

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, February 9, 2017

Call to Order

Dean Valerie Ashby: Welcome everybody. I know I'm not Anita and it's odd for you to be seeing me here. Let me say a few words. For those of you I haven't met, I'm Valerie Ashby, Dean of Trinity. I'm standing here in Anita's stead because of a personal emergency. I would rather her be standing here but here, but here I am. Also, in all of that, she did not do what we would normally do, which is call the Executive Committee and give this duty to them. She actually just handed the slides to me and so here I am with the slides. I am here, just so you know, to push the buttons and keep the meeting moving. I'm going to facilitate the actual agenda. When it comes to the actual curriculum discussion, Suzanne is going to lead that. I'm going to turn that over to her. I don't want to lead the curriculum discussion for all the reasons you're shaking your head and you don't want me to do that. So just so everybody's clear, this is why I am here. Apologies for the last-minute changes, but we will go on anyway.

So the first item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes. I am confident you have read them, so at this point we're going to approve the minutes. [There was a motion and a second to approve the minutes. The minutes were then approved.]

Before we go on, I'm supposed to ask, "are there other agenda items for today?"

Frances Hasso (Gender, Sexuality & Feminist Studies): I would like to add the resolution to support and defend all members of the Duke community to the end of the agenda. It should have been widely distributed.

[This was seconded and approved.]

Ashby: So we will add the resolution to the end of the meeting. We do have copies. You should have received the resolution from Anita but we also have hard copies here when we get to that point.

Now I'll turn it over to Suzanne Shanahan.

Curriculum Proposal Discussion

Suzanne Shanahan (IDC Chair): Before we jump in, I think Arlie was going to say a few words.

Arlie Petters (Dean of Academic Affairs): It's always a pleasure to see what mobilizes the faculty. I came to Duke in 1998 and I was (inaudible) Curriculum 2000. We know that things like this do not happen historically so we are living in a special time. I thought I'd just share a few comments at least from the point of view of relieving any anxiety you may have about the new kid on the block. So I thought first of all, what do I think about this proposed curriculum? Of course I will not answer that in any detail, but I am excited about it, at least from a decanal perspective and I think it's important that you hear my view with that general point of view. I see this as a catalyst that can generate synergies among its existing intellectual assets. I feel that it's a very powerful venue for something that we have to worry about as deans with respect to maximizing excellence across the diverse spectrum of talent among our undergraduates. So I really like the pathways dimension of this curriculum. Now here comes the other part: have we been thinking about the implementation aspects? Of course, from the very beginning and we have – meaning the academic deans – shared some of these insights with IDC, we've been doing this all along. If this curriculum is passed, naturally we're going to have a very carefully selected team implementation and I think you can immediately sense that there will be a sub-team that would focus exclusively on the frameworks aspect. So I want you to know this is something we have been monitoring. We're deeply involved with this entire process. It may be useful to add that Bob Thompson – for those of you who may not know Bob, he was in my shoes and he implemented Curriculum 2000 – I have been having extensive conversations with him to learn some of the lessons from that experience. I will tell you that if it is passed, there will be a lot of support in that dimension. I should tell you overall that curriculums, as we all know, they're not static. They are living curriculums and what one does is that you go through the process, you continuously monitor it as it experiences real-world forces, and I imagine two years out there will be tweaking where appropriate, and after it completes a full cycle, there will be another tweak. When Bob did 2000, there was a tweaking, or say there were some modifications that happened after a full cycle. But in this case, I imagine we would continuously monitor this as we go through the process. I think the last point I'd like to make – and to me this is more important than any of the technical details you'll debate – I believe it's extremely important that our offices make sure that the intellectual integrity of the intended document is preserved by the implementation mechanisms. So I want you to rest assured that we will make sure that no distortions will happen by whatever mechanisms that end up being developed. So I thought I should at least share this general perspective with you and I really look forward to hearing the discussion. Thank you.

Shanahan: I think pretty directly we're going to open it up to conversation. I did want to make a couple comments, then Lee Baker was going to say a few words. Hopefully everybody by now has read the document in assiduous detail. For the many, many line editors who sent us comments over the past few days, thank you very much, I appreciate it. I would also say that folks have come forward with a variety of questions, some about the implementation timeline, some about assessment, some about the implications for advising. Folks requested enrollment data. We're producing an FAQ that will be hopefully be up on the Sakai site for Council members later this evening. We put it in this format because there is enrollment data and we wanted that to be faculty-only access. But it does address a variety of questions and concerns. I

have a few slides here should people have specific questions they would like to see. I know folks would like some examples of things like the frameworks, etc., and I'd be happy to walk that through. But please do know that the FAQ will be up soon with the enrollment data.

I think I also want to thank what has proven to become the hardest working committee in Duke's history. They have been amazing to work with. I think they came to the table with a thinking about the best interests of our students and of our faculty with the notion of what it means to live up to our shared scholarly ethos. What does that mean now and what does that mean going forward? I could not be more happy or privileged to work with such an extraordinary group, so I would like to thank them. I would also like to thank everybody who has been at these many, many, many meetings over the past 3+ years providing feedback. In many ways, this is a challenge that our faculty live on very different planets, it seems. The students they encounter, the experiences they have are really heterogeneous and so what this committee has tried to do is really think about the common ground across our communities and really build something that (inaudible) in really important ways and we hope we've come close to that or as close as one can get. But it is, as you know, an optimization exercise and so that's something also to keep in mind. So, super briefly before we open it up to comments, frustrations, questions, concerns ...
Lee Baker.

Lee Baker (Cultural Anthropology): Dick Brodhead actually sent us a copy of Benjamin Franklin's concluding remarks at the Constitutional Convention and it really rained true in terms of when you have people with really diverse interests and really different ways of seeing the world trying to come together to have a coherent document, it's not pretty. People will argue and see the world really differently, believing that their position is the correct position. Benjamin Franklin obviously was one of those strident folks and he sort of said well later on it just won't be perfect and that was his sort of takeaway and that was as good as it was going to get. I also wanted to remind this body, the Arts & Sciences Council, in some respects this curriculum is an evolution of the work we've been doing for a decade now, perhaps beginning with our innovative neuroscience major outside of the Department of Psychology and Neuroscience, interdisciplinary, our global health major, these interesting certificates, lots of different certificates, our commitment to undergraduate research, in some respects our commitment to these coherent pathways in some respects we are integrating those innovative approaches to education, where research, taking classes, global education are coming together so our students can make meaning out of their education.

I want to also remind people that this is not a requirement distribution model. It's a different type of curricula. We have a distribution model: it's Curriculum 2000. This is just a different approach and I think it's difficult to try to achieve the goals of a distribution model in the goals of a making meaning model and I just hope as we have this discussion that we keep that in mind, that we wanted to really motivate our students to integrate classes, integrate their experiences, integrate their research into an educational experience that is really amazing. Thank you very much.

Shanahan: Great. I think we are going to open it up but Mary made me promise that you will speak into the mic and say your name before you begin.

Reeve Huston (History): I have a bunch of questions but probably the most important one is about the advising. It wasn't super explicit in the report but I did get an indication that a required part of the advising process is that students are supposed to actively write and use programs to talk about what their intentions and goals are. I'd love a confirmation that that's true and some comments about how that's going to work.

Shanahan: So I'm going to say a couple of words then I'm going to turn it over to Matt, whose been working with the interface that this will happen on. I think there have been lots of different kinds of conversations about advising. I think we do expect students to iterate them like they do in their long-range plan but on a yearly basis to reflect on what really animated them, on the ideas and opportunities that excited them and how they want to bring that forward. This will be done through the PebblePad interface and Matt can describe it. It's been piloted this year, a number of people have used it, but I think it will be an important dimension of that and if he could speak to the technical issues. If there are follow-on questions after that about advising more generally, because I know this is a hot-button issue, I think we've never had a conversation about the curriculum where advising wasn't on the table, so certainly maybe we can riff on that theme for a little bit. Matt, if you could just say a few words.

Matt Serra (Assessment): Sure, I'm happy to. PebblePad is a product of the UK which has recently come to the US. It's a digital workspace that allows any student, person, faculty, mentor, mentee, whatever to have their own private digital space where they can reflect, do their work, that sort of thing and then share that with any individual if they want and also receive feedback directly from a designated mentor or a mentor they choose as well as allowing them to produce outward-facing and inward-facing folios of their work if necessary or asked to. They could use those for course work or for programs asking them to do so ... Bass Connections, those sorts of things. They could also use it on the job market when they want to go out and produce something that's more than a flat transcript to allow a prospective employee to see what they've accomplished at Duke over their past four years. We've got that integrated now into some of the writing program, we've got it into some of the language program. All of our Certificate 2.0 programs that have a requirement for an outward-facing folio, we're working with them. We've got it purchased, it's enterprised, anyone can use it. I've been looking at portfolios now for almost 20 years of my life, and when I saw this, it was "where have you been all my life?" I think it's a tool that will serve us well.

Mine Çetinkaya-Rundel, Statistical Science: Our faculty had a concern about the credit/no credit option and specifically thinking about potentially its effects on an already existent grade inflation problem or perhaps more disturbingly the effect on students of different backgrounds. We're worried that students who might have a harder time adding additional courses, perhaps up to a whole semester because they can do up to four of these courses, these are going to be the students who have other non-curricular obligations, perhaps a different financial background that does not allow them to take these additional courses, they might be affected differently by this change than students who could easily add a fifth course or perhaps up to a semester. I was wondering if the committee did think about that, and if so, what your thoughts were about that because we were very concerned about that.

Shanahan: Certainly. So a couple of things about the credit/no credit proposal. First, this is a recommendation of the committee. I think it's really important that whatever emerges, emerges out of the implementation (inaudible). The committee actually spent a considerable amount of time considering different pass/fail models. The goal is really to encourage intellectual adventurism. There are many models across the country trying to do this. There are a number of innovations. In the FAQ, we review a couple of different examples. There are places that you can take as many pass/fail as you want, there are first semester pass/fail models, there are models like this credit/no credit, there are models like we currently have at Duke. What we realize from our current students at Duke, whatever the model that is in place now, it's not actually encouraging this kind of intellectualism. Students really don't use it that often. So I think what we're trying to do is what Wellesley and a number of other places are doing: we are trying something.

Yes, we did think extensively about the consequences of grade inflation and I think Lee can address this from personal sense, I think most people on the committee felt the same way. We actually thought this was going to do the opposite. This is also just four courses over a student's career and in fact if they don't use one in the first year, it's only three. So this is not going to have an enormous immediate effect on our students. I do think part of the goal is to encourage students to stick with something, to realize, "Maybe I am good at this," but with a sense of safety factor at the end. So they can experience failure without it having catastrophic consequences.

Baker: We thought a lot about the different trade-offs and I think you identified what could potentially be a trade-off, but hopefully not. However, we are also conflating this sort of credit/no credit with our current W model. So students withdraw often anyway somehow in continuation and so hopefully students will say, "At least I can try to persist. Maybe I can get a credit instead of just taking the W." Or some might want to just take the W and say it's – I think students will use this strategically. But I believe this is not going to create more grade inflation. Many of us feel like, "Gosh, they earned a D, maybe we should give them a C." But this will say "Yeah, you earned a D, you're getting a D. Use your credit/ no credit for this one." And it's sort of, not that we're full of guilt sometimes but you would feel better about that if a student is going to get full credit for it or not have it on their transcript and their using one of their credit/no credit for your class. I know I would more comfortably give a really poor grade in those situations because it's not going to have irreparable harm and the like. So I'm hoping on average that it's going to be the reverse of grade inflation.

Gary Bennett (Psychology and Neuroscience): And also, let's be clear. On the individual faculty level, individual faculty won't have any way of knowing necessarily whether students are using their credit/no credit option, so we'll be teaching presumably and grading appropriately without incentives to inflate those grades. If the student chooses to use the credit/no credit option, it's up to them.

Karen Shapiro (AAAS): One of my colleagues raised a question about the credit/no credit and the concern was: How will students decide to take a credit/no credit after the grade is given? How would their comments or evaluations about the course be scrapped? Their concerns would be lower that students suddenly decide they didn't like you, they didn't like the course, they're

going to take it credit/no credit but also this colleague is actually concerned that this will have implications on evaluations (inaudible).

Shanahan: Karen, I've actually thought about every angle. No idea. I wonder, however, if this will lead to evaluation inflation. If everyone knows they can convert the grade, they might think "I don't need to ding this particular faculty because I didn't do well because it will all be okay in the end." That's just one hypothesis. No idea.

Serra: Our current evaluation system is confidential and is not anonymous and so any student who decides to withdraw or take the pass/no pass could easily be removed from the course evaluation total.

Owen Astrachan (Computer Science): It seems to be that the credit/no credit idea and a few other ideas are somewhat orthogonal to this lovely frameworks, foundation, focused inquiry, mentored experiences. As one of the things that Mine pointed out which wasn't really addressed is if a student is taking four courses and drops to three because they did a credit/no credit, what I heard her say is at some point they have to make it up which means they are going to have to overload and the inequities in how you do that are – that's the key aspect for my perspective of what Mine was saying, not the grade inflation but rather that aspect of it because there will be perhaps no AP as well, you won't be able to make that up as easily. It seems to me that the credit/no credit and AP are orthogonal to this wonderful document otherwise and couldn't some of those and perhaps other issues be broken out so rather than a one – if this is the reason, for example, that Statistics would not want to vote for this otherwise wonderful document, but an up or down vote on that is separate from the curriculum seems like a wonderful opportunity to engage in the intellectual aspects of what we're doing here rather than what I've heard as "Oh, don't worry, we'll leave that to the implementation" but you know there's a lot to be said for the implementation and perhaps we could consider voting on some aspects of it separately than from what I'm viewing as the intellectual foundation which is this diagram that's up there.

Shanahan: Okay, so certainly the framing in the latest document attempted to move this over to a different category and we could certainly take that as an issue because I do understand these are a set of mechanical, technical issues that need to play out in real time, implications for different populations, etc.

Baker: But I just want to push back a little bit, Owen. Isn't that what we have now with the W? You have to make it up.

Astrachan: We have AP.

Baker: But we're going down to 32.

Astrachan: That's my whole point. You have to make it up no matter what. Even if you go to 32, you're going to have to make up that lost class and you have no AP in the bank.

Baker: But still it's a wash.

John Willis (Biology): The person who was just talking about AP, I think you're confused. Not all departments take AP credit; for example, Biology does not. So I think maybe you're talking about specific departmental things. Secondly, a lot of this discussion is focused on using the credit/no credit to get rid of a class where you are failing or where you're getting a C- or below. I think the goal, though, is to encourage students to take classes outside of their comfort zone where they might get a B or a C and they otherwise might not take that because they would be concerned about their transcript. I think that that is a hugely valuable part of this credit/no credit thing. I know, just as a personal anecdote, I'm a biologist, obviously I took a lot of science in undergrad but because I was able to take a lot of pass/fail classes at Brown, I took a ton of literature and art history classes that I never would have taken had I not had that option. I teach several hundred students a year in Biology and they all say they have no flexibility, they have no incentive to take classes outside of their own comfort zone, and so they would all unanimously like this idea of pass/fail or credit/no credit.

Ron Grunwald (Biology): This is really a response for one of the academic deans, but to Lee's point of clarification, the current rules limit the number of course withdrawals to an underload to one in a student's academic career so what I'm hearing is this essentially would be expanding that to four. The reason for the limitation now is exactly the point that was made, which is to hedge an adverse impact on progress toward graduation in eight semesters, so that's the concern.

Shanahan: So you can only withdraw to an underload once?

Grunwald: Yes, but if I can counter that, students who are doing poorly in a class have the option to fail currently or take a D, which potentially doesn't earn them credit towards graduation if they had multiple D's. So in a sense, a student who is doing poorly or who makes poor choices and does poorly runs the same risk if they're a student who can't afford to make up that credit in other sorts of ways, for socioeconomic reasons or whatever, they are in the same boat that they would be now, the only difference being it would be tacked on the transcript.

Josh Sosin (Classical Studies): I don't know how many minutes we've just spent discussing what I suspect are going to be edge cases, and they're not unimportant, but we don't have a lot of opportunities to come all together to talk about the substance of the document, so I want to suggest that we try to pivot to things that are hard-wired into the document that we know are going to touch all of our students. One of the reasons I've been a little uneasy with the conversation around counting credits is because I had the misfortune of going through a curriculum that required that I take only one course in math. This has been a disability that I've lived with for a very long time. On the other hand, I had years of very patient professors who put up with my gross inability to write and this is a skill I still wrestle with, still work hard at. I suspect I'm not the only person in the room for whom learning writing was a many years process that required multiple engagements, and I underline the word 'requirements' because I would have very happily not taken courses that challenged me to do the things that I was weakest at. And I'd add the same for languages, too. The thing about a foundation – I like the framing of this as foundations – is that it has to hold up a super structure and I'd like to suggest that one required writing course doesn't do that well, and that one required – I can't tell whether it's languages or culture or what – but one of them doesn't do that well, and that one required modeling and quantification doesn't do that well either. I understand that such courses will

continue to exist and students will have the option to take them as they wish and as their majors require, but this is a different thing and I think we have an opportunity to talk about ways we help the majority of our students rather than fret about the ways a minority of them are going to try to avoid taking credits.

Baker: I just want to point out, Josh, that when we were talking about requirements and we went back and forth, you were very specific about it should be an invitation to go further and we really listened to you and that's why we put the ones piece into the foundation. We almost called it the "Josh class." This isn't a distribution model where you get two and two and two and two, it's just not that approach. But you said it should be an invitation, and so in some respects we assume, we expect and hope students will excited, see the value proposition of great writing and language teachers and continue. But we didn't want to put it as a distribution requirement. The logic and philosophy was "yeah, we should invite them and they'll have opportunity to explore this and then go on because of the great instruction of our educators."

Leo Ching (AMES): Last night I forwarded a response that was co-signed and endorsed by Literature, Germanic Studies and AMES, I don't know if that reached anywhere. But I just want to follow up on Josh's comment because it seems to me that language – I understand Lee saying this is a kind of invitation, right? But how to invite are requirements. Also I think for language, it's a little bit different than writing. Writing, I can imagine throughout your career at Duke in different classes, you can continue to hone your skill and so on and so forth. Language it's very hard to do that. You are required a structure, not simply a super structure but a structure because it requires repetition. It requires continual study and so on and so forth. So it seems to me that one course is not going to do much, whether it's invitation or not. Because I think most students, especially thinking about how our courses are sequenced, you have the fall and the spring, you create all kinds of community among students after a whole year instead of just one semester. So we feel like there are many, many advantages beyond a cursory invitation to know one course requirement, at least for the language.

Shanahan: Just a quick response. Just to pick up on Lee's point, I think the language you used, Josh, was, "I want my son to try the cauliflower" and then hope, expect and encourage him to pursue the cauliflower (inaudible). So I don't think we're imaging students are necessarily going to be one and done.

Sosin: I'm sorry, that misrepresents what I said. What I said in this meeting, this was a delegation of the Trinity College Language Committee --

Shahanan: No it was Board of Trustees.

Sosin: Okay. In that case, I said the same thing twice. What I said is there are certain things that work well by invitation, there are certain things that don't, and there are certain things that whether they work or not, I don't care. When we go on a bike ride, my son wears a helmet. I don't invite him to do it, he does. There's not a choice about this and that's because certain times, people act like people and they don't want to do the thing that is difficult or unpleasant or inconvenient at the time. But that doesn't mean that it's bad for them. That was my point. That we have an opportunity here, given what we know and given our long experience, to be able to

say, “I understand you can’t appreciate the long view here, but what you are getting in this beginning semester is going to buy you all kinds of beauty three semesters down the road that you just can’t see now.” Cauliflower is beautiful. My son still hates it. I still invite him rather than make him taste it occasionally because one day he may like it again.

Shanahan: (inaudible) to what extent we should be making our students do certain types of things and what are those particular things. I think that’s not clear across the faculty what those things are, nor is the principle. So I think that’s one of the open questions. I know there’s a branch out there on the writing point that was raised ...

Clare Woods (Thompson Writing Program): We love the way you set up the frameworks and foundations, it’s a strong transition. But what we really would love to see is a bit more explicit structure and support and it seems (inaudible) Josh is making, but just how do we rather than put the burden on the people who are teaching these foundational courses and I’m just going to address writing, although I am from Classical Studies so I have a lot of languages and I could speak about that, but I won’t. But speaking just for writing, how can we help students take more courses at upper levels? We want to put out a raft of courses to help students in majors and across the disciplines. That’s something we really want to develop and I look for you all participating very much with us. But what’s the structure in the current blue print that allows students to see where those would fit and we have some ideas that would fit with the mentored creative or scholarly experience, we have some language we could insert there. We’re very inspired by the language for the immersive experiences of students, but building courses around that for multiple languages, for languages other than English, and that was very inspiring to us because we could see something similar to help students make the best of the big research and writing project or speaking project that they have for element four. So we just wanted to put that out there, express our concern that there isn’t really a structure that will help students know that they can take those more advanced writing courses.

Shahanan: Clare had shared something with Lee and I last night. Would you just share a little bit with that second piece about how you’re imagining that.

Woods: So I can read it, it’s very short. We crafted some lovely language and we would insert this into element four which is the mentored creative or scholarly experience. We say that if the mentored creative or scholarly experience involves a substantive written or spoken product, students must combine this experience with either 1) taking at least one and ideally two writing speaking WS – we’re going to change that and update the W designation because it’s time to do that but you must take at least one and ideally two WS-coded courses above the 100 level that directly relate to the kinds of writing/speaking they will be doing in the MCSE (mentored creative or scholarly experience) or 2) they must complete an approved WS sequence in the MCSE and ideally students will take that additional above-the-100-level WS course or begin that WS sequence prior to the mentored creative or scholarly experience. That’s what we’re suggesting to build a bit of structure in.

Mohamed Noor (Biology): I want to jump back to one of the earlier points with regard to languages and things like that. I love cauliflower but I don’t think the example of cauliflower is necessarily appropriate in this case. I think our language classes are extremely appealing. I’m a

biologist and I meet with hundreds of students all the time and a huge fraction of them are getting minors in Spanish. We're not requiring minors in Spanish, they just took the first class and then decided to dig deeper. Most of them actually are only required to take one because most of the ones I've seen have four years of Spanish in high school, so they're coming in, taking one more class, "Wow, this is great! I want to take a lot more of it." Or the other thing – this is the cheese on the broccoli here – the second option you have in regard to the second focused inquiry that option there with regard to study abroad. Large numbers of our students want to do study abroad and we specifically incentivize them to take language in there by if you take a study abroad and a couple of classes, including at least one in the language, then that will satisfy that requirement for you. So that's the cheese on the broccoli to make it a little more tasty. Again, we're trying to invite students to do it rather than putting a stick over them and saying you have to do it. We're trying to make it appealing and draw them into it. And honestly, they've already been drawn in. I don't think it's unappealing from the very beginning. So that's just my personal perspective.

Shai Ginsburg (AMES): I want to make three points. First, I have a comment about the distinction you make between the distribution model and the making meaning model. I don't think the distribution model is about making meaning. That's a false supposition. The distribution model was created to provide meaning and opportunity out of the curriculum. Second, regarding language, I actually would like to echo Clare to say that right now there's not enough structure in the proposal to encourage students to take upper level language classes. In fact the fact may be that the language that suggests that students do study abroad in countries where the spoken language is not English I think would actually provide or create a further hindrance for students who would like to take that because students would have to take difficult languages before they study abroad so that might hurt the study abroad program and would actually funnel students to what actually are our most popular study abroad programs, which are in England and in Australia. So (inaudible) department which teach some of the most difficult languages for speakers, we feel that would actually undercut our program. The third question actually takes us to a different issue. We like the model of mentorship and making the core Duke program universal rather than exclusive so we think that's a great model. But we also think that requires much more work from the faculty ... the mentorship, the advising and what have you. I was wondering -- and this is a question to the administration rather than the committee – whether they have thought about the investment, the money needed for the implementation of the proposal, for instance, in hiring more faculty to carry out this proposal.

Shanahan: Before they address the resource issue, which I know they are very eager to do, let me kind of clarify a bit on this mentored creative scholarly experience. What we are actually doing in this requirement is formalizing what is happening in ad hoc ways everywhere and all the time. There are a number of majors that have research capstones as a requirement for the major. We have 25-35 percent of our students participating in distinction projects. Hundreds of students a semester participate in Bass. We are also imagining this then as a way to make visible this current faculty labor. The other piece of it is to really say this kind of scholarship is happening inside and outside of the classroom at Duke through programs like DukeEngage; through programs like Data+, Story+; kinds of works in labs; collaborations that faculty have with their students; everywhere all the time this is happening. This is not in any way going to require significant additive labor on the part of faculty. What it is, is formalizing our labor as it is

currently being used and understanding that as a real value added to our curriculum. So I think that's a piece of it. Do we want to innovate and create new opportunities for faculty to do this? Absolutely.

Arlie, do you want to address any thoughts? I think it's clear there will be resources toward that end.

Petters: For sure we are definitely looking at incentives for faculty but I think the core is what Suzanne said. We have existing assets and activities that will really just get the stir up significantly more. I would love to double the undergraduate research budget I have in my office. So I see overall the research activities that our faculty are doing are going to have a much deeper intersection, a wider intersection across the student body. So that I think I feel very excited about and I'm not as concerned.

Randy Matory (Cultural Anthropology): I'd like to say that I really like the curriculum that you've put together and it's the sort of curriculum I would have liked to follow as an undergraduate. I think I'm like a lot of us, we were inspired by certain ideas enough to spend our lives studying them and curious enough about issues to try difficult things. On the other hand, I hope we'll be humble enough to recognize that much of the student culture is very, very different, and that no matter how fine a curriculum we design, many students will be instrumentalizing, and worry a lot more about their careers at the end of the day and credentializing and strategizing to spend most of their time on campus not concerned about class work. I don't know if this is an answerable question but I wonder how we can inspire students to identify with the creative potentials that are in a curriculum designed like this so that they're not making up stuff to fulfill the requirements but actually do design thoughtful curricula to examine what they are curious about and would like to be passionate about.

Denise Comer (TWP): That's an important question and one piece of that will be the frameworks for the first year as it's being imagined that students coming into Duke over the entire course of their first year will have the chance through the frameworks of taking a social science course, a humanities course and a natural science course all focused on a particular theme and with synthesizing elements, common elements. They'll have the time to learn PebblePad and think about exploring what they're curious about and maybe discovering that they are interested in justice through a lens that they maybe hadn't known existed before, right? By not only the three courses they are taking, but they are in a community of peers and they're going to be closely working with those peers to learn what their peers are doing in those other courses. So I think the frameworks serves an important function in starting off students moving in that direction.

Bennett: I concur and maybe take it up a level. Randy, your point is well taken. We are really fortunate to have a great crop of students here and I think one of the unifying themes that occurred over the years is that many of us are concerned about the instrumentality, the instrumental approach to which our students approach all of their education pursuits. And that probably shouldn't be a surprise to us because they are selected precisely because of their ability to instrumentalize all of their lives, and that's how they get here. Our current curriculum is one that allows students to navigate it quite successfully if they utilize that approach. The only way

to make a change in such an intractably, normative behavior like instrumentality is to change the system pretty dramatically and I think this system is one that would be very difficult for students to navigate successfully if they (inaudible). The other implication is of course that we will need to recruit a different type of Duke student. Different types of students will be attracted to a Duke where this is part of the educational experience, and we will need to recruit different types of students and I think that's okay. I think many of us are interesting in trying to identify ways of reaching out to the type of student who might want to or have the capacity to try and author and architect their own types of pathways. That's going to be a multi-year process, but it starts with a system change.

José Maria Rodríguez García (Romance Studies): I'm speaking on behalf of my Department, which met specifically to discuss the so-called "Blue Print" two days ago. While we're ready to commend the IDC Committee for its hard work over an extended period time, we believe, like other departments with which we've been in contact and whose faculty have also met as a group, that we haven't been sufficiently "heard" throughout this process. The perspective of our two Romance Studies colleagues serving on the IDC Committee doesn't represent the majority opinion on the "Blue Print" that has emerged within the Department.

As a multi-faceted teaching unit which offers instruction in four languages, we're not convinced by the lack of detail in the advising, mentoring, and implementation aspects of the proposal, and we worry about the administrative bloat that a requirement-light curriculum may create, not least because those details haven't been fleshed out.

I personally take issue with the Committee's framing of the proposal within a metaphorical and distracting jargon that means little when the document itself seems lacking in detail: how can a "social contract" not be "transactional" and be "transformational" instead? Are curricula made primarily of "requirements" or of "invitations" (formerly and fleetingly known as "expectations"? In the domain and praxis of education, some of these metaphors carry very limited descriptive value; moreover, they're terms uncondusive to responsible planning. In "Blue Print" my Department specifically regrets the downgrading of the term "requirement." Is a "requirement" best described as a course which "a student cannot avoid" taking ("Blue Print" dixit) but would like to skip? Does this assumption reflect an empirically demonstrated majority sentiment among Duke's undergraduate population? I and many others in Romance Studies still think that a required course in any discipline is a key socializing tool which allows students to claim membership in an empowering learning community; when reasonably conceived and organized, a required course is an intellectual incentive to spark one's curiosity and perhaps widen one's narrow scope of pre-existing interests while providing a stepping stone to more advanced and more specialized future study.

Reducing the current requirement in foreign languages and cultures from three courses (or one taken at the 300 level) to just one course at any level conflicts with the concept and aims of a well-rounded liberal arts education, one of whose cornerstones in the past two decades has certainly been the humanistic belief in the inherent benefits of furthering the students' engagement with "multiple languages and cultures." By envisioning the fulfillment of a token foreign language requirement through the completion of just one course taken in the student's first two years of instruction, "Blue Print" may encourage pedagogically precarious

overspecialization despite the “contractual” proviso of the “two focused inquiries.” Finally, from a socio-economic standpoint, we ask ourselves if Duke is now on the fast track to become a super-elite university ready to provide instruction only to the 1% of students who have already “completed” at least one year of college in the few ultra-competitive (and often ultra-rich) U.S. secondary schools and their counterparts abroad. We love our current undergraduate cohort because, immensely talented and engaged as these diverse students are, we don’t yet find in most of them the urge to “avoid” requirements and plunge themselves precipitously into a pre-professional track. “Blue Print” advocates the creation of a requirement-light teaching and learning environment wherein the faculty is implicitly assigned the primary task of keeping pre-professional students in compliance with the “expectation” of pursuing (or the “invitation” to pursue) a minimally cohesive course of study. This is a pedagogical scenario whose implementation and uncertain consequences remain largely unexplored in the “Blue Print” proposal and in the faculty-administration exchanges we’ve conducted in Council so far.

We feel strongly that at least two semesters or one year’s worth of study in a foreign language and literature should be required of all Duke undergraduates. We feel just as strongly about the quantification study requirement (math/ statistics/ computer science) and the writing requirement.

The Department of Romance Studies encourages other units to consider introducing with us a joint friendly amendment to have the “Foundational Core” requirements in “Blue Print” expanded or even preserved in their current size and mode of articulation.

Gennifer Weisenfeld (Dean of Humanities): I just wanted to follow up because I think you made some very good points and I think they are exactly points that support a new model, which is, from the arts and humanities perspective, the current curriculum is not serving us well at all. The attrition in majors and in course enrollments across the languages has been an enormous problem and I think if we don’t address it in a much more systematic and structural way, we’re really not going to be able to ... it’s just kind of going at it from the edges. So to me, this is extremely exciting because not only are we going to be attracting a new kind of student, a student that will have opportunities to take risks, and I think once they get into arts and humanities courses and language courses and culture courses, they’re going to be so jazzed about them that they’re really going to want to continue, which has been the experience across the board. But if they don’t get there, if it’s not built into this kind of framework the first year and second year, they are going to find us either too late or not at all. And the numbers really bear out that no action is not neutral, because we’re actually in a decline mode and it’s had very negative effects. So I just want to make sure that people understand that nothing is not neutral, that we really need to think very systematically about this.

Henry Pickford (German): We second some of the suggestions about foreign language being two semesters and the foundations being doubled as well. But our faculty had another point as well about requirements versus anticipations or expectations or invitations, which is that when you have strict requirements, you are as it were giving protection to the student not to follow an instrumentalist or pre-professional pathway. You are licensing them to say to their parents, “Mom and Dad, I have to take this course in astronomy instead of another course in economics because it is required for graduation.” So we wonder whether requirements shouldn’t be retained

in that regard in order to encourage the exploration because the student might take the credit/no credit in order to better their GPA in their major so the requirements might be able to work against that kind of thing. We very much applaud the idea that we'll be competing with Brown undergraduates; that would be wonderful.

Linda Franzoni (Pratt): I have questions about the frameworks component which is the first year and how tied that is to the residences because our students will be living in the residences and they won't be following the blue print. And I was wondering, you mentioned students might discover, might see justice through another lens, but will they be allowed to choose justice if they are living in Southgate versus Alspaugh.

Shanahan: Absolutely. So I know Frances, we had a conversation about this earlier as well. You had another set of concerns. We really decoupled it from the housing but what we are hoping is that there are conversations that happen within the dorms, scheduled in those formats, but we're not expecting people to live in the justice house over the course of the year. So certainly we are imaging these as intellectual communities that are inside and outside the classroom but it will not be tightly coupled to residence halls as our initial proposal last January indicated.

Bennett: I really appreciate that sort of attention to the potential for students in lower socioeconomic standing to have to put ... I think we've discussed that. I think an alternative hypothesis is that students who are expressly most qualified to deal with uncertainty and complexity and architect their own experience independent of being lead through an instrumental world view are at a lower socioeconomic status. I don't say that to minimize the challenge it might take to support them but I actually think they might be particularly well suited to a model like this.

I appreciate the comments with respect to the requirement issue, but I just want to return to one of the things Suzanne mentioned and that's that there is a massive amount of disagreement about the principle of requirements and also the specific types of courses or dimensions that we may require. I just want to offer that in my field of psychology, it is a very well understood and extraordinarily empirically demonstrated notion that requirements lead to impaired autonomous motivation, impairments in deep engagement, impairments in (inaudible). This goes so far as to say in clinical treatment, we don't require anyone to do anything expressly because we realize those types of requirements lead to far more deleterious outcomes and that's been demonstrated over the last years of psychological research. So I recognize that we all have different perspectives here, given the nature of the requirements issue. I had not thought of the sort of parental value of requirements and I value that. But nevertheless, I think that this is an area where there's good and healthy debate and science and experience on different sides and we landed in a place that I think is consistent with the model and maybe one that (inaudible).

Marjorie McElroy (Economics): We have 800 or 900 majors and the average grade in our major is lower than the average grade of our students in their other courses. I'm very much worried about the resources for the mentored creative/scholarly experience given the number of students we have and given this requirement. I've had the privilege of having many such experiences but with very few students. I teach economics of the family. Nobody knows what it

is. They take it. So we do marriage, divorce, etc., but people take the course because of when it's scheduled, to fulfill a requirement, as kind of a joke. So I typically have a small class and I trick them, usually halfway through the semester, they write a paper and at the end of the course, I tell them they can turn this into a paper for honors. Last year, I had the unique experience of having seven co-authors and I hope we can finish this paper. But I want to say that there's no way we can come close to doing that for 8 or 900 majors. What's the maximum number of people that can be involved in one of these outputs for creative experience? My faculty was very uncomfortable with giving honors to seven co-authors. There were faculty who sort of did it very reluctantly because they're saying, "well, who contributed what?" Seven is a lot.

Shanahan: I think it's really important that this is structured in a way such students need not complete this requirement just in the major. I think all of us would agree that the Economics Department has a mountain of students and imagining your faculty providing mentored and individualized mentored experiences for all of them would not be in any way, shape or form reasonable. We're also not imagining this being distinction work.

McElroy: But it's the kind of work they do for distinction.

Shahanan: Not necessarily. I think we are really opening the box to be something much more broad. For example, I have a team of seven students who are participating in Duke Immerse. They will write a series of papers. They are doing primary research in Jordan and the Middle East with refugees. I consider that a mentored scholarly experience. I have two research teams currently operative. That's 26 students as a total. They are all writing conference papers that they will present internationally. Some are co-authored, some are individual. But if you just take me this semester, I'm at 35, and I'm one person. I think the Sociology Department has a capstone requirement for their students that is research based above and beyond the research opportunities they provide for distinction.

I also think it's important, right, we're not going for the Princeton model. What we're saying is, this is a research university. Every student should be animated by the wonders of research at some point. It may happen first semester first year. It may happen in a capstone. We hope they then think about it in ways that shape their pathways if it's their first year or summarize it if it's their last year. But I think we really want this to be broad. We want to imagine things that happen in the summer, things that happen co-curricularly. We want to imagine these not just as written products but artistic products, things that are exhibits. We all engage in different kinds of research. It's about sharing it with our students. I totally get that Economics can't provide mentoring for every one of your students but there's lots of other people here who can.

Baker: I want to say thank you so much for that mentoring. That's going to count, that's important work you are doing. I hope you continue. But it will look different in different departments and not all Econ majors will do their mentored scholarly experience in Econ. I was going to ask Charlie to talk a little bit about his experience in Togo where it's not necessarily tied to the major but it's a wonderful research experience. He just published a book with our undergraduates about research in Togo.

Charlie Piot (Cultural Anthropology): I think it speaks to the issue just raised. I've been taking students to West Africa for the last nine years. I'm from Cultural Anthropology, very few anthropology majors. A lot of Global Health, Pratt, all over the place and I take about seven a year, I've taken about 60 and it's been one of these sort of immersive scholarly experiences that I think has been good for them and I think it's been even better for me, and I've been surprised as a faculty person. They ask questions about this place that I've been doing research in for 25 years that I've never even thought of, so it's been a two-way street for me and it's been with non-anthropology majors.

Astrachan: One simple question and then perhaps you don't need to answer fully. I read up there that frameworks consists of three courses and then I read in the document that FOCUS counts and FOCUS has two courses and when I look at that, where I come from, two does not equal three. But I also would encourage those people on the stage to consider when they hear, "I don't know how to do this in my department with my 900 majors" – we now have 400-something majors – it's not going to help me to hear that Professor X has exceeded beyond my wildest dreams in mentoring 50 students because our department I would like to do that with my co-majors, not say "well somebody else will take care of my students," because we would like to be able to offer that in our department and perhaps one of the things you are hearing is, "I don't see how to do this," so hearing from somebody who knows how to do it is not teaching me how to do it. And I don't want you or anybody to have to say okay, but you're hearing concerns and those concerns can't be well addressed by having someone tell you, "if you're only me, you could solve your problems."

Shanahan: So these are really well-taken points. I think certainly we would need to have a series of conversations with departments in the context of what it would look like in Computer Science. My point was only to say that is already happening, whether it is in Computer Science or not, it's in lots and lots of places. It comes in lots and lots of shapes and forms. Certainly we would love if every economics student actively engaged in a project in the context of economics. But we also understand that may well not be possible, so your point is well taken.

To the FOCUS frameworks point, Edna is here. I would just say FOCUS is the crown jewel of student experience at Duke in many ways. I think as we introduce students to different epistemologies and thematically emphasize intellectual community, I think it important that we maintain FOCUS as one of those options. And the two to the three, it's a student choice.

Edna Andrews (FOCUS): I just want to say one thing, it's 2 1/2.

Astrachan: I've been in FOCUS, I know that half doesn't count as an intellectually engaging –

Andrews: Actually, I think the people in this room that work in the IDC's would disagree with you. But I would say first that after the Harvard review this past year that Howard Gardner led about the FOCUS programs, one of the case studies for their analysis for a 21st century liberal arts education where he talks about the mystique where this is a beautiful example of going to a transactional to transformational education. That the one thing you don't want your blue print to be is dismantle one of the really positive things that happens in the first year and bring students to many new places where they would never end up at all. I think that the framework idea is to

extend that. I would note that the living/learning experience actually requires living and I'm not saying that frameworks should require living but I am saying that it is fundamentally not the FOCUS program because it's not a living/learning experience and seeing that changes everything. Also, that half credit, 1 ½ hour or 2 hour meeting every week in the evening is actually one of the cornerstones of the intellectual core of the program. It is a different number so I don't know how to speak to that but yes, I have to confirm that it's 2 ½.

Ashby: Can I just say a quick word about process, where we are? I was instructed by Anita that if the conversation is as it is, with a lot of really great conversation happening, not to cut this off and that she would recommend that we actually table the other two issues. One is about the absentee ballot voting, which will probably have lots of discussion on it and I don't want to cram that into five minutes. And Frances has agreed to let the Executive Committee work with distributing the resolution and pass through another version to vote on that, so we're just going to let the discussion go until 5. I just want people to know that you have until 5, so we're not going to cut this off.

Hasso: Well, what I was hoping ... I like the idea of maybe not voting, but I do think there's a kind of urgency to at least raising it so I don't know if we can stay five minutes extra ...

Ashby: So we'll stop a few minutes before to let Frances say a few words on this. The other issue is a much bigger discussion probably and that won't fit into this time constraint.

Grunwald: I want to continue on the frameworks/FOCUS thing and first of all point out that at least when I taught in FOCUS, FOCUS was 3 ½ courses and so if it's the crown jewel, it was shinier then. I understood that it was for instrumental or operation reasons why it's scaled back. So I'd like to endorse the notion that there should be parody if it's an either/or choice for students in terms of parody in credit. And that leads me to my question, which is about frameworks itself. Is it intended to be a meaning making first year immersive experience a la FOCUS? Is it meant to be FOCUS for all, which I'm totally in support of, I think it's a great idea, or is it meant to be a crypto-distribution requirements so that students get required exposure to one course in each division, which I also support and if it accomplishes both, all the power to it. My concern and my question, the relevance of my question to the nature of the framework dimension really has to do with how it's going to be implemented and what kinds of courses will departments contribute? Will Introductory Biology be an appropriate frameworks course or not so because it undermines the immersive experience, etc., etc.?

Comer: So what you're picking up on is it is sort of a hybrid version of that. It's not FOCUS for all, for sure. FOCUS has the living and learning community and it has a much more intensive and regularized IDC component that this will not. This will also have considerably more choice and so the communities of students are not going to be the 36 – or however many students are in FOCUS right now – there aren't going to be as many small clustered choices, right. So it's going to be five across the remaining students who aren't doing FOCUS, but in terms of the SSHUNS, that's a shift from the earlier proposal and my understanding is that was done in part because faculty were concerned, given already concerns about the increased perhaps responsibilities or not of advising and the scholarly mentored experience, but if we were also asking every department to consider designing this new half credit course, and what would that

look like and participating in this, that would be unsustainable across all units with other priorities that units have. So we thought it could be courses that were already on the books in certain departments with perhaps, faculty willing because they would want to do it, implementing and integrating some substantive element of the theme in any way that they thought was relevant. So I don't know enough about the syllabus for Intro Biology to say whether that would or wouldn't be possible in some way, but if it isn't possible, the learning outcomes that you need for Intro Biology probably wouldn't work within that, but maybe another course that's already on your books for first-year students would work.

Shahanan: So I think just to pick up on a couple of the really important points about this. I think many faculty since the Halloween document expressed concern that we really want students to be early on having exposure to the humanities, natural sciences and social sciences. So I think we thought it important to put that in the frameworks, absolutely. I think it's also that for us, it actually made programmatic sense. We do in fact want students looking at a single topic from different perspectives. This is something we heard over and over and over again from students that they know how to think sociologically, they know how to think biologically, and they don't know how those two things interact. They don't know how to think about a particular issue (inaudible). So I think this is really about engaging students in multiple epistemologies over the course of the year. It won't be that intimate, intensive environment but we are hoping that we are somehow pulling from the elements of FOCUS to create a sense of special community over the full course of the year for students. So, as Denise said, it really is a hybrid in that way.

Josh Socolar (Physics): I really like the idea of exposure into the frameworks and foundations and I'm wondering what happens afterwards when you get into the focused inquiries and you drop into your junior year. I don't see any real incentive there to continue toward a broad range of interests and I'm wondering whether – one could imagine, for example, somebody takes one humanities course in frameworks and one writing course and then decides they're going to major in Physics and minor in Mathematics and take a lot of Computer Science. So I'm wondering whether the committee gave some thoughts to the idea that the two concentrations would have to be sufficiently distinct ... (cross talk)

Shanahan: That's where we started. That is in fact what the committee really wanted. We wanted the focused inquiries to be in two really different areas in the way we're actually seeing all the time at Duke now. Students in very different disciplines pursuing different trajectories thinking about the way they intersect. I think what we heard from the faculty was that that makes artificial distinctions between disciplines. I think Scott Huettel said to me as a sociologist that Sociology and Statistics are a lot more alike than Physics and Statistics. Why wouldn't you allow that natural science decision? I think we really want to push students in those directions absolutely because I think that's one way to have additive depth.

Bennett: Given the principle of your question, I think if we look at other campuses like Brown that have open curricula, this issue does not happen with the frequency we'd expect. That is to say that students who have natural science majors actually take quite a few humanities courses. I think the general concern there is well taken but when you look at these other campuses, it doesn't manifest itself quite that way.

Sosin: Why not go whole hog? What's the justification for taking the middle position? I abhor the completely open but somehow I find that more tolerable than the kind of mish-mash.

Bennett: That's what we started with.

Shapiro: I have a question about the mentored research. I understand that what you're trying to do is name what is going on already. So I was just wondering whether departments themselves will decide the mentored research or will the deans decide that or the curriculum committee? Has there been thoughts of implementation or do you want to include a vast array of different kinds of mentored research?

Shanahan: I think – and Arlie can correct me – is what we imagined was having a standard rubric of things that are currently happening that would count as a mentored scholarly experience. These are things that a faculty member has to sign off on that they are in fact mentoring them. If a student comes to the table with something new or creative it would have to be approved through a further body, so if time travel photography was something that you want to happen, you don't have a category for that.

Ashby: Thank you so much for that very good, vigorous discussion and I'm just going to turn it over to Frances. She just needs to make her point and once she makes her point, there'll be more for us to vote on later but we just need to hear from her now.

Hasso: As most of you know, you should have received a resolution that I drafted with advice and consent and then I changed a few things because people wonderfully engaged with it in their departments and so the final resolution was sent out last night. It's here in paper and I just want to make a case for the college faculty council as a very important governance body at Duke University taking a position on these two resolutions, the January 25th border security immigration enforcement improvements resolution by President Trump and the January 27th protecting the nation from foreign terrorists entry into the United States. I won't take your time to read this. I would say this is very, very important for many of us. I don't think I have to convince most people in the Duke community that it's very important but I also think we often in this body discuss things where the proposal is coming from the top and I would like us to actually use it occasionally like this occasion to talk about something where we as a faculty in Trinity College have a position. I think the administration has done a lot of really important things on both of these issues, but I think it's different for the governance body to do so and so we're out of time, we have this important curricular discussion. So I think where we're at is we'd like to have a vote within a week electronically for the 32 or however many people are on Council. I don't think we should wait until the next meeting a month from now and I don't know what the process is. I appreciate being able to add it through Roberts Rules.

Ashby: The meeting is adjourned.