

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, November 11, 2016

Call to Order

A&S Council Chair Anita Layton: I want to welcome you to the November meeting of the Arts & Sciences Council. Let's vote to approve the October meeting minutes. Any suggestions or corrections? [There were none; the minutes were approved.]

Moving on... so what happened Tuesday really underscores the importance of education and political engagement. So Tuesday night I cursed and I cursed so much and the next day I walked around wondering whether instructor depression is a valid excuse for canceling class. But it's not. But after wallowing for a long while for me, I realized that I needed to pick myself up and stay strong. Seriously, we need to be good allies for our friends who are marginalized, particularly immigrants, minorities, Muslims, members of the LBGTQ, survivors of sexual assault, the disabled, the list can go on and on... They must be feeling really unsure, unwelcomed and probably even scared. So we need to listen, empathize and give space for their voices. I was very impressed to learn from Deborah Hill that seven Duke alums are actually serving in Congress and Eric Greitens T96 is going to be the next governor of Missouri. That is really impressive. So we are really training the future leaders of this beautiful country and we are doing important stuff.

A lot of you know I was an undergraduate at Duke. If you had come to the last meeting, you learned something about me. What was that?

Karin Shapiro (AAAS): You got a B in some subject or other.

Layton: Philosophy. Yes, I got a B in Philosophy.

Alex Rosenberg (Philosophy): Who was the instructor?

Layton: Not you. I'm sure it was not you. I would have learned so much if only I had had you as my instructor. Now, that actually was not my biggest secret. As a reward for you coming to this Council meeting, I will tell you my biggest secret. I was a Computer Science and Physics double major, so I took a good number of Physics courses. One of them was Quantum Physics taught by Roxanne Springer. She's a Physics professor, still here, and she was my Quantum Mechanics instructor. That was a pretty tough class. There was a final exam. Like all good students, I studied really hard the day before, and then I went to bed and I slept and I slept and I

slept some more and I slept some more ... and you know where this is going. I slept well into the final exam. I slept until the phone rang. Ring, ring. "Hello?" "Anita, what are you doing?" That was Professor Springer calling me because it was like an hour into the exam and obviously I was not there because I was in my bed. So I jumped out of my bed and ran and ran and ran and I had about half of the time left. Fortunately, it was one of those really tough exams with like two questions and you either know the answers or you're going to waste three hours twiddling your thumbs anyways. So I was able to finish, and my only B remained in Philosophy.

It would not have ended so well for me if Professor Springer had not called and woken me up. You have to realize, this took some work on her part. It was a long time ago when I was an undergrad so people didn't walk around with cell phones. To call a student, you would have to go out of the classroom, go somewhere that had a phone, and then she had to find my number. Now, I have cell phone numbers of my students on my phone, but at the time you had to pull out a big fat phone book, leaf through it and look up my name and call the number. It took a lot of work and she did that for some random kid in her class. Isn't that amazing? Yes, it is amazing and it saved my grade, which was even more amazing.

So I don't tell stories just to hear myself talk. That was an example of the amount of dedication on our faculty, us, and I benefited a lot as a student from your dedication. I have many more stories I can tell, which I won't, from the perspective of a student or as a faculty member working with you, and I'm sure all of you have lots of stories. These stories of dedication and commitment give me confidence that we can work together to come up with a wonderful, beautiful, perfect curriculum that can well prepare our future leaders. So I have confidence in you because I have to have confidence in something. People don't let me down. I realize we all love our students and we want to prepare them well.

That's it for me. I will get off the stage. Suzanne and her team are going to come up and after a few remarks, we are going to have a Q&A session. If you have a question, raise your hand and someone will run to you with a mic. Please state your name and department for the transcript and then ask your question. Maybe a lot of people have questions, I don't know, but what I know is that we all want to get out of here before the Duke-UNC game clogs up the traffic. So we want to move it along. So keep the questions brief, get to the point, and if you have a prepared statement, you can give it to me, I can give it to Suzanne and we can handle that offline.

Curriculum proposal Q&A

Suzanne Shanahan (IDC Chair): I know folks have lots of questions and ideas that we want to get to, but just three super quick points in terms of framing. First, I think it's really important that I thank the committee. They are really the loveliest and most hardest working group on campus who have participated in hundreds and hundreds of conversations, sifted through mounds of data about Duke and about our peers, and really tried to bring together something that we can all be really proud of. So their tireless work is really about doing something bigger than any one of us. I also want to thank Denise Comer, who stepped in early fall with the first-year experience committee, worked really, really quickly and with great, great humor to put together a really interesting proposal for us all. Hugest thanks to Denise. And to everybody who's contributed thoughts and perspectives to this particular framework. I think it's important that

when we move forward with the curriculum, it is in fact something we can all be excited and proud about.

Second -- I think I've said this hundreds of times -- this is a really iterative process. It's about ideas and feedback and back and forth between members of the community. The Halloween framework, as we are euphemistically referring to it as, is something where we took the work in January and really tried to accommodate what were really wildly divergent perspectives, views and ideas. This faculty thinks very diversely and often very divergently. What we tried to put together was something that reflects the commonalities of us all. I'd also say we are still looking for input. This is the first of many conversations that we will be having over the next month. We've said this before, we'll say it again, we are willing to meet with anyone, anywhere, anytime to discuss the curriculum. I think it's really important that everyone feels it represents their sense of community. I think a community only really works if it reflects the ethos and ambitions of the community. It is our social contract. It's where we, with students, strive toward excellence. So again, please, any feedback is welcome.

Finally, just as a bit of set-up, Gary, Lee and I would like to say a couple of words about what we like about the framework and then we'll just open it up for general questions.

For me, this framework really tries to capture the creative energy of Duke as a scholarly community and make that what we share first and foremost with our students. For me, it's about learning to learn and absolutely loving it, whether it's a topic you are familiar with or just beginning to embrace. However challenging, it's about that love of learning. This is what I think we can really share with our students. Sally Kornbluth often says that the secret sauce of Duke is our collegiality. I really think our secret ingredient is our creative energy around learning here as a community. I know that, for me, the thing I love best about working with students is when I learn with them and this curriculum is about doing just that. So Gary, do you want to jump in and say something?

Gary Bennett (Global Health): Sure. So maybe I'm a bit more practically... so maybe some of you are doing this, but I'm actively fluncking particularly with my seniors. I had a wonderful flunch yesterday at West Union with a student I've known for a long time and we were reflecting on his time here and I said, "what are your thoughts about your experience?" and he said, "I love the place and I love the social experiences that I've had here. But my primary regret is not having become more involved with my faculty and specifically with faculty around research projects." This is not a student who has particularly deep scholarly interests and he just missed out on having close relationships with his faculty and was already, in his first semester of his senior year, beginning to experience that as a regret.

So one of the things I really like about the curriculum is that the mentored scholarly experience, with a small 's', will not benefit markedly the 25 percent of students who are doing a rigorous honors thesis. That's a real win for our university. But it will be a very useful incentive for many of the rest of our students to discover opportunities to explore scholarly experiences deeply with faculty. I think we all can recall times as undergraduates when those interpersonal interactions, which are often social but emerge out of a scholarly project with faculty, those are some of the best times I had as a college student and I think we want that for all our students.

The other thing that I've been thinking about a lot as we were writing this document is that we think about the curriculum as primarily benefitting our students, and that's of course true, but there are a lot of ways in which the curriculum can benefit the faculty. In this curriculum, there are a variety of places where I think it would be easier, more fun, more exciting to be a Duke faculty member. One place is the credit/no credit option. This has a lot of benefit for our students, but for us -- I actually think the downstream impact of this is it may help us contend with grade inflation. When you don't know whether a student will ultimately recover a grade, you will have still a little less influence by their interests to give a better grade.

I think a couple of other things. Again, the mentored scholarly experience would be a great opportunity for all of us to imagine ways of getting students involved in our work. I think the six courses, the sort of thematical alignment that students have as an option as a potential secondary depth option will for departments and potentially for individual faculty entrepreneurial opportunities to just dream up interesting thematic sequences for students. I can see many departments doing this. But I could also imagine faculty doing this as well. It might be a way of contending with the onslaught of certificates and master's degrees. We might just dream up some things, try them and see how they work, see how our students experience them and play with a variety of options. I think that's going to be a real opportunity for all of us.

The last thing I'll say about that is the signature core courses are a real opportunity for us. I think our initial foray into the signature courses have been a really great first step, but we can go further and I think we're going to do that here in the signature core. These are going to be exciting opportunities to really showcase our best teaching. We might have said "best faculty" in the document. I think we were perhaps a bit too detailed there, I think we really should be showcasing our best teaching and that will be a great opportunity, I think, in a set of broader activities, to really return teaching to the place of prominence I think it should enjoy. We had to start someplace, I think this is a good place to start.

Lee Baker (Cultural Anthropology): Thomas Jefferson created UVA so that we would have informed citizens that would not follow patriarchal populists without critically assessing and understanding their points. Seriously, we want informed citizens. We really thought and we really designed this as a super rigorous curriculum for our best students. We were reflecting about what does education look like in the 21st century, where these students are going to be serially employed, they're almost going to be freelance workers from one job to the next and they have to make strategic decisions, reinvent themselves, put together narratives, stories and activities and follow their passion with an ability to explain how they are learning and learn continuously. So we had this shift in paradigm. Requirements are not a super effective way to motivate people, but what can motivate people is following passions, reflections, planning, strategic thinking and taking some risks to put together a pathway or choose a major or design a research program that will really enable these students to maximize the value of their education. We want our students to design an education with purpose that really squeezes the value out of Duke University and just satisfying requirements doesn't do that. It's being able to integrate their DukeEngage experience, their language experience, their research experience and their classroom experience and have those experiences interact with each other so when they go to Dublin, they can take that experience into the classroom.... It's this interaction and that's where the value of the education really happens and that's where we wanted to design a curriculum that

supports that kind of creative learning as opposed to “oh my goodness, let me satisfy a requirement” learning, and for them to reflect and instill and discern their passion.

So I’m really excited about this and personally one of the reasons for me is hopefully my daughter will get into Duke, she wants to go to Duke, she’s done early decision, and in some respects, I was designing this for her. What does this kid need? How does she learn? What are her passions? She’s currently in Costa Rica learning languages, by the way, she wants to really study languages and international studies here at Duke. But how would this best serve this type of student in the 21st century. So that was really a personal statement but also to understand this type of student and this type of age set. Thank you very much.

Shanahan: Great. So we just want to open it up for questions.

Rosenberg: I have been exposed to three generations literally of undergraduate curricula, and I am frankly amazed at this outcome because I know from my own experience with all those generations of undergraduate curricula reform the degree to which this whole process is a matter of resource driven, turf protecting (inaudible) avoidance, and the outcome typically is something that pleases relatively few people. Here, we produced an outcome which I think meets the most important test that we can assess a curriculum with and that is, “Does this curriculum attract the kind of students that we want to come to Duke?” The previous curriculum didn’t. We know from quantitative studies how few students identified the curriculum as any part of their interest in coming to Duke. I believe that this curriculum will attract the kind of students who apply to Duke and who we want to accept our invitation to come. I think it’s really critical that we think about curricular reform in that context -- the kind of students that we want to educate, the kind of students we want to come to Duke -- and I think this addresses that question nearly as closely as anything I’ve seen in American higher education in 45 years.

Antonio Viego (Literature): Congratulations to the committee on a very fascinating document. I have a question just about the title and whether we are settled on that title. “Experience Duke Deliberatively.” I feel that the experimentation, creativity that’s in the document itself is sort of canceled out by this title that reads like an imperative, a command if you will, a super egoic command. So I don’t know if there were other titles thrown around, but I really think we want a better title.

Shanahan: So we are taking any suggestions, any ideas for titles. All are welcome and we really appreciate that perspective.

Baker: The impetus of that is we kind of thought that students were doing Duke kind of haphazardly, with trying to satisfy requirements. So that was the sort of impetus. One, it’s deliberate in choosing courses and aligning co-curricular --

Viego: But there’s something punitive in this title. The description is already describing what it would be like to experience Duke deliberately and it calls out to the spectre of what if you don’t do Duke deliberately? What’s wrong with it?

Shanahan: Fair enough.

Scott DeMarchi (Political Science): One thing I like was the deliberative part, so maybe you add a “please” in front of the title? Two questions that I think would make your lives easier. One is, it seems like the first year, which I like, is FOCUS light and FOCUS seems to me to be the best thing we do at Duke. It’s been the best thing we’ve done at Duke forever and I don’t know why we just don’t go whole hog and do FOCUS for everybody and let faculty have the resources to be invested in FOCUS. The second question is not really a question. It seems like everyone is going to turf fight over enrollments so if there were an announcement from the Allen Building saying, “we will do the best curriculum we can and we will take care of enrollment such that we do not disadvantage departments or people, it might make your lives easier. When I walk around hearing people talk about it, it’s easy to separate the half of their opinion that’s an opinion about the curriculum, the other half is turf. And there hasn’t been a clear statement about that.

Shanahan: Okay. Denise, do you want to respond to the question about the first-year experience?

Denise Comer (TWP): FOCUS is great and I had a conversation with Edna and our committee looking at the first-year experience and also thought about that and frankly there might be real limits in our ability to imagine how to scale FOCUS that encouraged us to go in a different direction. I think part of what makes FOCUS great is the living, the residential component and when you scale it, you lose that smallish residential component that is part of the driving base of why FOCUS really is great. So what we opted for instead was to take some of the elements that FOCUS provides, which are multidisciplinary conversations and groups of faculty and students who are talking about things not only in classroom settings but also through residential activities and over dinners and over special guests and special activities and special experiences, and we crafted those within that longer first-year experience at Duke.

Reeve Huston (History): I have a bunch of questions but I’m going to stick with two. One is, am I right in interpreting, I can’t remember what the category is called in the other culture requirement, it’s my understanding that under this plan we would no longer have a language requirement but that language classes could be one of the ways you could fulfill this. Am I correct?

Shanahan: Yes.

Huston: Okay. The other is the mentored scholarly experience. I’m wondering what your thoughts are on allocation of faculty time and resources. It seems to me that seminars is not one of the options in this and I can completely respect that –

Shanahan: I actually think seminars are in fact one of the options if the objective is to engage in mentored research. So for example, there is a mentored research requirement as part of the Sociology major. Some students fulfill that vis a vis writing, doing independent distinction work. Some do it in the context of a seminar. So I think there are many ways in which this can be achieved and the idea is to really ensure that the different ways disciplines engage in research, there are many, many opportunities to map onto that.

Shapiro: First, thanks very much. It's really an amazing amount of work. I have just a few points I'd like to ask about. It seems as though one of our objectives earlier on was to try and have students do more courses outside of the major and it seems as though we've pulled back on that in having people continue to do the major, minor and certificate. I was wondering, instead of just having a major and minor or a major and certificate, instead still having all this capacity to credential means that students will have less time and place to go and experience something ...

Shahanan: Right, so I think that on the committee there's been an evolution of thought. I think really early on, a concern about credentialism was really a driving concern. We talked at points about everybody should just do one thing and then kind of thought that maybe they could put a combination together. I think it's actually a combination late in our first year with Kathy Sikkema who was really incredibly eloquent about the idea that we could imagine these as credentials that students are just checking off or as opportunities to craft coherent pathways for themselves and that what she was seeing in her very best of students was they were putting things together in really creative ways that facilitated their learning in ways that would not otherwise be possible. I do think one of the ways we've tried to mitigate this is with, as Gary said, the secondary pathways where students can craft something de novo or have collaboration with a faculty member or however departments template it so that the idea is about the process and not every little doo dad that appears on the transcript in the end. So I think we did have – and others on the steering committee might want to jump in – there was a significant evolution in thought based on a set of conversations beginning with Kathy.

Baker: The second part of your question was pursuing a secondary pathway outside of the major or in a different area? Is that correct?

Shapiro: It would be great if it was outside the major so that people --

Shahanan: So the secondary pathway is meant to be outside the major --

Baker: But not necessarily outside of the division, a completely different area in humanities or sciences ...

Shahanan: Which I think initially we tried to say you should do something completely different but I think that within the nature of scholarship at Duke, there's so much overlap and so we're not going to say no. But what I do think we're trying to do is encourage students to have multiple depths in different kinds of fields.

Bennett: While also retaining degrees of freedom for those students who want to go deep (inaudible).

Shapiro: I guess we'll have to wait and see how this really unfolds. The other thing is I did want to ask about the Duke core courses. I understand the idea, but how do you actually envision them? Would these be big courses taught by faculty with lots and lots of TA's sort of picking up the slack as opposed to – how is it going to work?

Shanahan: I think we imagined them being at different sizes, depending on what departments and faculty wanted to do. But I think our objective was really have this be an occasion where students could engage with faculty, right? Scott's teaching a Decision Science class which now is huge. It's an opportunity to let them get to know that field through Scott and I could consider that one of the signature core courses. I think they could be small seminars. I think it really just depends on the learning outcomes of the course, the discipline, the department and what people are trying to achieve. So I think we're imagining lots of different models. We're not imagining a faculty member breezing in, giving a lecture, breezing out. This is meant to be an opportunity for faculty to engage seriously with their students.

Shapiro: How will the signature core courses be determined?

Shanahan: I think what we're really after is the best instruction. I think we drew the model from something that Inge has worked on for some time in terms of signature courses, the idea that faculty would submit an idea, there would be some back and forth, but really they are meant to be broad and with faculty who are really excited and animated. We want to get our students excited about the kinds of things that excite us every day.

Frances Hasso (GSF Studies): I read the document carefully and I had some visceral responses to some words in there, so I sat back and I asked my Thinking Gender students if they would be willing to spend half an hour with me yesterday. So they did. I had them write, each of them really quickly in three minutes even though they wanted to cry -- and they did cry at the end, I gave them time. So just write something that you'd love to change about the Duke curriculum, and then we spent half an hour. I used class projection and I kind of highlighted the five points. Based on that, the mentored scholarly experience was basically non-controversial and desired. I felt the same way. Now, based on your answer to that question about the capstone experience or another seminar where actually you are doing a serious research project, that's very important. So I just want to report that one.

Number four, secondary depth, that was also non-controversial. We were all confused about the one and two, but the fact that there was three, which basically said major, minor or certificate, even if one and two were confusing, there was three.

Number four, a major, we didn't discuss this as much because there were divisions between the science students, who understood sequencing and they didn't want the idea you know of dropping to eight, and the humanities students. So nobody really understood the significance, although some students raised the question of market value, the language of parents and passion bothered some students because passion sounds like it's Gender, Sexuality and Feminist Studies or African American Studies, a lot of areas of scholarship that are fundamentally important but they get situated in this weird binary. They asked about interdisciplinary majors, but I would say generally there wasn't a lot people didn't understand.

So really number two and number one. On number one, the students were -- they thought it was a terrible idea. This is just these 10, for different reasons. They asked why would one want to be stuck with a professor and students for the whole year if the class doesn't work out? It was really very interesting. What if you have no ideas what your interests are when you come in and

then you sort of change your mind along the way. People who've done FOCUS say that there's uneven quality in the courses and not always vibrant intellectual communities, but at least you are in it for one semester. Similarly, I thought the women raised really important questions about living communities because this whole thing is structured on you live in a certain community and you take these classes, but they say that often harassment and abuse on campus occurs in your living community, so what does it mean to be stuck for a year in a classroom if there's a problem and you just get credit at the end. Then they started talking about housing allotments and how they don't know who they end up with and one person said, "Can this be a sophomore year option instead where students have more of a sense of what's going on?"

So that was one area. The second area was real disappointment with the content because they wanted to know what happened with the Duke 101 idea, which I don't know, did we talk about this? They raised that they wanted a Duke 101 idea, a kind of introduction to diversity and inequality, somebody said different forms of oppression, called it ethical inquiry. We had a student in Duke Student Government and she said she was part of a discussion of student government where that was what they wanted. If there is this common class, there would be this ethical diversity kind of question. So that was them and I still wanted to know how is this better than the first-year seminars or quality 100-level courses. Why is the common in improvement, I wasn't sure? So that's one.

Number two, sorry, is the five courses taken during the first two years at Duke. This is where I was really, I mean it was great to ask them. They loved it. They hate the 13 codes. They think they're stupid, they gave bunches of reasons why they are stupid, and why they have to overload and the inconsistencies of what's coded and what's not. So I won't go there because I don't think any of us are arguing for codes. So basically they liked it.

My thing is, in light of what they said, I thought what I would still like is a continuing foreign language requirement and then I sort of suggested that maybe there be six requirements and I wondered why, like proposal art performance one, cultures and languages even one, humanistic inquiry, that already exists, the social science inquiry would be by itself and then maybe you'd have quantitative sciences one and natural sciences the other. Is that bad? So that's my thing for number three.

Now, foreign language, a foreign student raised the issue of a lot of non-English speaking foreign students, they are already competent in at least two languages. So if foreign language, which all of them thought was crucial whether they were in it, did it. So those are my comments.

Shanahan: Good job!

Bennett: I'm glad they liked it. I think your points are well taken about the Duke experience, Frances, and we certainly started with that and there's a committee that considered that and ... Let me just talk about one thing. You said there was some confusion about the one and the two, which would be the six-course sequence, I imagine. The areas of secondary depth would include

Hasso: They were confused about there's three ways. Neither of us figured out one or two ...

Bennett: So they can be a major, minor or certificate. One of those (crosstalk) ... Just to clarify, we are saying a major is part of the curriculum and the area of secondary depth needs to be either a major, minor or certificate or P3, which would be the six course sequence or the three courses plus immersive. So those would be the three options.

Let me just say one thing that came to mind is this point about the curriculum attracting the students we want. I think it's a really important point, it's something we started with and something we thought about. My wife was an undergrad here a long time ago, and when she and her friends get together and talk about Duke, they don't recognize the Duke that I'm experiencing. They don't recognize the Duke students that I teach and they frequently say, "We could have never gotten into Duke." I think that just reflects what happens often in cohorts in universities like ours, particularly in universities that are selected like ours over extended time horizons. So what I think is really critical for the secondary area of depth, I think we have that secondary area of depth in major, minor, certificate. That's safe for today's students. That works. Eighty three percent of our students already do something like that, right? I think many of our students, and certainly many of the students I work with, I can imagine taking advantage of this course sequencing. But I really think of those as building for the future. We will be attracting students with this curriculum that will really make the most benefit of those opportunities as our immersive global experiences expand, change shape, I think as coursework grows to support those immersive experiences, I think those will become very, very exciting.

Again, I think this offers a lot, the P3 and P4 offer individual faculty, centers or institutes areas for entrepreneurial investment in creating things that we think will attract the students that we want. So I think one of the principals to keep in mind for this kind of curriculum is that the students we have will make great use of it, but I'm excited to see what the students of tomorrow and ultimately the data on how students tend to utilize this curriculum will be what we use to continue to evolve it. Curriculum 2000 was revised in 2004, and I expect that we might take a look at this in a couple of years to make some tweaks along the way to accommodate what we're seeing.

Jesse Hunt (ROTC): Good afternoon. I represent three departments here today: Aerospace Studies, Military Studies and Naval Sciences. I applaud you for the effort on this, I've been watching this grow over the last year and I do think this is a well-founded endeavor. I'm not envious though. I just came back from the national commander's conference and we had 145 commanders there trying to appease them. You have a similar job trying to appease us, so I do applaud you there. When we initially started this, there were a couple of requirements and I do have a concern relative to those students who are pursuing a presidential commission. Our programs beyond the classwork which run through all the semesters, semester one through eight, our portions run across the spectrum. I'm just concerned about how these students balance the requirements of the experience, the signature core and the major, the secondary depth, the mentorly experience and then also the presidential commissioning program course contents. There's a lot to balance there. Initially we discussed the secondary depth as the pathway, but I see here the signature core has been added and so I also think that competes. I'm concerned that our students may be overburdened, specifically those that are in the tech fields, potentially there could be some in the social sciences fields as well. I'd just like to ensure that we take a look at this to enable some accommodations for their needs. I have several students right now that are

very taxed completing the curriculum for Duke and our programs and so I'd just like some consideration.

Shanahan: I actually think there are more degrees of freedom for students in this curriculum than in C2K. I also think that as we discussed moving forward that there are opportunities for your students to self author a pathway in military science or some such that would be a way for them to bring those elements together in really thoughtful and creative ways to reflect their unique experience here.

Hunt: I think that works for the junior and senior levels. My concern is the freshmen and sophomores because there really isn't a pathway there and the course curriculum we provide will be below the line. So we have academic courses to take which are actual classes twice a week, but on top of that there are generally nine to 11 program hours outside of those classes that are required as well, so the students' time will be very taxed.

Shanahan: Right. I think we imagined all of your courses would somewhere in the overall structure of the curriculum. I'd also say that we have a lot of majors at Duke where if you don't begin early on, especially if you come in with less math background, for example, you really have to jump on it. We're not assuming that students are waiting in a subliminal state until they get to their junior year and begin those programs. We're actually imagining some of that exploration happening early on that would then lead to fulfillment of a pathway. So it's not as if you have to take all six courses in your junior and senior year. It's just that we're trying to slow down the declaration process such that students don't kind of come in, as we all see in orientation as "I'm a Math major," "I'm a this major," "I'm a that major." You haven't taken a class; at least see what's here and experience and explore. So that's really what I think we're after.

Baker: We can do that offline but our premed students, our athletes, our double majors, our co-majors, we had that in mind. So we weren't cavalier and we thought through your program and we believe it has more flexibility. But we can do it in real time and actually mock it out.

Shanahan: We'd be happy to meet with some of your students as well to talk about the particular challenges that they have.

Owen Astrachan (Computer Science): I don't actually understand the logic in the statement that talks about expanding from 34 to 36 courses gives you more flexibility. It absolutely makes no sense to me. I'm not asking for you to make sense of it to me. I think what that somehow does mistakenly is equate all courses as equal, and I look, for example, in my due diligence at schools like Penn and Princeton, where if you get an AB degree, they require fewer courses to graduate than if you get a BS degree. Somehow they are viewing courses as different. I can tell you that our students view our core courses as requiring far more effort, and they typically say things, and perhaps they shouldn't, but they do. "Well, when I take two of your courses, I'm going to be sure I pair them up with some – dare I say it – courses that require fewer hours on my part." So to equate courses as equal, I think, is a mistake. And I also would urge us – I have so many students that have a hard time getting to 34. Getting them to 36, I don't see how that opens up more avenues. I urge us to consider courses as ... please, let's do that.

The requirement about AP credit – I urge you to leave that to the departments. If a department doesn't want to offer AP credit, let them say we don't give AP credit or placement. But we want that. I'm telling you, we need the students that take AP to place out of our intro course, and if we don't get their score, they won't be able to, and we won't get their scores if they don't report them, which they won't if Duke has a no AP policy. So before you tell me that's not what you imagined – I don't know what you are going to tell me – I don't see any reason not to leave that to the department. If a department doesn't want AP credit, let them decide there's no AP credit. It's very easy.

Shanahan: Certainly we can leave that to departmental decision. I would say we're not talking about using AP classes for placement. We're saying that an AP class should not be part of the 34, 32, 36 – whatever number we land on – courses you take at Duke to graduate. That's what we're talking about.

Astrachan: Then departments can decide that.

Baker: Well, Owen then departments can decide to use the AP credits, right, and use it as credits that reduce the department from 16 to 14. It could even go down to eight because they've got the flexibility. But overall it still remains 34. You could do, see what I'm saying?

Astrachan: No.

Baker: You, as the Department of Computer Science have how many courses toward your major?

Astrachan: It depends. AB, BS. Ten to 14.

Baker: Ten to 14. If you use that AP for your department, we would say fine but then that means there's two other courses somewhere else to make up the 34. So they are taking less in your department.

Astrachan: I'd like to see the data on how many people use AP credits to reduce the number of courses they take from 34 to 32. If you have real data there that it's a cause for concern, then I'd be happy to drop my conversational piece.

Baker: But we do have a concern students graduate with well over 34 routinely, and I don't know exactly ...

Shanahan: Between 35 and 36

Baker: And increasingly graduating early and going part time in the spring.

Rosenberg: Even if there were one student who graduated with 33 or 32 credits, I would object. We're cheating them of an education by not giving them at least 36, and I think one of the

strengths of this proposal is the increase in the total burden of education that students have to bear.

Layton: We're going to wrap up at 4:30 so a few more questions.

Christopher Walter (Physics): We met about this in the department and talked about this yesterday and we had a bunch of questions, so maybe you should come talk to us. I had some stuff I was going to ask about that was just informational. But instead, let me just skip to something related to what we just heard which is the thing that people have the most concern about. One problem I see, and I think my colleagues see, is a lot of students feel like they have to overload and they overload in a way that they shouldn't be doing and partly – we've talked about this before – they feel like they have to be doing everything. So the way it is now with 32 credits, if you came in with no AP, you would have to do that twice. A lot of students have a couple of AP credits so they don't have to overload. So these students are overloading now and you want to add – they are going to have to do a lot more overloading. So we first of all think that's a big problem and you seem to have coupled it with the idea that they can take six classes without getting a grade. So what that means is they can take more classes, and they sort of feel like they are overloading when they ... but it won't be as serious because they are taking these classes when they don't have to worry about a grade. So we feel like the idea that you could take a couple of classes without a grade, that seems like a good idea, but six seems like way too much for us, first of all, and the idea that they have to do it, they're going to take all these classes that they're going to do it so they're going to have to overload, what it means is they won't take those classes as seriously. And we're not interested in having a class where the students take the class for no credit where they are not taking it seriously. We're happy to have some students in the class where they decide ahead of time it's going to be no credit if they want to try something new, but they have to be fully engaged. It can't be a thing where they are just doing a little bit extra at a time. So this was, I would say, a pretty serious concern and people even asked if we could vote on it separately. I think basically everyone in the room had that concern.

Bennett: I think that's a really fair point, let me just note that the one piece about taking it seriously, we considered this at great length for over a year and the consensus we came to was that if we allowed students to make that determination on the front end, then they were much less likely to take the course seriously. If they had the opportunity to convert the grade at the end of the course then you could presumably have a scenario where a student didn't know they were going to convert it until some point midstream in the class, maybe end of the class, maybe after they got the grade. If a student makes a determination at baseline that they are going to take it no credit, I think you are guaranteed that the level of seriousness is not going to be there.

Walter: What I wanted to say also is it's really coupled with this increase in the number of credits.

Shanahan: There are just two other pieces to add about the AP. I think there's real inequality both at Duke and across the country in terms of access to the AP opportunities, and if we're going to give credit when there's such vast inequality, I think as a community that's not unproblematic. So I think that's part of the challenge. I'd also say that we could think about having all students take four a semester or everybody takes five a semester, but what we did was

we split the difference and we say, “if you are taking nine a year, you are not in fact overloading.” And so that’s a specious distinction made in part because we give AP credit. But certainly these are issues at the margin. I think we’ve heard from lots and lots of people, and particularly students, that we need a really robust pass-fail policy to encourage intellectual adventurism. I kind of push for a higher end, other folks think we should give students two opportunities to do this. There’s probably something in between.

Bennett: On the point of inequity, the average Duke student today takes just under 36 courses to graduate. The students who take north of 36 courses are racial ethnic minorities and first-generation college students, which I think reflects the inequality in AP opportunities.

??? I’m just curious, does that average actually incorporate the AP that are automatically ...

Shanahan: No. It’s the courses you take while here.

Germain Choffart (Romance Studies): My question is about Duke University calls itself a global university with an international presence with some many programs going abroad. We have a campus in China and we’ve had a couple of questions about the foreign language requirement. We heard feedback from students saying that the language classes were actually great and were beneficial and were something they actually enjoyed. So, with any corporation, business, society, anything, university, when you decide to offer a new service or a new program, there needs to be a need and a survey and analysis about why we need to bring that in, so has there been such a survey or analysis for taking a service out, taking the foreign language requirement out? Have you had questionnaires to all the students graduating? The current students? The incoming students? Have you had any knowledge of whether or not it was beneficial or detrimental to the students? When we see that Princeton is incorporating a second foreign language requirement on top of what students already know, Yale still has a foreign language requirement. I’m sure some other universities are taking that out or leaving it to the students, but it just seems to me that Duke, if it has to be an international school, should have a very strong component in foreign languages and that’s why I’m very confused when I read this curriculum and it’s taking it out when it seems to be something students really enjoy and if we’re trying to put the entertainment of the students as something first then why was that taken out, the foreign language requirement?

Baker: Thank you so much. We thought extensively about the foreign language requirement and requirements in general. While Duke is committed to globalization, it’s international, we also are a leader in science. We also believe we have a commitment to diversity. We also want, we feel that Duke is committed to ethics. So what we did in this, we’ve shifted the paradigm of what a curriculum is and we value ethics, diversity, quantitative sciences and modeling. We really believe these are fundamental to a great university and we value them. We’re trying to walk away from requirement equals value, and so we don’t have any requirements in the traditional form where you tic off the boxes. The Duke 101 enables students to be introduced to these different epistemologies, the networks of knowledge, and then we want students to get excited and motivated and pursue these different areas on their own. The evidence does suggest that requirements are not a really good way to motivate learning and if they come at it on their own – I know in ICS, I’m the director of International Comparative Studies, we’re not touching

the language requirement. And we feel like we're going to have as many majors, maybe more. I think the Department of Cultural Anthropology, we need writing and language before they even declare their major. That might be pre-requisites or co-requisites before they declare the majors. There's going to be ways in our secondary pathway that says you can take language then study abroad then take a follow-up, a structured curricular integration of an immersive. That's going to value in. So we are valuing these different networks of knowledge, particularly language, but we want to get away from requirement equals value.

Bennett: I'd say that in the two years that we've had meetings, two hours a week for two years, and the hundreds of things we've had on this topic, I think the thing we've talked about almost frequently is this issue. I've said many times the thing I've enjoyed most about being on this committee is the fact that it is the most non-partisan group that I've been a part of. No one walked into the room with any expectations about specific curricular options. So the question that's emerged that's been persuasive to me has been the question of whether, given a commitment to excellence and language education, does the existing general education requirement achieve that? And I think there are reasonable differences of opinion of whether or not that is the case. That said, I think there are many opportunities and many majors, like my own in Global Health, I'm completely supportive of Global Health developing a language requirement to ensure, given our students need to have understanding of other cultures, they need to be proficient in their interactions with other cultures. I think one of the things we will do as a consequence of creating this curriculum, this four degrees of freedom is to give the option to departments to develop their own requirements that may lead to greater innovation in how we deliver high-quality language education. I think that's a major potential opportunity that's offered.

Layton: Thank you. We have a word from our commander in chief.

Valerie Ashby (Dean): Committee members in the room, would you please stand? I am coming in on the tail end of this development but I know there have been a time commitment to this and a seriousness that all of the faculty have engaged in this process. I am so proud of the way we are having these discussions. I love the engagement of all the faculty but really just wanted to stop and take this opportunity to thank all of the committee members and especially the leadership of the committee. When you see your colleagues standing up here, these are the best of Duke. These are busy people and they have made this commitment, so I just wanted to say thank you very much to the committee. I'm excited about where we are going. We're almost there. I feel like we're almost getting to something that people are feeling pretty good about. So I'm excited about the conversations. Thank you for the way you are engaging. I love that interview with the students, that was really important. I just want to take this opportunity, I know you have to move on, but I haven't had a chance to collectively say how grateful I am. Thank you.

Faculty Opportunities at DKU

Layton: Next on the agenda, we have Haiyan Gao. She's the Henry Newsom Professor of Physics and also the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs at DKU and she's going to talk to us about faculty opportunities at DKU.

Haiyan Gao (DKU): I'm very grateful to have this opportunity to talk to you about DKU and the kinds of opportunities that Arts & Sciences faculty can have at DKU. Let me first tell you a little about the city of Kunshan. You know that we are in Duke Kunshan University with the provision that we are developing a new model for global higher education in the 21st century. And many of you perhaps have not been to China. Kunshan is located close to Shanghai and Suzhou. I apologize that this map is not in English, but we do have very frequent trains to Shanghai as well as Suzhou, and you can see that 83 trains travel every day, which is about every 10 minutes that you can get on the train to go to Shanghai and Suzhou.

Kunshan is also a city not only well-known in China for economic development, it actually is a beautiful area and has a rich culture. The city also received many honors, from economic development as well as a best city to live by international organizations.

Some of you have been to Duke Kunshan and others of you I hope will go there soon. We have very beautiful facilities, as you can see. Many of the classrooms are built to engage the students and faculty in an active learning and teaching kind of environment.

So currently we are in phase one and we have all our graduate programs: global health, medical physics, management studies and a very new one which is environmental policy. This program will have its first class in the fall of 2017. We also have new master programs under development.

From the beginning of the university, research has been very important. The first research center at DKU is global health. A new Environment research center which has just been launched with a new director from UC San Diego and this center focuses on many interesting and important areas. We have faculty from the Nicholas School and Pratt in addition to faculty from DKU.

We heard quite a bit in the earlier conversation about the foreign language requirement and at DKU we have a very active language and culture program which integrates teaching learning and culture learning. At the moment, the languages we are focusing on are just English and Chinese and we hope that in the future there will be others.

We also have a plan to develop an applied physical sciences and engineering center, with three major focus areas at the moment. One is new functional materials, the other is optical imagine and spectroscopy and also beta science will also be a very important part.

We have more new research areas on the horizon, and here I want to highlight the Humanities Center. A number of faculty in Arts & Sciences are leading this effort. There is also the Wuhan-Duke research institute and that provides a place for research collaborations not only with faculty at Wuhan but also with other top Chinese universities. So DKU really provides Duke faculty with networking opportunities and a platform for research in China.

As you know, we currently have a non-degree undergraduate global learning semester program. In many ways this is a pilot program as many of you know we hope that next week Academic Council will approve the four-year degree program. But this program has been quite successful and will be even more successful if we can attract more Duke students. So far we have attracted

over 300 top students from China, US, India and other countries. So far, 240 students have graduated from this program, this is a one-semester-only program. And the students who have already graduated from their home universities in this program, about 1/3 are actually in DKU graduate programs and many others are in top graduate programs in the US and UK. So it has been very successful.

So far, we have 60 courses for the Global Learning Semester. We have a very healthy balance of arts and humanities (18), natural sciences (15) and social sciences (27), and many colleagues in A&S have been very actively engaged in teaching at DKU.

We have been working together with Thompson Writing Program very well. I want to point out that we together initiated a global lecturing fellowship program between DKU and the TWP. The global teaching fellow teaches halftime at Duke and halftime at DKU. That seems to be a model perhaps to be considered for arts and humanities postdocs.

In addition to teaching, you can also see that many colleagues have organized conferences, big and small, at DKU. We've actually been quite busy with a lot of very successful events, and more are coming as you can see.

You just heard about the curriculum for Duke. You have also heard about the DKU curriculum. This chart is just very quickly to remind you of what you've heard many times. In thinking about the potential opportunities, DKU can be a testing ground and can also be a place where colleagues here can be involved in pedagogical innovations and one example is the integrated science curriculum, which can be a pilot for Duke Immerse.

So let me just summarize the kinds of opportunities I see for faculty at DKU: teaching in GLS or a future degree program; getting involved in pedagogical innovations; developing new masters programs or research areas; engaging in research at DKU; exploring research and collaboration opportunities at DKU; and participating in the DKU faculty search processes at Duke.