science Department): This is for the whole department?

Professor Suzanne Shanahan (Sociology Department): Yes, that there is a plan and that is what we imagine. It is meant to be...you have an e-portfolio, so you must continuously reflect on the experience with the guidance of an advisor. The courses are circumscribed, but, yes, that is the point.

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History Department): I am going to turn the floor over to Dean Lee Baker at the end of this session, because we have to move on to another item on our agenda. For those of you who don't know, Dean Baker has been deeply involved in the development of this [proposal]. I am pleased for him that we have reached the point of seeing the proposal on the floor of the Arts and Sciences Council. I think he may have wanted to say something about it.

Dean Lee Baker: It has been a long process to get to this point. Many partners have participated, and many of them are in the room. Suzanne really took the leadership at a late stage, as did David Malone. I think what is important is the idea of re-packaging [existing elements in an undergraduate education], underscoring or articulating what Duke does best, and sort of making it and underscoring it so we do it a little bit better. We know our students are doing many elements of these certificates anyway, but this [proposal] provides a more strategic and coherent pathway for them to navigate this particular learning. Most importantly, it both recognizes and values the learning that they do in the classroom and then they bring it to their experiential [activities] and then return to the classroom. It's that interaction between learning in and outside of the classroom that we want to capitalize on and enhance. [Setting up a certificate] . . . really benefits undergraduate student learning outcomes. I am really excited that it has gotten this far, and that it is taking the form of a certificate program. I hope you consider voting and passing on this at the next Arts and Sciences Council.

In the interim, if you have questions, ask me, **Suzanne, Eric Mlyn, and David Malone**. A number of people can get those questions answered for you. Thank you so much.

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History Department): Colleagues, you have a copy of the proposal that was sent out as part of the announcement for the Council meeting. Now that you have heard some of the questions, [I hope] you understand what this type of certificate can do. It is hard to grasp a proposal like this in the abstract, initially. Please, when you return to your departments, talk with your colleagues, mention it in your department or your unit meetings, see what kinds of questions might come up, and share the proposal of them. This is your Council, and you [representatives] will have the last word on the proposal. We will wait until the next Council meeting for the Executive Committee to give its views on the proposal. We will be sure that this is the first item on the agenda.

Introduction of Cary Moskovitz and the DUS Survey

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History Department): Our final item on the agenda today involves the results of an interesting survey that was carried out back in November. One of the things that the Executive Committee has been interested in this year is to improve communication wherever we can, and wherever we think it is [especially] important [to do so]. One area in which we see this as a possible need involves the Course Committee. I know a lot of colleagues in your departments look at the Course Committee as an abstract entity somewhere out there in the ether space. But it's not. They are your colleagues. Right now they meet each and every single week. They go through every new course proposal. I have also dragooned them into becoming part of the new DKU Joint Committee because of their expertise in reviewing and approving Duke courses. We need them.

Let me introduce Cary Moskovitz [co-chair of the Course Committee] who designed and drew up this survey. If you are a DUS, you took part in this. We had an extraordinary response to it, and the results are intriguing. It is meant to make what the Course Committee does more transparent, and to make clear what DUSs understand and don't understand. I will introduce Cary with this least known fact. Most of you think of Cary Moskovitz in association with his current work as a director of the Writing in the Disciplines program in the Thompson Writing Center. Does anybody know what he has his PhD in? Some of you do! It is Aerospace Engineering, and [he also has] a master's degree in Architecture. I am so delighted when I think about that combination being brought to our writing program in the form of Cary Moskovitz. Cary is co-chair of the Course Committee, our other co-chair is also here too, **Susan Wynn**, who is Professor in the Education Program. **Inge Walther**, who is the ex officio member of the committee, would also be available to discuss or answer questions.

The DUS Survey with Cary Moskovitz

Professor Cary Moskovitz (Thompson Writing

Program): [First,] the appropriate back-story. . . The course proposals, back when they were paper, were signed off on by department chairs and DUSs. In the electronic version, they are signed off on by DUSs, and a lot of the work of getting them to the committee comes through staff people. That fact, in addition to observations of the committees made over the last few years, and questions about oversight responsibility led us to design this survey, and I did not do that alone.

What we want to do today is show you some of what we think are the highlights from this. The full results will be available to all of you in the next week or so. We are going to resist interpretations with policy implications. What we really are interested in is seeing, in this case, what the DUSs sense of responsibility is for different decisions that involve the courses that come to our committee, and then hopefully it will engender some conversation among us about what this might mean for any future decisions for the current or future curriculum.

To start with, one question asked about just purely for DUSs what proportion of those proposals that come to them they actually themselves review. One was course number and level: almost all DUSs said that they review those. Course descriptions, most of them and curricular codes, two-thirds. The reviewing is if they feel that they basically are always looking at these, that is green, sometimes red, and blue too, and you can see that there is variation depending on what the particular issue is with the proposal, what the DUSs sense of their own responsibility to look over those before they come to the committee.

These are only three of the comments, but the three that we thought were particularly useful to look at for DUSs who marked never or sometimes. I think it is clear that at least when we look at these, what we see is the DUSs having a sense for their faculty being the ones who know the courses well enough to make those decisions. Then we asked specifically about the responsibility of the DUSs and others in the departments or units about the area of knowledge codes, and again the same green significant responsibility, red limited, and blue no responsibility. You can see here that slightly more than half of [DUSs] feel that they have significant responsibility for those areas of knowledge codes. They attribute, almost all of them, 23 out of the 29 that responded to this question, that responsibility to the faculty member and considerably less to department program committees, which exist in some departments or units and don't in others, or the chair or program directors.

In terms of the W codes, and I will say when you look at this, the results were almost identical for the R codes. About the same for the DUSs sense of their own responsibility, in this case 100%. They assumed a significant responsibility for the instructor, very little for others. The only real difference between these and the R was instead of the course instructor or faculty member being 29, it was 25 or 26.

This question asked in relation to those, what percent of instructors knew what the codes are that their courses carry. This includes our regular rank permanent

faculty, visiting faculty, graduate students etc. You can see here that less than a quarter of DUSs believe that all of their instructors know what codes they carry. Right now, it is important that we understand that these are the DUSs beliefs about the faculty members, these are not the actual results from faculty members themselves. About half of DUSs believe that 50 percent or less of the faculty knows which codes are assigned to their courses. This is one of the issues that drove us to do this survey in the first place, and to take on some of the other things that the committee has done over the past year. You all might have gotten some e-mails telling you which codes your courses carried, if it has a W or an R for instance, this year because we heard enough anecdotal evidence to lead us to believe there may be something systemic there.

On a related note, "in your estimation how well-informed are your instructors regarding the guidelines or expectations for those codes?" These are just the DUSs assumptions, but very few thought their faculty was very informed about what those codes actually meant. More [of them] thought [the faculty] were not very informed than were very informed.

Two other issues, one is in terms of course overlap and redundancy. The Course Committee reviews hundreds of courses and proposals for changes in new courses per year.

Professor Inge Walther (German Studies):

Actually, it is about 1,000.

Professor Cary Moskovitz (Thompson Writing

Program): We routinely see courses come, and we say, "Didn't we see this last semester or last year?" We look through the bulletins and see that this other department has a course that is almost the same as that one. As a matter of fact, when you look at the descriptions it is hard to tell fundamentally what the differences are, or with a significant overlap. We wonder if anybody actually looks at the bulletin and says, "Do we need to be offering this course, or is this course competing with other courses?" Especially with the issues we have right now, in terms of enrollment in courses being sufficiently enrolled that they do not get cut given the budget implications. What we found was from the DUSs point of view, [a] relatively low sense of responsibility that there is somebody looking at the big picture for courses that are being offered at Duke to see if new courses that are coming online are duplicating other courses already on the books.

Finally, cross listings [of courses] are things that as a committee, we feel are largely out of our jurisdiction. In other words, DUSs, chairs, and instructors are the people who decide whether or not they think a course should count as a cross list. We see a lot of courses that get a lot of cross lists, and it is not always clear what the basis for those are. Is it just that the course actually would be equally well offered out of the department, or it is just something that would be of interest to those students? [For] this question, you can see we asked on what basis courses would be approved for cross list.

The first one was a pretty easy one, "Would it count as an elective?" Eighteen responded that would be sufficient for counting as a cross-list. The second one is, "Is that a necessary condition?" Does the course have to be

sufficient to count as an elective to get a cross-list? Thirteen DUSs said so [and] only if it meets some specific criteria for departments eight. Down at the lower end of the list, five DUSs said that a course would be cross-listed even if it would not count as an elective, but might be of interest to their students. Finally, a much higher threshold: four DUSs reported only if a course counted as an elective in the department or unit and also was taught by affiliated faculty.

That is all we have for you now. We are hoping that there will be a little bit of time for you all to talk to each other, and maybe just raise some questions about [what] the possible downstream implications might be for the curriculum or even more so within departments or units for themselves to decide what they want to do.

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History Department): I think that discussion is really important, and as I look at the clock I might ask council members to stay until five after five, so we can get to our Dean's corner after this. Questions, comments, observations, especially from DUSs; you filled out the survey, I am curious to hear your impressions of the results, or what impressions these results make. I know the Course Committee has been talking about them and what they see from this, but I think it is important that you draw conclusions.

Discussion

Professor Ken Rogerson (Sanford School of Public Policy): The comment about classes that already exist, that is fine if they have permanent numbers, but I think our issue there is special topics courses that show up. Someone will come to me and say, "I've taken that course," but I did not know that it existed. I do not know how to address the issue of special topics courses that we keep coming across, but [it is] very interesting insight. There are differences between permanent numbers and special topics just as an observation.

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History Department): Inge or Cary would you like to talk about special topics courses?

Professor Inge Walther (Associate Dean of Trinity College): Special topics courses are normally designed to be offered only once. One of the reasons for the course re-numbering has been because people were overusing special topics because they simply ran out of course numbers. I am hoping with the institution of the new numbers that those courses that were offered always as special topics over and over again will become regular courses, and therefore there will be fewer special topics courses, because special topics courses are really meant as experiments, just one-offs. A graduate student has a special area of interest, or a faculty member who wants to try out a course that maybe will then become a regular course. That is the purpose of special topics courses: [they should be] just these one-time courses, so the issue of redundancy should not come up there.

Professor David Malone (Program in Education): I would like to ask Inge, Susan Wynn, and Cary, what was most surprising about this data to you, since you are on the ground working on this every day.

What did it reveal to you that you found the most alarming or surprising?

Professor Susan Wynn (Co-Chair, Courses Committee and Program in Education): I do not know if I found anything particularly alarming. I found the comments that DUSs shared very interesting. I think some of the comments will help to make our work more transparent and making how to request a code more clear.

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History Department): I was struck by the results by just reporting beliefs of DUSs, not realities, but the gap between what DUSs are doing and what they think their faculty know or don't know [was striking]. I wonder if there is some communication or a way of reaching faculty who are applying for or who do not know about codes. In other words, the courses that are being coded in ways faculty do not quite understand themselves. There are some conclusions we should draw from that.

Professor Inge Walther (Associate Dean of Trinity College): Part of the larger picture here is that our curriculum has existed since the year 2000, and although the curriculum is by now old, memories are short, and also when we have new faculty coming in they are not always as [well] informed [as one would wish]. We have taken several steps to address this. We are hoping now with the new online forms are giving faculty the ability to fill out their own forms, and on the forms themselves, there are now links to all of the specific criteria for the codes. I think what often happens is that faculty give a course description to a staff assistant, leave it to them, and say, "By the way, I want these codes." Then the poor staff assistant has to figure out how to justify them. A lot of work is being done by staff assistants that more properly should be done by faculty and/or DUSs.

The other piece of the picture, the other concern of the Courses Committee, for a number of years now, has been the fact that we approve individual courses, but there is really no sense of who is in charge of looking at the bigger picture in terms of the overall number and rationale for courses in a given curriculum. That traditionally has been a part of the role of the department chair, which is why the old forms required a chair's signature, and [now] they no longer do. We just wanted to get some discussion generated around that. Should the chair have a larger role in deciding what new courses are going to be a part of the regular curriculum?

Professor Randy Matory (Cultural Anthropology Department): I am so glad this came up again because I think there was a related conversation before I went on leave a year ago about that grid of various rubrics of courses. As a relatively new instructor here, I find those categories mysterious. No one explained to me what they were about, what their purpose was, and what their connection to each other was, so it was just an exercise, more or less, for me to fill out what applied to my class. My thought ultimately is if we really take these categories seriously and are concerned that our students be exposed to categories of instruction that fit them, every incoming instructor should receive an explanation of what they mean, how they interlock with the bigger picture, and how to make your course conform to this pedagogical

program. I had no idea of any of this as I checked off boxes.

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History Department): My question is how many departments introduce their new faculty to the courses and the coding process? A couple more observations?

Professor Cary Moskovitz (Thompson Writing Program): One of the underlying issues is that the courses get approved based on rationale that comes from individual faculty members, but that rationale basically disappears once the course moves into the system. I think it is worth thinking about whether or not we want a way for that information to stay with the course. The Courses Committee has increasingly tried to get the message across to instructors to embed as much of that course description as possible. But, certainly, I think your case is not unusual. When people take over new courses, much less invent their own, they ought to be able to figure out what codes they carry, but also why a course carried a particular code, what the implications were, and when they would need to re-apply or not for those [codes].

Professor Susan Wynn (Program in Education): Your comment is very relevant to me because I felt the same way when I came on board nine years ago, trying to figure it out from the bulletin and looking online. One suggestion that we have talked about is having an online module that new faculty and existing faculty as well if needed, could quickly take and get an overview of the codes and modes of inquiry.

Professor Steffen Bass (Physics Department): I have to say, I felt exactly the same way when I started teaching, and I am not sure that an online module would actually be sufficient, because that would be something like a one-off. I think what should be done is like what the navigation system in your car does every time you start it up. You have to press o.k., “Yes, I am not going to enter anything while I drive.” At the beginning of each semester, automatically, the system Storm knows which course you are teaching, and it sends you an e-mail, “You are teaching this course, which has these areas of knowledge, and these different codes associated with it, and this code means that, click okay if you have understood,” and now you can access your course.

Introduction of Laurie Patton

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History Department): I know there is more that you can draw from this survey. The Curriculum Committee is going to make it available to everyone, especially [the] DUSs you will find it interesting. I ask for your patience now because I would like to move to the Dean’s Corner, and let Laurie have her [time]. I have introduced this feature in our Council meetings because there are so many things going on in the Dean’s office that we need to know about, and it is also a chance for you to ask Laurie Patton about it. She is all about communication, in any event. Laurie has just come back last night from India. She has been in China, India, and Malaysia for the last several weeks working on our behalf, and here she is before us, probably jet-lagged—but she will never show it—ready to engage the faculty on the most pressing issues of the day.

Dean’s Corner

Dean Laurie Patton: I just want to comment, first of all, that it is a very rare institution where you hear faculty say two things: one is faculty members don’t actually know the codes of the courses they are teaching, and the second is “no new funding ever.” I just want to give you a quick run through of where we are going to be this semester, and I will have to do it quickly because we are about to have an information session [about DKU course proposals], the second one, in this room. I guess if we could characterize what is going on this semester; it would be *the semester of making it real* on many, many different fronts.

The first thing is the budget. Charlie Becker is here and he is our new chair of the Budget Advisory Committee. We will be meeting in late January to start that conversation. I am very excited about it. We are going to be thinking about priorities and decision making in times of budget stringency, and you will remember from Tim Walsh’s slides last time that there are various factors that are putting pressures on all of the university’s budgets, but particularly within Arts and Sciences, being no exception. Later this month, we will be talking to the Provost’s office about the picture for the coming year, and as soon as we hear about that, we will be strategizing on how to meet the financial challenges in both the short and the long term. The phrase that I am thinking about a lot these days is “financial sustainability.” Every single liberal arts college is going through that. I think Duke is in a better position than many, but it is crucial, and it is something that we are really going to have to tackle and make real in a very serious way. I wanted to let you know that that is what we are going to be doing first and foremost this semester.

Second, there are wonderful results of the interdisciplinary poll that Ruth Day shared with me somewhere over the Atlantic when I got this. It was very exciting. We will be sharing some of those results with what Arts and Sciences faculty members actually think and do about interdisciplinarity. In other words, let’s think about it on the ground and from the ground up, so I will be sharing those results.

Third, Tom already mentioned the online integration. Peter Lange, the Provost, will be meeting with that committee to talk about the next steps around questions of financial modeling, integration, and policy. That is something that is going to be very real as we go forward with our pilot courses in the next year.

Fourth is the online course evaluations, I will not mention more about that.

Fifth, I wanted to clarify a little bit why the Liberal Arts in China Committee did accelerate and bother the chair of the Arts and Sciences Council on the [winter] break. Essentially, it became clear after the question of “establishment” [of a new university], which means the creation of a whole new university was going to be postponed. It was therefore more important, and it was decided that the masters level courses that were going to lead DKU were going to come only with establishment, and not during this interim period of a cooperative education agreement, which put a lot more pressure,

suddenly, on the undergraduate component of this [project]. I wanted to give you this little background so you knew why we suddenly had to start moving as fast as we did. I think we have a great timeline in place, I am very, very happy about it, and Tom has been extraordinary, as well as the Joint Committee, in getting this going. It is real faculty leadership. I am very pleased about the fact that our courses that will be approved for DKU—remember they are only courses; they are not a curriculum in any way that is for the second phase of all of this—will be done by and through the faculty, and that is tremendously important. Having now been to the DKU campus—it is very exciting to see it going up—there is a great deal of excitement on the part of the Chinese educational world, as well as the Chinese government. I would be happy to share more about that, if you like, later on.

There is also a new committee that I am going to be moving forward on forming, but I want to do so very carefully, as I mentioned several times, and this is the Advisory Committee on Race and Difference. I will be meeting with AAAS, I have been in touch briefly with Wahneema [Lubiano] and Sandy Darity about this. Basically, the idea is to make sure that race and difference is an everyday part of our conversation at Duke. It is a very straightforward task, and we will move forward with forming that committee. That is the only one left, and I promise you that there will be no more new committees about larger big issues during my first term as Dean. We are doing a lot, but I did want to reassure you that there might be committees that need to get started because of responding to a particular issue, but other than that, these are the ones that we will be working with for the next few years.

In addition, the Committee on Advising, which we have started, is going to be chaired by Steve Asher. It will meet in late January. Its charge is to focus on advising and continuity of advising throughout all four years, particularly the transition from pre-major to major, focusing on the life script and not the transcript. This will be a very exciting group. Remember, also as I wrap up what is ahead for us, we have given a charge to each of the Arts and Sciences Council committees for this year. I am going to be reminding them of that charge, and asking them to come back with some reports at the end of the year on how they fulfilled that charge. I can go back and let you know what those are a little bit later on.

The University Course is ready and up and running, which is very exciting. It is on water. We had a wonderful Winter Forum on the Oceans. There is a lot of continuity here. The course is entirely full. All of the schools in instruction except medicine and nursing due unfortunately to their curriculum [constraints].

Two final items. First, David Malone had a wonderful session on Integrative Education. If you looked at the *Chronicle* the student conversation in response to that was phenomenal. We are hoping to hold another event on “Pushing Beyond the Credentializing Culture.” That is something that I am very excited about, and we will be following up with that this semester.

We will also be thinking about some healthy enrollment questions. In other words, I want to get specific in support of departments who are trying to figure out how to change their enrollments. I want to change the conversation. If you have the same conversation in academia, the third time, in my view, is: let’s have a different conversation. Instead of creating anxiety around low enrollments, I want to develop a workshop for departments to help them define what healthy enrollments are, working with [the deans] on how we see healthy enrollments, and move forward instead of creating a nebulous expectations of big courses. We love small courses. We just want to find a way to make sure we sustain courses that are well enrolled, even if they are small. I want to create a different approach to the problem and we will be working on this spring workshop for you all.

Finally, in fundraising, the great news is we have a million dollar donor—a prominent international figure—who will join our Board [of Visitors]. This [development] was one of the high points in my travels to Asia. We will increase [the size of] the Trinity Board of Visitors as the [capital] campaign moves forward. The criterion is being able to give one million [dollars] or more, and we look forward to several exciting possibilities for increasing our board membership at that level. There are several gifts in the pipeline, which will be announced later on, but the fundraising is very encouraging indeed. Given that [we look upon] the campaign as the “new SIP funds,” we will be able to create a nest egg for Trinity College for the future. I will inform you about specific developments in fundraising and the [capital] campaign’s success in my regular communications with the faculty.

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History

Department): I apologize, Laurie, for such a shortened time [for Dean’s Corner], but we will give you more time in the February meeting if possible. Thank you, colleagues!

Meeting Adjourned