**Sherryl Broverman (Interim Chair):** There will be an electronic election for two new ECASC members, one from the Natural Sciences and one from the Social Sciences.

**Valerie Ashby (Dean):** Recognition of 2016-17 Teaching, Advising, Diversity and Leadership Awards:

- **David and Janet Vaughn Brooks Award** – Dorian Canelas, Chemistry
- **Robert B. Cox Award** – Kathi Weeks, Gender, Sexuality & Feminist Studies
- **Howard D. Johnson Award** – Jessica Namakkal, International Comparative Studies
- **Richard K. Lublin Award** – Markos Hadjiannou, Literature
- **Award for Excellence in Teaching Writing** – Miranda Welsh, Thompson Writing Program
- **Alumni Distinguished Undergraduate Teaching Award** – Thomas J. Nechyba, Economics
- **Award for Excellence in Advising** – Catherine Admay, Sanford School of Public Policy, and Sue Wasiolek, Student Affairs
- **Dean’s Diversity Award** – Sherryl Broverman, Biology
- **Dean’s Leadership Award** – Naval Science Advisor Team, Naval Science

*Note: need to vote to approve March minutes in the fall.*

**Sherryl Broverman:** We have had the opportunity to have new conversations with a more diverse range of colleagues. These conversations will help us moving forward. We wouldn’t be having these conversations if the IDC group had not stimulated a rich discussion. However, ECASC had voted to pause this process so that we could back up and have a wider faculty driven conversation. Dean Ashby also had a meeting with Chairs and independently determined that a pause is needed. Sherryl asked Dean Ashby to speak.

**Dean Ashby:** Shared her concerns about a lack of collegiality and civil discourse among the faculty - she said some faculty had not acted respectfully and she was concerned about this. Dean Ashby said that even though the IDC committee might not want to hear thank you again, because a thank you had often been followed by negativity-- that still the IDC must be thanked because they had provided a tremendous service to the college and they had been very thoughtful and conscientious in making this an open process - she noted that the faculty at large owed a tremendous expression of appreciation to the IDC committee.
Reiterated that we are at a pause state. How we move forward will in part depend on the conversation in this room.

The floor was then opened and a wide ranging and collegial conversation occurred about philosophies of education and the values that should undergird a curriculum. There were also multiple comments on the need to get faculty input sooner in some way that indicates how widespread, or not, support is for any particular item. Multiple methods were proposed from non-binding straw polls to charrettes or design competitions. Again, there was a strong general desire for representative, democratic input with faculty starting early in the process, rather than risk moving too far in a direction that had little support or that neglected the views of on particular discipline or division.

One theme that emerged was the marginalization of small departments and their perceived need to attract students in their courses in order to survive - it was pointed out that this is actually a structural institutional problem within Duke - and the small department problem has really little to do with the curriculum and needs to be decoupled from the curriculum and addressed administratively. Some folks thought that the curriculum proposal process became a means for to vent frustrations about problems more related to their small department status.

**Steven Asher (Psychology and Neuroscience):** Chairs and DUSs should meet, faculty in departments should communicate.

**Warren Warren (Physics and Chemistry):** Gain an understanding of what the faculty as a whole feels before moving forward. Do a straw poll of faculty first to get a sense of where there is broader consensus and where more work needs to be done. The first of many to indicate the need to touch base with faculty in a way other than ‘listening’, but which gives feedback on the about the feelings of the faculty as a whole, not just those who are willing to stand up and voice their view.

**Randy Matory (Cultural Anthropology):** If using a non-binding straw poll, he favors a chair’s poll based on faculty interactions. Advising is also a big concern for many. He suggests taking away the connection between course enrollments and resources, as small departments are concerned about this.

**Emily Klein (NSOE):** Discussion of issues and principles should go first.

**Jonathan Mattingly (Math):** A straw poll would help focus the conversation.

**Shai Ginsburg (AMES):** Who is the curriculum designed for? Need data regarding students. Add Admissions into the conversation. Implementation needs to be discussed at the same time.
Unknown: Chairs/DUS’s should draft poll. Get as many faculty voices as possible; the IDC sessions were always scheduled during his class times so he couldn’t participate.

Cary Moskovitz (TWP): Perhaps some meta thinking about a design problem. For example, have a contest with groups of people creating a vision and rationale and being able to argue for their vision. He has concerns about a curriculum based on polls.

Ron Parr (Computer Science): Get input from alumni – hindsight often highlights pros/cons of experiences.

Charlotte Clark (NSOE): Sponsor a design charrette in order to vet ideas.

Chris Walter (Physics): Need to separate departmental issues/needs from student issues/needs. Also, need a way for Council to communicate with each other via a common list serve or website. Right now there isn’t way for a broad email conversation.

Rey Chow (Literature): Should decide WHAT we should do in education. Content is important. Faculty should have courage to argue about their beliefs.

Sarah Beckwith (English): The obstacles that hindered the success of the curriculum proposal should be noted and taken seriously. She is against polls. Curriculum = what we value. Perhaps a long pause so that we can develop a new vision.

Chantal Reid (NSOE): Perhaps a web forum could be set up like with U2? There should be data available from alumni and student affairs that could be accessed.

David Malone (Education): Agrees faculty should “own” curriculum. Also, noted that there has never been this many faculty attending a council meeting. Currently, most faculty responsibility for governance is outsourced to POPs. All Faculty need to step up and take responsibility for our curriculum and campus climate not just at moments of crisis but every day - faculty need to mentor and inspire and to teach in ways that truly engage and draw out the intellectual curiosity within each of our students. The curriculum has revealed institutional inequities and how much of the university’s work is done by PoPs.

Thomas Pfau (German): Should think of curriculum in the way it affects students, not departments. The larger concern should be responsibility to students and how we want to see them leave. Need to agree on basic principles for a curriculum, otherwise it would be better to farm out to individual departments to run their own.

Matory: There’s two different ways to view students – compelling them to do things or leaving them to decide. They are adults, not children. Those who want less requirements do care about the students.
Frances Hasso (GSF): There are problems people agree with about C2K (web, codes), so between the pause and the new curriculum, can those be dealt with?

Mattingly: Some people view that less requirements = more intellectual. He doesn’t want a long re-set. The current curriculum is not okay. He favors straw polls as a way to move forward.

Pfau: Thought C2K was worst curriculum until now. Natural sciences have a high level of requirements, humanities have fewer requirements and rely on the university curriculum to achieve meaningful results. Maybe we should rethink majors and put limits on them.

Ginsburg: Disciplines aren’t the same and somehow that needs to be represented in the new curriculum.

Carol Apollonio (Slavics): Knows that Admissions doesn’t have a policy of admitting pre-professional students; many are artists, etc. Something happens when students get here. There are other issues involved (cost of education, desire to make a living, parental pressure) that a new curriculum won’t solve. She argued that POPs often are the boots on the ground and know the issues with students and teaching, so they should be involved in decision making about any new curriculum.

Connel Fullenkamp (Economics): We should re-evaluate how we teach – are we achieving the goals we desire through current teaching methods? Also, should come to clarity about Blue Print sooner rather than later. If it’s going to be scrapped, go ahead and do so. Admit it is a sunk cost.

Steve Asher: Also must consider Duke’s culture and the emphasis on extra-curriculars (DukeEngage, DukeImmerse, etc.). Will that continue?

Surya Prabhakar (Economics student): Must consider nature of the students. An open curriculum assumes students with intellectual curiosity. He thinks most students coming to Duke do not have as much curiosity to begin with, particularly in their first years. He developed that through the requirements, so he would argue for keeping them.

Sherryl Broverman: summed up the discussion. Noted that there was a universal desire for more frequent check ins with faculty that go beyond listening tours or council meetings. We need to find a way/methodology to collect broad based feedback to count all voices and reflect the extent of support or interest.

The council session was closed for a reception. Many faculty stayed and enjoyed a very collegial atmosphere.