Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Arts & Sciences Council

Thursday, January 11, 2018

Call to Order

Anita Layton (A&S Council Chair): Welcome. I apologize for the room change. Someone took our room and they’re having a class. So here we are. I hope you all had a wonderful holiday break. I did; it was just way too short. Anyway, let us start by approving the December meeting minutes which are on Sakai. Are there any requests for comments or revision or change? No? Okay, then can somebody give me a motion? [A motion was called, seconded, and the minutes were approved.]

Faculty veto referenda

Layton: So at the last meeting, Mike Munger helped us introduce this proposal for a veto referendum. It is a highly complex issue and I appreciate Mike giving us a really fabulous introduction and explaining to us what it is all about. Nonetheless, it has a lot of details that need to be clarified and to think about, so why don’t I invite Mike back up here to lead another discussion?

Mike Munger (Political Science): So hey! I think we actually have a bit more clarity now from having discussed this because we discussed it at the ECASC meeting and I have talked to a number of people who have had suggestions. So this grew from the perception that people have that there might, in principle, someday be a resolution that is passed by Council that doesn’t really have the full support of the faculty. There’s two reasons that might be true. One is that the Council is, in a way, like the Senate in that each unit gets one vote and a large number of faculty might be upset about something that was passed because we need something more like the House of Representatives. Another possibility is that someone who does disagree and wants a chance to say that “This was done too hastily, here are reasons you haven’t thought of, please rethink it,” might be able to use an opportunity to deliberate and have a veto.

So remember that veto referendum is not a full referendum. There is no provision in the bylaws for a full referendum for faculty where actually resolutions can be passed. But this is a check on the inordinate power – and you can just feel it in this room, can’t you? The inordinate power that Council has – or a number of our colleagues feel. So it is a chance for at least dissent to be heard and to be registered. It is less radical than a full referendum.

Now a veto referendum is always a bylaws provision that protects the status quo from change that is controversial, the product of arbitrary representation and since in many cases the implementation of resolutions is essentially voluntary by faculty – if a lot of faculty are really upset about something and it’s just ramrodded through Council, it’s not really going to come to a very useful end anyway.

So I wanted to remind you about eligibility to vote in Council. This is from the existing bylaws:
II. Composition of the Council and Procedures for Election to the Council

A. Membership: The Arts & Sciences Council shall consist of an elected Chair and representatives of Arts & Sciences departments and programs that have regular rank faculty with primary appointments in that department or program and that make substantial contributions to undergraduate education. Each department or program shall have one elected member and one elected alternate, except for the three military departments which shall have one elected member and one elected alternate representing all of them. In addition, there shall be one elected representative and one elected alternate from each of the undergraduate majors housed outside Arts & Sciences departments and programs. Arts & Sciences Council representatives shall approve new representatives to the Council from eligible academic units by a two-thirds majority vote. For voting purposes, the Faculty of Arts & Sciences shall be composed of the regular rank faculty members as defined by Trinity College of Arts & Sciences and whose primary appointment is in a department or program of Arts & Sciences. Representatives from units outside Arts & Sciences shall vote on matters concerning general undergraduate education, but not those specific to Trinity College nor on faculty issues, as determined by ECASC. The Chair of the Arts & Sciences Council may hold a primary appointment in any Arts & Sciences department or program. The Dean of Trinity College of Arts & Sciences, the DVPUE, and a representative of the Engineering Faculty Council are ex-officio members of the Council.

The important part for our purposes is this in red: “Representatives from units outside of Arts & Sciences shall vote on matters concerning general undergraduate education, but not those specific to Trinity College nor on faculty issues, as determined by ECASC.” It probably should say “shall be allowed to vote,” they are not obliged to. So the point is that Council is the Arts & Sciences faculty plus those regular rank faculty from other units when the matter that is before the Council directly involves undergraduate education. It doesn’t say “directly,” it says “concerns general undergraduate education.” We had a number of concerns about this. It could be that anything that comes before Council affects undergraduate education in some ways because it’s faculty. The decision about whether or not units outside of Arts & Sciences ultimately comes down to ECASC, but we’ve always had just as a presumption, the default is that members of Council from units outside of Arts & Sciences would just normally get to vote. If something were very controversial, ECASC might say, “No, this is an Arts & Sciences matter but not something else.”

So I want to make sure you understand that it has been our practice, and in fact it is in our bylaws, that regular rank faculty outside of Arts & Sciences are represented by members of Council and members of Council always have ex officio status and are able to vote on matters concerning general undergraduate education.

So this is the revision of the language that I put up last time that is on Sakai. There’s a few changes, some of them important and some of them just housekeeping, but all of the changes from the previous version are marked in red.

III. K. Faculty Referenda

The Arts & Sciences Faculty can, by a vote of the members at large, veto motions passed by the Arts & Sciences Council. A veto referendum is triggered when a petition containing valid signatures (actual or electronic) of at least 10% of faculty eligible to vote is received by ECASC within 10 business days of the vote on the original motion. An announcement will be made that the referendum process has been triggered within 3 business days of the submission of a successful petition.

The wording of the referendum shall take the following form: “Motion X (date passed by Council) should be nullified.”
“[Motion X: Text of motion passed by Council]”

- A "yes" vote signifies that the voter believes that the challenged motion should be nullified.
- A "no" vote means that the voter approves the challenged motion and wants it implemented.
- A vote of “Abstain” counts toward the Quorum but is neither yes nor no.

Faculty will be allowed 10 business days to vote. A valid quorum is 40% of the faculty eligible to vote. Eligibility will depend on the subject of motion that triggered the referendum: if a representative of the Council can vote on the motion, then the regular rank faculty from that unit are eligible to vote in the referendum, and count toward quorum requirements. Any total number of eligible votes less than 40% affirms the motion as passed, because there is no quorum.

If a valid quorum was attained, then the votes—yes, no, or ballots cast as “abstain”—will be tallied. If the proportion of the “yes” votes, calculated as \( \frac{\text{#yes}}{\text{#yes} + \text{#no} + \text{#abstain}} \) is at least 50% + 1 person, the original motion is nullified. Else, the original motion is affirmed.

Because this is a bylaws change, we would not vote on this until the meeting following the one in which the final language is introduced. I am proposing that we accept this as the final language which would mean that we would have a vote on this at the next Council meeting, not on this one. So I’m sorry, I know you get the feeling that it’s Thursday, so we must be talking about veto referenda, but with any luck, the next Council meeting we will actually vote on this.

So it said “required,” but I put “triggered” to make it more in keeping with the rest of the language. Before it said “10 percent of Arts & Sciences faculty,” now it says “faculty eligible to vote” because that is defined elsewhere and if for some reason eligibility for vote has changed, we wouldn’t need to change this language. So you’d like to have it be modular enough that this language would survive some other change somewhere else rather than having to change all the definitions all the way through. Yes?

Chris Walter (Physics): I’d like to clarify what you were describing on the last page about who is allowed to vote in the Council. This does not apply to what you just showed us, right? There would have to be a bylaws change from somebody from the Environment faculty to be able to vote on the referendum because this only refers to people with representatives in the Council. Is that correct? Those are two different things?

Munger: Let’s skip to what’s relevant to your question. Eligibility will depend on the subject of the motion so I’m going to take that as my own friendly amendment. I’m going to add the word “the” there, that triggered the referendum: if a representative of the Council can vote on the motion, then the regular rank faculty in that unit are eligible to vote in the referendum.

Walter: So sorry for not reading that.

Munger: Well why would you have? I was trying to go over it a bit at a time but you have successfully called attention to the key point. What we realized was that both the simplest logic and ethically the most sensible approach would be to say “if the Council member can vote, the faculty member can vote.” So if the Council member can vote on the matter that was the motion,
then the faculty, the regular rank faculty can vote on the veto referendum for that same piece, that same resolution.

Marc Stern (Armed Forces): So I have a question that’s definitely specific to the three military units.

Munger: You are supposed to represent your own units, so please…

Stern: So my question is this. In an early version of this – now I’m the alternate and I wasn’t here for the initial meeting when this came up, so I only read the notes and spoke to the primary representative and there were words in the minutes that I’ve read that specifically said “tenured.” Now is that purposeful or is that uh, because I don’t see any of that here, because we’re not tenured obviously for good reason but I believe we should be able to vote. I don’t think that would be the intent.

Layton: It shouldn’t be there.

Munger: The bylaws say regular rank faculty.

Stern: That’s what I see now, but he said that and he wrote an email explaining to me and I indeed saw it in the minutes. So I just want to make sure that earlier version is not included.

Munger: You and I might dispute whether it was ever properly there. It is not there now and should never have been.

Stern: So bottom line is we are voting members for this purpose.

Layton: Are you regular rank?

Stern: Well, you’ll have to excuse my ignorance. I won’t quiz anybody on submarine operations so… Title X of US Code Law says when a university accepts an ROTC program, which Duke did a long time ago, we are given the rank of full professor. It doesn’t address that. We’ve always agreed and understood that we are not tenured, we do not gain tenure, we do not get tenure. I don’t know if that’s the differentiation between regular rank or not. We’re definitely not tenured.

Layton: Regular rank does not imply tenure.

Stern: Perfect. So I think we’re okay.

Munger: If you’re not, we’re happy to talk about that, but the bylaws are what they are.

Stern: It’s appropriate that we are allowed to be part of this.
Munger: Well and if you saw the word tenure, someone else may have also, so you raise an important clarification. This has nothing to do with tenure. It’s regular rank full stop. Any other questions?

Walter: Yes. Going forward one page just to follow up to close the loop. Shouldn’t this language say, “if a representative of the Council has voted on the motion”?

Munger: No because that would imply that they had to have been present at the meeting.

Walter: “Could have voted”?

Munger: Maybe “could have voted” or “is eligible.”

Walter: Because if you can vote, that means that ECASC has to make another decision, right? You made a decision as to whether they could vote on the initial motion and so you’ve made that decision once and once you’ve made that decision, that sets into motion whether people in the future from that faculty can vote.

Munger: It is not inconceivable to me that someone with a lot of time on their hands might interpret this to mean that. So we must rule that out and so I will be happy to substitute the subjunctive because that is the intent. What you say is the intent, so why not say the intent? The bylaws should say the intent. So I’m assuming we have unanimous consent to call that also a friendly amendment because that is the intention of the meaning. So the word “the” and that change to “could” means that we still get to vote next time.

So again, a change from “Arts & Sciences faculty” to “eligible” and there’s also a change that is not marked but it was suggested by a couple of people. Hm, this still says motions. So I tried to get the word “resolution” consistently so let me say that “motion,” “legislation,” whatever else it is referred to – all of this says “motion” so that’s fine – “motion” is what we are going to refer to the things we do, whereas in fact it might be a number of different things that we pass. But anything we pass is being called a motion for the purposes of this referendum.

Catherine Admay (Sanford): I really appreciate all the work you’ve done on this, Mike, for all of the rewriting of this bylaw. I just, because of that question that you asked, want to make sure the decision about whether Public Policy or School of the Environment could vote is going to be made in advance and so whatever motion goes before us, Mary or Anita will tell us, “you’re voting or you’re not voting.”

Munger: Yes.

Admay: And then there would be an opportunity for us to have a conversation with you, even though you, ECASC would be in charge of making the decision, as to whether or not we agreed with your exercise of jurisdiction.

Walter: But that decision would be made – I didn’t know it was being made before – it’s being
made at an even more upstream level, right? It’s whether or not you could vote on the original motion in the beginning that people –

**Munger:** And that’s what she’s asking. Have that be, make sure that – I don’t want to single out Public Policy – make sure that units that are not included have a chance to say “here’s why we think we should be included because it is properly general undergraduate education.” So at least to have some kind of hearing before ECASC. The practice has been, I should say I realize these are words and words have meanings, but the actual practice has been a strong presumption in favor of inclusion. We have not excluded until now under the presumption that most things bear on undergraduate education.

**Clark Bray (Mathematics):** I have a question about the formula. So the fraction of yes votes must be at least 50 percent plus one person and I’m wondering if that is the intent? It seems to me it would be more natural to say greater than 50 percent. Point being if there’s an odd number of voters, then the 50 percent plus one is awkwardly higher than it should be. So for example imagine nine voters; 50 percent is four and a half; 50 percent plus one is five and a half. That would mean it would take at least six of the nine.

**Munger:** And it’s simpler anyway, so sure. So again, I ask consent because that’s just a more elegant and better way of expressing the existing intent, let us agree that is a friendly amendment. Any other questions or comments? Remember we are going to discuss and vote on this yet one more time and if you think of other things, please feel free to email Anita or me or anyone else you want to.

**Kim Lamm (GSF Studies):** And this document will be available?

**Munger:** This new one will be on Sakai also.

**Lamm:** Thank you.

**Munger:** Alright. Thank you.

**Internship Policy**

**Layton:** Thank you, Mike. The next item concerns the consistency with which our students gain course credit when they participate in internships. So I’m going to ask Jeff Forbes, our very hard-working Curriculum Committee chair, to tell us what this is all about and what we need to do.

**Jeff Forbes (Computer Science):** Thank you, Anita. Hi everybody. So the internship over the past year and a half or so – Dave Malone, who was the previous chair of the Curriculum Committee, worked with the Registrar and Val Konczal in Trinity College to look at internship courses and how they are credited. We found that there was quite a bit of variety. So in looking at courses that are in some way labeled “internship,” you have some courses, for example, Public Policy offers an internship that has zero credits; Education has a course which is labeled
“internship” which is two courses; Sociology, one; etc. So there is a wide variety of both how they are graded, graded basis and all that. Similarly, there wasn’t a lot of standardization in terms of how courses that have some internship component were in the actual Bulletin, which makes it challenging because it’s hard to figure out both for the student whether a course is an internship and also for establishing other existing policies which I will mention in a bit about whether a course should be labeled an internship or not.

So after reviewing the internship courses that have been offered from 2011 until now, the Curriculum Committee came up with the proposed model, which is that the internship course itself would always carry zero credit, that the Registrar would attach an internship course component to our course so we can track it efficiently. But then in terms of the credit part where students are doing some work, whether that is the memo that they are doing, whether it’s the work they are doing with a faculty member, you can do that with a credit-bearing independent study or some special topics course like Writing 270 and we have lots of existing policies for dealing with that.

And that is separate from the idea of a practicum course. A practicum is where you have a course where it’s some part-time out-of-class work where you are under the guidance of a faculty member, which is different from an internship when you go off to do your internship and then write a memo about it. So it would be up to departments to determine how they would prefer to establish an independent study or special topics or just converting to a practicum.

That’s the proposed model. What that means in terms of what we have to change in the Bulletin are two things. It means we cross out a lot, which the Bulletin is pretty long so crossing out things is probably a good idea. One is that we have, in terms of credit you can count towards graduation, it says no more than one course credit in elective academic internships. We would cross that out because now all internships would be worth zero credit. Then there’s a section about academic internships and what we would say is, “In Trinity College, internship courses carry zero credit and in order to receive credit for an internship, students must do something else.” The idea there by doing something else, we have very good models if you’d like to do some work and build upon that work in terms of what you are doing in the class in an independent study or some other study, we can do that. And if you have something like Education where you have state-mandated internships, but those are being done under the direction of someone in the program, those things can be practicums so we can deal with that. And we say that if you have any questions, we’ve kept the part where you can still contact your academic deans.

Course credit: "(7) no more than 1.0 course credit in elective academic internships;"

"Academic Internships"
In Trinity College, internship courses carry zero credits. In order to receive credit for an internship, students must enroll in an independent study or companion course in which the student distills from the internship a certifiable academic experience that qualifies for course credit within the faculty member’s department or program. Academic internships must be offered under the auspices of an academic unit in Trinity College. Each student’s internship must be sponsored by a departmental/program faculty member and approved by the director of undergraduate studies. Such internships typically draw upon work experience to investigate a research problem from one or more intellectual/disciplinary perspectives. They thus have an experiential component and a formal intellectual component leading to submission of a substantive research paper. Academic internships are of two types: 1) those that are required for an existing major and are required in programs designed to meet state teaching certification standards; 2) all others are considered to be electives. Only one course credit from these elective academic internships may count toward the thirty-four course credits required for graduation. Further information about procedural requirements may be obtained from the academic deans."

So any questions why we are changing the internship policy or what the changes and implications are? We’ve sent emails to any DUS who has an internship course and the deans of curriculum and course development are ready to help them change anything they need to, so they are here to answer any questions you may have.

Ron Grunwald (Biology): Jeff, I think I know the answer but so why should there be internship entries on the transcript at all?

Forbes: That was a very good question.

Grunwald: I assume in Public Policy, it’s a requirement for the major?

Forbes: That is the answer.

Admay: I don’t think so because our internship is not … I guess the 120.

Forbes: Yes, for zero credits. So the idea is, for some programs – I think there would be two answers. One is for Public Policy, that’s a zero credit thing but it’s a requirement, so it’s good to have a requirement on the transcript because it makes it very clear to state whether someone should graduate or not. And that could also be an issue for other certificate 2.0’s that are coming down the pike that are experiential as well.

Val Konczal (Trinity): I was just going to say that originally Public Policy was not transcripted but it was hard to follow where a student was at graduation time and be able to get a definitive answer if the student finished their internship or not. But for quite some time Art History has had courses for credit that are not required, they are elective, but they do count toward the major that are internships. Then we have the Duke in New York and Duke in LA programs that require internships.
Grunwald: To be clear, those simply go away?

Forbes: Well, those Duke in LA, for example, would likely morph into practicums.

Amanda Kelso (Global Ed): Those are practicums.

Admay: Right now they are? Is that what you’re saying?

Forbes: Well currently the title is internship. We would change that to practicum.

Kelso: It’s a marketing thing but we will change it.

Martin Reuf (Sociology): The Sociology internship is also a practicum. Doesn’t this push it downstream to the standardization where now we have standardized practicums?

Forbes: But that’s true of all of our courses. I think what we are saying in terms of standardizing practicums, there you are saying, “Well, what’s the amount of work the student is doing in this practicum,” just like we’re saying in an independent study or anything else, but it removes the idea that if I do an internship for Public Policy and do 180 hours and write a memo, that’s worth zero credit, but if I do that in another department, it might be worth half or one credit. That’s what we’re trying to get rid of.

Walter: What’s the definition of an internship? It’s not a joke. I understand if you go and work for a senator or something and you get paid, then that’s an internship, but what’s an academic internship? How’s that different from a research independent study?

Forbes: So first, an internship as we’re defining it, you’re doing it with someone who’s not a Duke faculty member. So that’s very different from an independent study in that respect. So you are going off and doing something outside of the university and then there might be some reporting back on that. But we’re trying to distinguish between the reporting back, the academic credit you might get for that, and departments can come up with any model they want for giving credit for that, for the going out and doing stuff.

Walter: But what is an academic internship?

Forbes: Academic internship is one that is going to appear on your transcript. So if a department submits an internship course, then that is, I’m declaring by definition, an academic internship if it’s approved.

Karen Murphy (Trinity): Just a note that that’s what existing in the Bulletin now, so that’s what it is.

Admay: So what do you think, Jeff, that we are going to do about standardizing practicum? That’s somebody else’s problem?
**Forbes:** I guess I don’t see that as quite the same because since that’s a part-time excursion. I think it’s pretty clear how we can draw a line between internship and practicum for that point of view but that’s – the Course Committee deals with definitional issues like this all the time, so I don’t think this is a much harder problem than any of the other ones that Jesse currently deals with. Is that correct Jesse?

**Jesse Summers (Trinity):** Yes.

**Reuf:** (inaudible) has reminded me that for the Department of Labor, internship has to carry credit if the student is not getting paid.

**Forbes:** Yeah, um … I do not want to weigh too deep into how internships when people are not being paid should work. My understanding, and I could be wrong about this, is that if they are taking an internship course and they are getting an independent study course upon return, that should be sufficient. Right, because they are going to be receiving some kind of credit. If they aren’t doing this as part of their academic program, supervised by a faculty member throughout and having regular … and it’s only a part-time thing, then that would just be a practicum. But if they’re going off over the summer or doing the academic year and are later going to write a report on it, then they’re going to have to show how …. There are programs, for example, there are courses we already have on the books that are “write up something you did in the previous internship” and those are completely legal courses.

**Unidentified:** That’s the one that the writing department --

**Forbes:** Writing 270 has one, Latin American Studies has one, some other ones … So what we are trying to do is distinguish between the academic work that’s being done and the internship experience that might be necessary for some undergraduate programs.

**Admay:** So one of my jobs is to look at the syllabi for courses that students take as a part of study abroad and very often they want to take internships and I only allow that to get transfer approval if there’s this academic component or they write a paper for it. How’s that going to work now for all the students who are studying abroad and taking internships?

**Kelso:** So I go back to they’re not even allowed to do it for credit unless there is a course that is attached to it. That is, I believe, falling into the category of practicum again but I go back to internship is a very sexy word, it’s a marketing – that’s what students want to do, that’s what they understand. I believe that is what you are looking at. That’s supposed to be theory in the classroom and practice in the internship.

**Admay:** They go out and work. From the ones that I know, Amanda, I’ve read so many of these (inaudible), they go work for NSF in Geneva for example and they track what was this like to network and I have to stress over whether this counts as academically demanding for them to talk about what it was like to network, and they have to write a paper and I stress about whether there’s enough academic content in this. I don’t have a sense that there’s a professor in the picture. Is that going to be my job now to check and see?
Forbes: No. To clarify, when they do this, they are getting a Public Policy elective right now. Is that what they are getting in terms of credit?

Admay: They are getting … well Public Policy elective is something that counts toward the major and that’s not what we’re doing. We’re just saying this will count as a course for the university. It’s one of your 36 –

Forbes: So it’s like Pub Pol 100 or Pub Pol 300? So that is your department’s issue, so you get to decide as DUS how to bring something in as transfer credit. What we are saying is that if you proposed a course to the Courses Committee that was internship, two credits or one credit or half a credit, that would get turned away. But you still have all of the latitude that you have and you can consult with Jesse who would be able to help you with thinking through this particular situation. But this change would not affect how you handle transcript credit right now. It would affect new courses or existing courses that you have that are explicitly internship courses. This is going to affect Pub Pol 121 for you guys, for example. 120, it wouldn’t affect at all. But Pub Pol 121 is for credit. Any other questions?

David Malone (Education): So in the text, it doesn’t really address the time element of the relationship between the independent study and this academic internship, so I assume that is up to the faculty member.

Forbes: That is entirely up to the faculty member. The faculty member could put the independent study at the same time as the internship. They could do it a semester later, that could also work. I assume doing it before the internship doesn’t make a lot of sense, but otherwise it’s entirely up to the faculty member, subject to the same rules we have about independent studies.

Grunwald: I just want to point out that there are certain circumstances in which doing it after doesn’t make any sense, either, and that would be under the circumstances in which the academic work done for the independent study was equivalent to the work done during the internship. In those cases, the student registers for an independent study or an academic credit the semester following, but they’re not doing any of the work or they’re not doing any credits worth of work, then it’s a misrepresentation on their transcript with their other academic work.

Forbes: Sure. Again, faculty would be subjected to the same rules of independent study that already exist. What we do next is up to the Arts & Sciences Council chair.

Layton: Do we need a vote on this?

Forbes: Since we are trying to change the Bulletin, we would need a vote.

Layton: Okay. So it doesn’t seem very controversial. How about we do a voice vote?

[The changes were approved unanimously.]
Konczal: Since this is a change in graduation requirements, and because it’s part of our restriction to the 34 course credit requirement, so we can change the credits to zero now but we can’t change students who have matriculated before this fall will be allowed to count the internships that they have taken. I just want people to understand that.

Forbes: We’re just changing the Bulletin going forward.

Walter: So just to understand, it’s not that … say we do this now, next year this would not apply to say a senior this year. It would only apply to freshman starting next year?

Forbes: Here’s how I imagine it’s going to happen. For all existing internship courses that are for credit, those courses will change, submit a change request and make themselves zero credit and in terms of the course limitation, that, like all other rules, you get to go with whatever the Bulletin was when you come in. But it will be the case that … we expect that someone who took Public Policy 121 next year will not receive credit.

Curriculum Discussion

Layton: Alright. Moving along. Last item: the curriculum. Our favorite topic. So we started last year, 2017, laser focus on the curriculum. That was all we talked about. So it seems fitting for us to begin 2018 spending some time talking about where we want to go. So let’s have some small group discussion about what we like or maybe don’t like about what we have right now.

So I think C2K, Curriculum 2000, might be a good place to start. We were talking about graduation requirements, so here they are. If you are a student at Duke, this is what you have to do to get out of here:

• BA or BSc
• 34 course credits
• General education requirements
  – Areas of knowledge (ALP, CZ, NS, QS, SS) x 2
  – Modes of inquiry (CCI, STS, EI, R, W, FL) x 2
  – First-year writing
  – First-year seminar
  – Small group learning experience x 2

And here, I made this nice graph that summarizes what those requirements are together with some of our co-curricular programs. So, for instance, the Focus program would satisfy your first year seminar requirement. With Duke Immerse, students usually do within their majors. DukeEngage and Bass Connections sometimes get credit but maybe not.

So what we can do is, I suggest we split into three groups and each group has a facilitator and you can talk within your group about what we like and maybe don’t like so much about these requirements. So we can talk for 20 minutes and then a representative of each group can give us a summary of that group’s perspectives. These ideas are going to be recorded and then we can use them to guide the conversations that we are going to have this spring and beyond. So what
are we going to talk about? Some suggestions: at the last meeting, Dean Ashby told us about what her office has been working on with department chairs to improve our first- and second-year classes. So what have our own departments been doing or what should they be doing? For example, what do you like about these requirements and what do you want to change and how are you going to change them?

Three of our colleagues have graciously agreed to facilitate these discussions. Alex is here, he will lead one group. Chris Walter, he will lead an other group. And David Malone, I just recruited him today, he’s going to lead the third group of this discussion. So let’s split up and talk and then we’ll report back at 4:33.

[Group conversation]

I know everybody is enjoying this. I hate to cut it off. How about taking three to four more minutes to wrap it up, then I will ask a representative from each group come up here to give us a summary.

Okay, I would like to hear from each of our groups. So who wants to give the first summary? Alex?

**Alex Rosenberg (Philosophy):** Very briefly, there was some interest in the new curriculum in our group, though considerable concern that it ill served the Humanities or the need for our students for Humanities and a good deal of interest in some component of the curriculum devoted to independent sustained research either at the beginning or at the end of the students’ time. And another member of our group made the point very distinctly that the current curriculum is schizophrenic in that on the one hand it doesn’t really serve the aspirations of our best students and provides a kind of a grid of requirements that proports to hold our less good students’ feet to the fire without entirely doing so. And then there was the member of our group who was quite concerned about the design or development of a curriculum that would be sufficiently distinctive that it would be a reason why students would want to apply to Duke.

**Chris Walter (Physics):** Okay so I think most of our discussion centered around the idea of requirements and what they should be, whether there should be more of a kind of check box type of requirement like we have now or something more like what was in the IDC before. One interesting thing that came up in the discussion was that every department has to offer a BA and some departments offer BS’s and those students have a lot of required classes that are sometimes difficult for them to come up with when they are also taking things like the language requirements which are strict across the university. So there was a suggestion that maybe there could be a difference in how the overall requirements of the university were approached for different sorts of majors. So we talked about that for awhile but I think in the end one thing we came around to was that people actually liked the idea of requirements, sort of the thing that people complained about with credentialism but kind of a liberal arts education where people have to take a bunch of requirements, but they don’t like how strict it is, that we have all these codes. And that this problem that I discussed before and other problems could maybe be addressed if we moved to more of a distribution type set up where instead of having a whole bunch of codes, you basically just had to have a few classes in the Natural Sciences, a few
classes in the Humanities, a few classes in the Social Sciences. So less prescriptive. And people have found when doing advising that the students actually could be quite smart and quite sophisticated about trying to do a good job at what they were doing, that they discover things when they take these other classes. Of course, in this sort of situation, the assessment of the courses by people in the Curriculum Committee is very important because it’s easy for somebody to try and game the system by making a very easy class or something to get students streaming in their system. So I’d say in general summing up, people felt that having a system where you had to check off on doing a certain sort of liberal arts basis type of thing was good but more flexibility in the requirements in what you have to take would be appreciated by a lot of people.

David Malone (Education): We had essentially I think three big ideas and I’ll just share those ideas and hopefully the people in the group will jump in. One is the idea that the current curriculum has both advantages and values but it also has significant challenges and disadvantages. And similar to your group, one of the advantages is that it does invite students or require students to take courses that they might not normally take to step outside their comfort zone and people seem to like that. So finding some way to have distribution requirements without so many check boxes might be a way to go. A second idea was the notion that our students are often but not always seeing the world through a different frame of reference than we do and theirs is much more – I know when I was in college, I never worried about getting a job. I just took courses and I was like, “Oh, the economy will be there.” I don’t think they see the world like that. So one of the things we talked about in our group was a way in which students often see things in utilitarian ways of what skill sets am I going to get out of this experience and how is that going to be useful to me. So we had some discussion about to what degree we should push back on that mentality of students saying things in a credentialing utilitarian way and one of the ideas that came out of our group was kind of a reframing of this into habits of mind that would be useful to our students and having conversations with our students about that. The third idea was the sense that one thing that was left out of the three-year process of the IDC may have been building faculty consensus about what the outcomes of a Duke education should be, that we should use more of a backward design model of trying to think about how students should be different as a result of four years and three summers of the Duke experience. Then I asked the group if they thought the faculty would have general consensus around what vision we had for a Duke graduate and, believe it or not, most people said they thought there was general consensus about the outcomes – about what we would hope the outcomes of a Duke education would be.

Forbes?: Did you ask what that was?

Malone: Would any of you in the group like to comment on that? Professor Fullenkamp, I think you did say that there would be general consensus.

Fullenkamp: I think there would be. If you think about it in fairly general terms, we really want our students to come out of here thinking very critically, think for themselves, and to solve problems by drawing on diverse pools of knowledge and using tools in a real meaningful way. I think when David talked about the habits of mind, that’s exactly what we’re talking about. We want people to come out of here with habits of mind instead of just some hodge podge of crap.
Malone: Let’s don’t put that in the record that students are coming out with a hodge podge of crap.

Janan: I was just going to expand a little bit on that. I think that we could probably find broad general consensus around the idea that we are training our students to analyze databases, to find patterns therein, to draw significance out of those patterns, and to mount an argument, an evidentiary argument from those patterns. That applies pretty much across the board.

Malone: So there we have it. That is the goal of a Duke education. Now we only have the small task of figuring out the mechanisms that are going to lead to that. So those were our three ideas but people seemed hopeful and it seemed very positive.

Layton: Alright, thank you. So is there anyone else who wants to comment?

Malone: I do want to say one thing. I do like Alex’s – the notion that I do think we have an opportunity here to do something very distinctive in terms of a curriculum that can be identified as “this is what a Duke education is.”

Layton: Okay. So I think that was fun. Did you enjoy it? I did. Should we do it every time? So these ideas are being recorded and we can use them – very useful – to guide us and use in our future conversations about the curriculum. So that’s it. Goodbye and I will see you in a month.