Call to Order

Sherryl Broverman (Interim Chair): We have today something old and something new. Something old is obviously the curriculum that we’ve been talking about for three years in phases of research, drafting and redrafting and such. The new is me, I’m your interim chair for the next few months until Anita comes back, certainly until the fall.

As we move forward together – it’s interesting to come in at this point in the process – I hope there’s some statements we can all agree on. One is the curriculum is owned by the faculty. That is central to what we all believe. We create it, we implement it, it’s a contract, it’s an invitation to our students to the intellectual life of the university, it’s how we think about our communal endeavor of research and scholarship. There’s been some concern I’ve heard that this hasn’t been completely owned by the faculty and, whether true or not, I’m responsive to that perception and I’m trying to counteract that. To that end, I disinvited President Brodhead. I asked him to please reschedule, to come to another time, which he very graciously understood. I know we all enjoy hearing from him, his eloquence, but we thought we didn’t want to give you a perception that there was a finger on the scale or any kind of top-down bias, so. Not my favorite conversation to have had this year, but I thought it was important and ECASC supported that.

I hope we can all agree also that there’s an optimization process going on right now. Anytime you have rules or guidelines, you can’t optimize for every variable, you can’t please everyone, particularly true in a diverse liberal arts and research university. There are so many different interests and desires of what we want from this. So I hope we can think about what’s the best fit for the communal good and realize that we can’t optimize for everyone’s particular interests.

I think we can all agree also that our faculty colleagues on the IDC Committee, some of whom are here, did a herculean task of becoming experts in the literature and sharing that with us and making themselves available. There were over 500 meetings on campus for discussion and feedback. I think few of us, really if you think about it, would take on the responsibility if you knew you had a three-year commitment for weekly meetings. Not all of us would say, “I want to do that.” So I think it’s a dedication to their commitment to create the best Duke experience for our students. I hope we can all acknowledge that the committee members came to this process without any ideas of protecting turf. They were open to wherever the literature led them, and as a reminder, the BluePrint was created by faculty pulled from every division on campus. It was not designed to privilege any one unit and certainly many of the people were invested in a process that would have impact on the units they were in but they felt for the communal good and the optimization process, it was worth it. I hope we respect what they brought to this.

So today most of what we want to do is have a robust discussion about the next steps. The next meeting in April, we’ll vote and how to manage this vote has had extensive, deliberative conversations. We
recognize that our colleagues on the committee have created a holistic vision for undergraduate education that’s basically like a complex ecosystem and all the interlocking parts are critical for working as a whole. However, I also think it’s important for us to think about this vote as a referendum of the core issue, which is do you want an open curriculum or do you want a curriculum where there is more requirements and mandates for student intellectual pursuits. That’s really what it all comes down to. So ECASC has recommended an up or down vote on the current draft with the understanding that a ‘yes’ on the current draft includes a guarantee from the deans (I got it in writing) that the faculty will be deeply engaged in all decisions during implementation, that data will be collected throughout this process as they always do for the first few years to track student enrollment choices so we can see if the predictions of the model are being held out, and that course corrections can be made if we find that students are not seeking the diverse pathways that we hope and anticipate they will. So to vote yes is to try this and then be critical analysts of its impact. However, if for whatever reason you want to vote ‘no’ against the BluePrint in its current draft, then the Council floor will be open to representatives to call a motion to reconsider it with any possible amendments if they wish. So if this route is chosen in April … first in April will be the vote … do you like it in the current version or not? If yes, we’ve got a new curriculum, we can start talking about implementing. If no, maybe we might be done, but we’d have the option of bringing up amendments saying, “I like this part of it, I think I would like to modify that part of it.” We’ll go through that in April. We have the fluidity from the administration to have this go through the first meeting in the fall if we need to do so because we really want this faculty voice. My understanding is that if there’s a complete ‘no’ and people want to move forward, then there’ll be a new committee. This committee’s work is done, they’ve done yeomen’s labor, it’s done, clap for them again. If we decide we’re not moving forward with their product, then a new committee will be called in the fall, probably start with this since there’s been a huge amount of work in it and hopefully everyone should like some part of it, and move from there. So -- and this will all be sent out in an email -- what will happen in April: if you like the BluePrint now and you’re willing to take a risk on it, vote yes. If you disagree with the BluePrint, vote no. If you think it can be amended, vote no on it, call an amendment, bring it back with changes you think represents your vision.

Today’s for discussion. We need to finish at 4:45 so we can get to the other resolution on the agenda. Before we start discussion I was going to … go ahead, question?

Jose Gonzalez (Classical Studies): I submit to you that in the bylaws of the Arts & Sciences Council it says that we have to be ruled by Roberts Rules of Order. The procedure that ECASC is suggesting is not according to the rules. Any main motion can be discussed and amended on the spot so you can’t proceed exactly the way you said you were going to.

Broverman: I can have our parliamentarian rule in, but Roberts Rules is, in my understanding, a guideline and ECASC can set any procedure that they like and if this body here doesn’t want this procedure, then there’s a two-thirds vote to change it.

Gonzalez: Two thirds majority. On a two thirds vote you can change even the bylaws, of course, but you cannot proceed without that two thirds majority vote.

Broverman: Two thirds to change the process that’s been currently proposed. Parliamentarian, want to comment?

Mike Munger (Political Science): The chair is responsible for choosing the rules under which the meeting will be held and anyone who would like can make a motion with due privilege under Robert’s Rules they have to be voted on, but it would require a two-thirds vote to change those rules, and if you
would like to make a motion and it would be seconded then yes, it would be voted on. But in the absence of that, the rules that she has discussed are how we will proceed.

**Broverman:** I was going to ask if we can do the minor business work of approving February’s meeting minutes before we jump into the discussion and the voting process.

**Gonzalez:** If I may say again, I have an email here ready … I thought this issue would arise since you sent an email before about having a vote, so I do have a copy of Robert’s Rules of Order. I’ve extracted the sections that say any main motion is amendable at the debate. That’s the baseline. Any deviation of that requires a suspension of the rules, which is a two-thirds vote. So I submit that the scenario is exactly the opposite, that by default we have to be ruled by the Roberts Rules of Order and any suspension of the rules requires a two-thirds majority vote and I’m about to send this email so every member of the Council will have this in a moment. In the email I also have a page that says if a member of the Council is parliamentarian, he’s not allowed to make motions, debate or vote.

**Broverman:** Right. He’s here to talk as our reference.

**Gonzalez:** Yes, so you’ll have this email in 30 seconds.

**Broverman:** So there’s been a lot of discussion on Robert’s Rules and how binding they are and my understanding of all parliamentary rule which of course we’ve been researching is that ECASC gets to set any procedure that they like and it is the responsibility of the chair to clearly delineate that procedure.

**Gonzalez:** If I may read from the bylaws, rules of procedure under E. It says “the Council shall follow the rules set out in Roberts Rules of Order.” Any deviation of these bylaws requires a two thirds majority to amend.

**Munger:** I’m not trying to take a position on what’s been discussed. The chair has made a ruling. Roberts Rules are moot. The procedure she has decided on can be overturned by a vote, but the decision by the chair on the rules has been rendered. We will proceed under these rules unless and until there is someone who makes a motion and it is seconded and by two thirds vote, her ruling is overruled. You can do that; it’s not that there’s no answer. Roberts Rules are moot. Her ruling binds.

**Chris Walter (Physics):** Because she’s the chair?

**Munger:** Yes.

**Gonzalez:** From Roberts Rules of Order, the ruling of the chair can be appealed and it’s a majority vote, not a two thirds vote, but that requires that the chair rule and that we vote.

**Broverman:** I’m going to rule this out of order for the moment so we can first get our business out of the way of approving the February minutes and then come back to this and then make it open so that people can change the rules that I have delineated. (The minutes were approved)

There has been a request to change the process for the vote. Is that what you are contesting?

**Gonzalez:** Well it should be done at the next meeting, but yes, the procedure set out is lawless under Roberts Rules and under the bylaws for this council.

**Munger:** So before you register any exceptions, let the minutes show that he is registering an exception to your ruling.
**Broverman:** So that is what’s going to happen during the next meeting. This is sort of a parliamentary procedure debate. He does not necessarily agree on … but he is our official parliamentarian following the rules, so I have been educated on this process. If people would like to change the process, someone needs to make a motion and a second and we need two thirds majority to vote.

**Gonzalez:** This is for next meeting, and I propose we postpone this until Council has had a chance to look at the email I just sent.

**Broverman:** Okay. Wonderful. Thank you. So what we want to do today is have people come up and be able to express their views to each other. Council members are here, the IDC colleagues are here to answer any questions you might have for them, but this is really a chance for us to deliberate amongst ourselves about the BluePrint as it exists and where we want to go at Duke with the curriculum. So there are microphones set up. We ask you to try and keep this short because we’re trying to recognize as many positions as possible. I also don’t want this to be simply a “get up, make a statement, sit down.” I want this to be a deliberative process if possible, so there will be two minutes for commentary or questions. I’m going to try and keep track of time and how many people want to speak so we can make sure that voices get heard. So with that, I’m opening up discussion.

**Discussion of New Curriculum Proposal**

**Randy Matory (Cultural Anthropology):** I’d like to say again that I truly appreciate the committee’s work and I think there’s much that’s excellent in it. I would like to add that I have shared with my students in the University as a Culture course that these deliberations are afoot and that they are exercised, they feel that they have not been consulted. So I hope in the next stage, as we engage in the iterative process, students’ experience of the previous curriculum will be considered and will be solicited and the critical issue is how the curriculum fits in with their global experience as students here, of which classes are only one part. I would also like to add that that sort of respectful consideration will enhance their donations in a few years.

**Broverman:** Now is it correct that Randy is the only person here who has a comment? If not, then please come up … the only reason we’re not using a (pass-around) microphone is that you can’t see your colleagues facing this way. We’d like you up here speaking to your colleagues. So you can come up and line up by either microphone and state your name and what you’d like to say. This is our chance to be a deliberative body.

**Alex Rosenberg (Philosophy):** I think those who have participated in these meetings know that, by and large, I have been quite favorable of the process and the outcome, mainly because I think the Duke curriculum should be the most important magnet in drawing the kind of students that we want to come to Duke and we know from data that the current curriculum bears no role whatsoever in attracting any students to Duke. However, I regret to say that my department has instructed me to vote, at least on current draft before me, unfavorably. It’s largely because my department simply doesn’t understand this document. For example, they asked me in particular to explain the following two sentences to them: “Groupings of five to 25 classes across all three divisions under a range of disciplines will cluster according to common themes. For example, 15 to 20 faculty might design Frameworks classes, each through a disciplinary lens or around questions related to justice, climate change, health, economic inequality or artificial intelligence.” My colleagues don’t understand how groupings of five to 25 members of the faculty could reasonably and profitably design any such Framework courses. They need either a much more specific set of examples or a much reduced number of faculty engaged in the delivery. They also have, of course, the natural questions any faculty member would have about the incentives to participate in this program. My department has instructed me to communicate to the A&S Council that
what it favors is not Curriculum 2000. Indeed all of the reasons for the dissatisfaction with Curriculum 2000 that motivated the current proposal are shared by my colleagues. But what they see as an acceptable and indeed optimal alternative is getting as close to the Brown University undergraduate curriculum as we possibly can. I think this view, while it does not entirely represent my own view, is an entirely reasonable one and should certainly be folded into the next round of discussions over this meeting and the next one.

Broverman: So if there’s someone who cares to make a response or anyone from the IDC cares to have input, there’s an opportunity, so it’s not a series of statements. If not, we’ll move on to the next person. We are talking to each other, so I want this to be a dialogue if that’s what you all decide because this is your council.

Raquel Salvatella de Prada (AAHVS): I’m just going to read a summary of the discussion we had last meeting. Our department’s vote was closely split: 7 against / 6 for. Our department felt that there is much to be excited about in the proposal, especially its embrace of mentored student research and for beginning to recognize the potential of making as a site of experimentation and as a way of knowing.

However, our concerns included:

1. The proposal seems to confuse vision with strategy, and while many supported the spirit of the proposal, there remain too many questions about its implementation. For example:

A. Admissions — How precisely would Admissions recalibrate its recruitment efforts and admission criteria to attract the kinds of students who would thrive in this curriculum.

B. Labor — what are the labor implications of the proposal? How will departments and individual faculty get credit for supporting these different pathways for enrichment outside the major? What are the labor implications of increased advising necessary to support student engagement? If there are plans to create a new workforce of full-time advisors, what are the implications of this for the structure of the University, especially with continued budgetary pressures?

2. Many of our faculty expressed concern about the reduction of language course expectations to a single course. Real engagement with the benefits of language study — an understanding of how language functions in the context of culture, as well as understanding one’s own native language better — cannot be realized in a single semester.

Finally, several faculty wondered why the language of “structure” could be used instead of requirements: We gain knowledge through structured learning, not checking off requirements.

If there does seem to be a big split along divisional lines — sciences supporting / arts & humanities departments against — then there needs to be a discussion of what it means to push forward on something that half of the University doesn’t support.

Catherine Admay (Sanford): I’m actually here to ask a question because one of the things that we’re concerned about in Public Policy is the breadth requirement of the new format. We’ve been thinking about the Frameworks course in particular, which has these three parts. The idea is that in Frameworks you would be exposed to social sciences, humanities and natural sciences, and that way you would get at least one class in each of our divisions before you graduate. This would not be true, however, if you are in a FOCUS cluster, like the one Sherryl and I taught, where you might not have a natural sciences course or a humanities course. You might have different versions of social sciences courses. So then it would be
possible to graduate from Duke without ever having to be exposed to a natural sciences course or humanities course if you use the FOCUS alternative in your first year. I’m wondering (as I’m trying to understand if that’s the case), if the sentence, “Like FOCUS, we expect the portfolio of thematic clusters to evolve over time” and that these two possibilities, FOCUS and Frameworks, would co-evolve: is there some idea that FOCUS would be asked to make sure that the three different divisions are covered in any thematic cluster? What is the plan for making sure – or is there not a concern for making sure– that students would in fact graduate with a humanities course or a natural sciences course? And I’m asking as somebody from the social sciences.

Chantal Reid (NSOE): One of the points raised by the faculty in the School of the Environment was exactly that, that it would be feasible for students taking FOCUS to get out of either natural sciences or humanities, and our faculty was really concerned about that. So I would also like an answer to that question.

Denise Comer (TWP): I so much appreciate you raising this concern. The intention was never to dictate what FOCUS does or doesn’t do. FOCUS is its own body and they can chose to evolve the way their leadership wants them to evolve. I think this is an important point and I don’t remember us talking about it. I don’t know what to say other than thank you very much for raising it. You are right that if there’s a loophole there, that people could end up without an NS, SS or HU if they do the FOCUS route and that’s something we need to think about in committee.

Ron Grunwald (Biology): Just a reminder that we did talk about in the last Council meeting at least in the context of the number of courses. So whereas a non-FOCUS student will be obliged to do three courses in Frameworks in their first year, a FOCUS student is obliged to do 2.5 courses in their first year. So there’s a lack of parity there in addition to the disciplinary distributions.

Admay: I think it’s the distribution that Public Policy is concerned about.

Walter: Just a response to that, there are some courses in the Foundations, the second year, although it was actually unclear when we talked about this in our department. So you have to take a writing or speaking class, a second language class and something called modeling or quantification. In the text it says that’s math or statistics, but then it says “or something that fulfills the QS requirement” and we didn’t know if that meant the old QS requirement which would include natural sciences or if that means something else. But in principle, by tweaking that, you could also require it somehow there.

Broverman: Since there’s been multiple questions about the first-year experience and Frameworks, Lee Baker would you like to get up and talk about the thinking when they created this?

Lee Baker (Cultural Anthropology): On the FOCUS program, we did sort of discuss it and so many of our decisions were weighing trade-offs. Trade-offs are real and we all have to – particularly the committee’s deliberation. FOCUS was committed to interdisciplinary work. Many, not all, have all three divisions and that there would be sort of a goal to move in that direction so that there would be more parity between FOCUS and the Frameworks course. We wouldn’t mandate it, particularly if it didn’t make sense in the current FOCUS program, but if we’re moving in that direction, we would have that sort of coverage, if you will. And for the QS, many of these, particularly the very eloquent Art History deliberations, reporting out on their deliberations, we … obviously our committee couldn’t deal with hiring and incentives and all that. That was squarely in the implementation phase and wasn’t part of our charge. We didn’t have the tools or the power or anything to make those cases. So many of these issues, including the QS, we expect that to be part of the implementation. There’s going to be some, I think, compelling statistics classes in sociology as well as psychology that would qualify as QS’s as well as other disciplines. But I think that’s going to be the role of the implementation committee to decide.
**Broverman:** I just want to say that ECASC hasn’t taken a position on this. We’ve stayed neutral, we haven’t endorsed it or not. I’m certainly not speaking for ECASC, I’m speaking as a professor of biology who’s taught in FOCUS. Catherine, you are absolutely right, there’s two avenues through the first-year program right now, the Frameworks and FOCUS program. They’re different, different in lots of ways. And in some ways, Frameworks may be better because you get those three different divisions. In some ways FOCUS is better. You get the residential unit, you get the dinners, you get other things. I think right now the way they put this together, they said, “We already have something good. We came up with something that will scale a little better. We’re going to try it over the next three years and see how it plays out.” With the recognition that there are two ways through the first year, both hopefully produce community, prompt students to synthesize across boundaries, try to accomplish the same pedagogical and emotional goals but with different formats. But they are different, absolutely.

**Julianne Werlin (English):** I am representing the English department in a statement discussed and unanimously endorsed in a formal vote. We ask that it be entered into the minutes.

We thank the committee for all the hard work they have done in the difficult task of proposing a new curriculum. We will be voting against adopting it for the following reasons.

We do not agree with the curriculum’s rejection of requirements. Requirements are an indication of what we collectively value and what we believe our students should know. By eliminating requirements in favor of student choice, we are concerned that we will create a curriculum that defaults to the strongest pressures of the market, the pre-professional mentality, and the intervention of parents. We do not believe that asking students to justify their choices can remedy this problem: the English department tried a “pathways” model in the 90s and abandoned it very quickly, as we discovered that students are capable of justifying almost any pathway and that it was impossible to mount sustained inquiries in such a model.

At the same time, we question the structure of the requirements the curriculum has retained. The changes to the curriculum have been so frequent and so substantial, and yet also so contingent – from pass/fail to no pass/fail, the addition of Writing 101, the substitution of Frameworks for Duke Experience and of Foundations for Signature Courses – that we do not feel the result presents a coherent approach to a curriculum.

We are also concerned about the instrumental approach to knowledge by Frameworks and Foundations. In Frameworks, the introduction to each discipline is driven by external themes rather than the discipline’s own questions and problems. At the same time, by focusing on research skills rather than content, it assumes that scholarly methods can be severed from deep and sustained study of material, a premise we do not accept. We also do not think that one term of work in a foreign language is enough to constitute a foundation.

Finally, we have concerns about the implementation of the curriculum. Since there has been no discussion about the implementation of curriculum so dependent on advising, we don’t actually know what we are voting for. We see no warrant for hiring a large number of professional advisers who are not themselves teachers or scholars, especially when we are assured that Arts & Sciences must shrink its faculty.

Duke’s mission of providing “a superior liberal arts education,” including the study of the humanities, is more necessary than ever. WE do not believe that the new curriculum will support this mission.

**David Malone (Education):** Are we capturing all these comments in the minutes, particularly the written statements we’ll be able to
Broverman: Well, they’re all in the minutes so people can review them and share them.

Malone: Perhaps people who have written statements could submit them if they feel moved to do so.

Broverman: Our goal is for faculty to have the most deliberative discussion that they can. If people want to submit or circulate statements, that is certainly something they can do.

Malone: If you think the minutes will capture the comments, then that will be sufficient.

Broverman: We’ll try and get those out as quickly as possible.

Mark Chaves (Sociology): My colleagues and I discussed this last week and not to my surprise, my colleagues liked a lot of what was in the document but much to my surprise they instructed me to vote no on the document as it stands. The substantive issue that we cared most about was the issue of the distribution requirements. Requiring one course in each division seemed to us to be not smart or our vision of undergraduate education. Actually the issue that affects them the most and upset them the most was when I reported to them the rumor I had heard that amendments might not be allowed to be voted on, and their heads exploded basically. They didn’t understand how that could be a possibly wise way to move forward. I understand, of course, the committee’s vision of this as one holistic thing, but the truth is that the parts are separable and there are pieces that it makes sense to be voted on separately through a series of amendments. So whatever the reality of the ECASC decision or the chair’s decision, I plead with I don’t know who but to allow a more open process. It’s really hard to understand what possible rationale there would be to not allow amendments. I think the framing of this as a referendum, an up or down vote, a referendum on open or not curriculum is not a helpful way to characterize this. That’s not the issue that’s here. This isn’t an open curriculum, there’s requirements in this curriculum. There’s interesting questions and debate is how much requirements and what kind of requirements and we should be allowed to vote on the specifics of that. In my mind, that’s the only way forward and I would urge us to get there more quickly rather than wait because I think the substantive discussion would be more productive if we knew we could vote on amendments so then we could focus on one thing at a time and talk about the distribution requirement and vote an amendment up or down, and talk about the language requirement and vote an amendment up or down. So anyway, I don’t know if it would be helpful for me to move that. I guess the ruling has been that it requires a 2/3rds vote, I don’t know if that’s a helpful thing to do now or not but Sociology that was even more … we were prepared to vote yes to some version of this, but not if there’s no amendments allowed to be discussed on principle.

Broverman: Just a clarification: amendments are allowed. If there’s parts that you like, you can change that. It’s saying “do you like this in this form,” if the answer is no, you vote no.

Hasso: It’s backward. (cross talk)

Broverman: It gets you to the same point, where you get to say, “I love this part of it, but this gets mixed with that.” Whatever you want to do.

Christopher Walter (Physics): I would be worried if we did it like the process you guys wanted to do. So if instead of saying yes or no, we have this thing and don’t like it and go through some process of revising it, if the process is that somehow people get up and start making amendments and some of them are voted in and some are voted out, I think you’re going to wind up with a hodge podge. What’s the process when you vote? Will you wind up with something coherent when that happens? I mean, you can imagine a scenario where we did that, but I think it would have to be quite structured. The idea of one
person stands up and makes an amendment and everybody votes yes has direct implications on what other people’s amendments would be later. I find it pretty dangerous to do things that way.

**Gonzalez:** That’s the nature of deliberative councils. If you don’t want it this way, you need a two thirds majority because the whole baseline of the bylaws is that we’re ruled by the Roberts Rules of Order. That’s the only safety we have in governance for the minority. If the chair can capriciously set the rules that he or she wants and then it requires a two thirds majority to overturn those rules that diverge from …

**Walter:** I’m not asking a process question. I’m just talking about if people are unhappy with it, what’s the process where you get something that people are happy with and the idea of a sequential set of amendments that people are voting on seems pretty dangerous to me.

**Gonzalez:** The way to prevent that is you can propose a suspension of the rules…

**Broverman:** Excuse me. Everyone is looking forward to your email which they will read on process and if they want to have a 2/3rds vote to change it, that can happen because this is a deliberative body. Let’s go back to comments, please.

**Mona Hassan (Religious Studies):** In our meeting last week, the Department of Religious Studies expressed a number of concerns about the Blue Print and its current iteration, including the following three points: 1. The values of the university, particularly in developing ethical and culturally literate and well-rounded students are not reflected in the new curriculum. 2. Rather than successfully emulating existing models at Brown University and smaller liberal arts colleges like Oberlin and Swarthmore, we ultimately need the culture at Duke that will shape how this proposal is embodied here. 3. The department is also concerned that the resulting curriculum, instead of being perceived as flexible, will be perceived in the wider world as lightweight.

**Reeve Huston (History):** Mona, can I ask for a clarification on your second point? Your second point sounds important and not fully explained.

**Hassan:** The discussion within the Department of Religious Studies centered around the concern that the curriculum is not connecting to any actual existing culture at Duke and that while it is possible to change the curriculum, it’s a much deeper process to change the culture at Duke and that if we change the curriculum merely on paper, but that’s actually not going to get reflected in how it’s going to be implemented on an everyday basis. So the idea that we open up the curriculum to an open model that students will be driven to, still be driven to seek out languages and writing and take … if they’re in the humanities to seek out natural sciences, the hard sciences, the physical and vice versa, that people in the, say a biology major or a chemistry major will naturally still be drawn to courses in the humanities or social sciences … our department’s concern is that will actually not happen given the profile. The department also underscored the importance of the admissions process in ensuring diversity and also, particularly in the times that we live in, the department was asking, “isn’t it important for us to train ethically minded students and to train students who are exposed to other languages, who are exposed to other cultures who can be literate not only in Religious Studies – our department wasn’t concerned about its own individual interests, but rather the values of the institution and the students that we will be training and sending out into the world.

**Admay:** I want to ask a question that relates to the review of the Blue Print if it does get voted in. I feel it makes a lot of sense to experiment with something and try to see what will happen, but it makes more sense to me if I know according to what criteria I’m going to be evaluating what happened. I’m concerned about the account of this as “Let’s just see what happens. We need to try something new. It’s so appealing.” Because there is an argument for saying let’s try to do better. Really there is that argument, but the problem arises when we don’t know against which criteria we’re evaluating. One of the criteria
that I would have, and that actually worries me as a faculty person, never mind as a Public Policy representative, is the idea of what students will do with this choice? So I really appreciate the way the English Department phrased it: that is, is this a kind of pseudo choice? I was one of those nerdy people who went and read the articles that [the FAQ document] suggested we read. The first one has an account of pseudo choice in it and what’s wrong with so many teachers is they give their students pseudo choices and that doesn’t really count as choice. So I’m a little concerned, in our modeling of this curriculum, that there may be a way in which we’re saying “we’re going to give you more freedom to take the courses you really like,” when behind that we know that these students are subject to such strong forces, not only of their parents, but of their GPA, and having so much to worry about in terms of getting into med school or law school. I deal with these worries from students all the time. They just really are very concerned about taking these other courses and will feel like now they have none of the protection to try other courses that comes from everybody else having to try them too. [Without that general requirement] they would be at a competitive disadvantage if they went off and tried something that was not in their area of strength and they got a worse grade which might affect their getting into law school or med school. And so, when they’re given the choice, for them it feels like a pseudo choice because they know they can’t take that choice and possibly fail or do poorly. So the credit/no credit [idea], as much as my department didn’t like it, honestly I feel like it’s a necessary part to having students really experiment. I wonder if we could, and I think Chris you talked about this long ago, if we could have a snapback provision, where we could maybe try this for two years and then, if we find that all our ideals around a liberal arts education, where students really do explore and really do take courses across the gamut of disciplines and epistemologies, are not panning out. Then instead of having another huge political governance fight about what we are going to do about it, we could just have it be a snapback to C2K and that will be where we come back to because there’s been a problem with what students have actually done. We won’t have to go through this process all over again. Look at how much work has gone into this to come to a new equilibrium: we know having an argument about a new equilibrium takes a lot of capital. I wonder if it’s possible to introduce the idea of a snapback as part of the critical evaluation or not, because I think if a snapback was there, I would be – and I think Public Policy would be – much more inclined to take a chance and just see what does happen, because it’s a question. What will students actually do when given a choice?

**Randy Matory (Cultural Anthropology):** Both Mona’s comment and yours and the follow up question from Reeve made me want to remind us that a large part of the students’ activities on campus are related to Greek life and the Blue Devils and so there are lots of centrifugal forces with respect to their engagement with the kind of intellectual program we are interested in. I might add that C2K elicited the same complaints, that intellectualism was optional and so the question is by piling on a series of requirements regarding what we think is the ideal intellectual composition of our students, do we really achieve the result of broad education or must we just trust those students who want a broad education to get it and those who weren’t going to get it anyway, who checked the boxes and didn’t compose a coherent program even with C2K’s extensive requirements, they’re not going to do it.

**Broverman:** I know there’s people in line, some who haven’t made a comment yet and some have made multiple, I’d like to go one round first where everyone gets to speak before we circle back, but if you want to comment, that’s just fine.

**Gonzalez:** You could invert the comment to say that those who are fantastic are going to do it with any curriculum and that a curriculum has to be written for those who really need it. So the argument is valid, but it can be turned on its head and seems to be just as valid.

**Matory:** But we tried it your way with C2K. Everybody’s got to read that article, what’s the guy’s name, where intellectual engagement is optional. It was a direct response to C2K. I thought a lot of people had read this article but it was a direct complaint about Duke where these surrounding cultural issues at the
university lots of students, despite the very precisely intellectually outlined requirements of C2K, were not fulfilling the promise that we hoped a new set of requirements would cause them to fulfill. [Note: Matory provided a link to the article: http://www.chronicle.com/article/when-intellectual-life-is/25222]

**Beth Holmgren (Slavic and Eurasian Studies):** We had a meeting last week. I have been on the fence personally, so I’m following Alex’s tactic here. I was on the fence about these changes for a number of reasons but my department empowered me or asked me if I wanted to be an electoral college representative or actually reflect the popular vote, and we decided popular vote would be best. In that case, they did not want to vote for this as it stands. The issue is not that there wasn’t a great deal of thought and care put into the planning of this, though at times we in the humanities – and I do want to correct those who call us language departments. We are foreign language and culture departments who also teach a little bit of history, so this language notion that we are a bunch of people teaching first-, second-, and third-year whatever, that’s true, that’s important, but that’s part of what we do in general in teaching foreign cultures. But our concerns were, I know our students haven’t read that article, Randy, and our students are puzzled. We asked some of our students to look at this particular draft. We also feel, and I know this as chair, I’ve been chair for a really long time, that there isn’t really good coordination between Admissions and the way in which the curriculum unfolds. So Admissions still admits those people who want to come to Duke for certain reasons, which is it seems to be very much a pre-professional school, not a liberal arts school. I would like to change that, but we really need to have that in place and we have to have certain general administrative backing for that, and that’s a real problem because I would love to be able to teach Brown students and I love the students I have in my classes, but the people being attracted to Duke are not being attracted to it because it’s Brown, they’re being attracted to it because it’s going to give them a great job in investment banking or public policy or as a doctor or whatever. So that’s a problem and that comes to another question that was raised in our faculty meeting, which is the advising staff and how they are going to be trained. We’ve had problems in the past about advising and how they are directed into various courses and this is something that we would actually need – dare I say this, but I do say this in front of Valerie – money for that. We would need money to provide expert educated advising help for this. This is something extremely important. And of course you know that we are, because we do teach language that we don’t say this beyond this room, but are difficult, so this notion of having one semester or Russian or Polish or Turkish or whatever, Romanian, is ludicrous. Again, there is more encouragement on that score for various kinds of stronger than expectations. I think that is important and it’s important to any liberal arts curriculum and we need to go against what the mainstream in America is, which is make us all English all the time. So that’s my statement and if anyone wants to respond and tell me that’s all been solved, I’ll be very happy.

**Lee Baker (Cultural Anthropology):** I would like to talk about and maybe Alex can help me with the Admissions front. You know, Duke has a relatively low yield in terms of the students that choose to come to Duke and they are being admitted. The students that are going to Yale and Brown are being admitted to Duke when they apply, but they are choosing not to come. So there is an argument and it was part of our line of thinking that the curriculum is not an exciting motivating thing to come to Duke. So they are choosing to come to be good physicians, investment bankers because that’s tried and true with Curriculum 2000 and they know that, as opposed to being engaged really sort of invested in designing their own education and sort of making meaning out of the opportunities. So that’s just a clarification on the Admissions point. I’ve got to admit, Christoph is admitting them, they’re just choosing not to come. I don’t know if Alex can put a finer point on that.

**Rosenberg:** I think you said it very well, Lee. But in order to secure the kinds of students we want, we must start by providing a magnet for them to come and the first step is a curriculum that attracts those students and then to give Christoph marching orders to go out and use this curriculum to go out and attract the kind of students we want. We cannot expect Christoph to attract students first and then to offer them the kind of curriculum which we think such students will follow.
Holmgren: But I would say, in answer to that, having gone through these sorts of circular arguments before, that humanities chairs have said please do include the humanities in what you do, and do talk about the fact that in many departments and in the interaction between departments, that this can be like a small liberal arts college where you can choose. It doesn’t make a whole lot of difference in what the Admissions office presents.

Broverman: We have one more comment. There are people who haven’t had a chance to speak yet and I want to make sure that we’re done by 4:45.

Matory: I’ll say this again until somebody takes it seriously: we are a big-time sports school. That is far more important a draw to the kind of students we’re getting than our curriculum is.

Holmgren: So why change the curriculum then?

Rosenberg: Randy, what is the next step in that argument? How do we take that into account? Does that mean that we retain the status quo or do we make some change?

Matory: I just think we should be thoughtful in our thinking that by changing the curriculum, we’re going to change the kind of student we get. I don’t think that’s the causal sequence in which it’s going to work.

Broverman: I’m going to ask, just to try and be respectful of diversity of voices in the room so that everyone has a chance to speak and move on because we only have a little over 15 minutes and we have five people here, so you can have two minutes.

Gonzalez: I just want to say first before I read a statement here that I certainly do not impugn anyone’s motives. I think the committee has done wonderful work, it’s come with passion and imagination to its remit and I don’t want any of my statements to be interpreted as a lack of respect for the work done.

As Classical Studies DUS and member of the A&S Council, I rise to speak against the Blue Print curriculum. For me, its main shortcoming is its dogmatic opposition to curricular requirements. The virtue of this opposition was often asserted but never argued. Until the 11th hour, and despite numerous requests, not a single item was ever produced on the allegedly voluminous scholarship that – so we were told – had shown requirements to impair learning and depress motivation. The few references in the literature to the FAQ cannot, and do not, make up for the lack of discussion that informed the process all along. The view they support apparently assumes that student motivation is the goal of curricular requirements. Not so. Superior course design and teaching motivate. While requirements seek to facilitate and secure a range of outcomes, motivation is emphatically not one of them. Motivation and requirements are largely orthogonal. The logical outcome of the Blue Print’s teaching philosophy would be to ban requirements for majors too. I doubt this view has many advocates.

The impact of this radical conviction is nowhere so conspicuous as in the Blue Print’s “Foundations.” Here at least, after significant pushback, the IDC sought to accommodate their opponents, but with a mixed and puzzling outcome. Despite explicit recognition of the importance of “disciplinary epistemologies,” the proposal runs counter to the ways students actually learn to write, study new foreign languages, and acquire the skills essential to a quantitative understanding of the world. This foundational learning proceeds very slowly at first, and builds up by gradual and systematic accretion. It entails a non-negligible amount of tedious memorization and redundancy, and requires an extended minimal period of engagement and practice. With this in mind, the absurdity of a one-semester-long requirement is obvious.
While the initial demands on the student are high, immediate satisfaction is minimal. The payoff, no doubt, is considerable, but deferred until a point that cannot be reasonably reached within one semester. I believe that the current three-semester sequence cannot be abridged, or else the gains will be evanescent and of no long-term benefit to the student or Trinity’s mission.

The Blue Print started as a “tweak” and grew to a wholesale transformation of the existing curriculum. The “cone of silence” established a pattern of secrecy early on that has hampered a responsive engagement with the legitimate concerns of dissenting faculty. We are now told that undesirable outcomes will be monitored and remediated after a trial period. With past history as a guide, I am not reassured.

The dangers of a curriculum approved over the serious concerns of a sizeable opposition should be obvious to us all, and especially to the administration. This radical a change in the pedagogic mission of Trinity should only be attempted when the vast majority of the members of the A&S community have a purchase on it.

Some may say that the status quo is unacceptable, that inaction is not a choice. But this is a false alternative. We should move forward, but we must do so in a way that is open and collaborative, that welcomes faculty input at every point. The foundational philosophy of a future proposal must be openly argued and vetted. If it remains in its current form, I urge the members of this assembly to vote down the Blue Print at the April meeting.

Broverman: If I just may interject a minute, we have more people trying to speak, we are trying to finish at 4:45 to move on to the resolution. So I have two options. One is to not have any response, just let our colleagues make statements without response. The other option is if people want to vote to stay later, I want to be respectful of people’s time. I’m going on the head nodding vote right now of letting them go and do their statements without responses, and if you could keep it to two minutes, that would be wonderful.

Shai Ginsburg (AMES): I would like to echo a few of the things that were said before. I think implementation is a crucial component and without knowing exactly how the curriculum is going to be implemented, we cannot vote on a curriculum. The curriculum is a statement of ideas, it would be judged according to the way it is implemented and hence I suggest that before we proceed with any further discussion, the committee and the administration would give us a road map of how the curriculum exactly is going to be implemented. The second point I would like to make: as far as I know, the Council has not discussed the impact of the curriculum on non-tenured and tenure track faculty. Many of the classes that are at greatest risk in the humanities are taught by non-regular rank faculty. I’m particularly concerned about the foundation classes. Again, in our department and many other departments in the humanities, these are taught by non-regular rank faculty. The curriculum puts them in the line of fire without providing any protection because their job – we put the onus on them to persuade students why and how to continue developing foundational skills, and if they fail to do so, not only their departments or disciplines are at risk, but their very livelihood. I think that’s a very unfair position to put irregular faculty in. The next point I would like to make: a report published on February 28th of this year by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences has called for increasing foreign language learning capacity throughout the education system. I would like to request the committee to address specifically how it responds to this call by the American Academy. I think that Duke considering itself a leader of education has a responsibility to respond to that, to adopt these recommendations and to implement them. Thank you.

Full statement from the department:
Like others before me, we would like to express our gratitude to members of the IDC for the time and energy they put into thinking about the Duke curriculum and coming up with this draft for a new curriculum. Much as we appreciate the countless hours they put into it, however, we believe that the draft has to be judged according to its merit, not according to the labor put into it. And AMES faculty have serious concerns about the proposal.

First, whereas the proposal articulates ideals for a new Duke curriculum, it does not specify how these ideals would be put to work but in the broadest terms. A curriculum, however, is judged not by its guiding ideals but in its concrete implementation. Without a clear plan on how the ideals spelled out in the proposal are to be implemented, faculty are given no tools to assess the feasibility of the proposal, nor to determine—should it fail—whether this is due to the ideals or to the implementation. We therefore urge the IDC and the administration to work together to provide the council with a plan for the implementation of the curriculum before further discussion on whether to adopt it or not.

On the base of the current draft and without clear knowledge of how the curriculum is to be implemented, we have a number of grave concerns.

We are most concerned about the impact of the new curriculum on non-regular ranked faculty, i.e. instructors, lecturers and professors of the practice.

As many have noted, the new curriculum calls for significant additional labor in advisement and mentorship. Yet, both the IDC and the administration concur that the new curriculum would not require additional resources. At the same time, the new curriculum would surely result in reducing the number of classes in the humanities and sciences that address current curricular requirements and that are commonly taught (at least in the humanities) by non-regular ranked faculty. We call on the administration to make assurance that positions of non-regular faculty would not be cut to pay for the additional labor the new curriculum requires, to identify the resources to be used to fund the new curriculum and so to secure the positions of non-regular faculty.

The new curriculum further stipulates that current requirement in the humanities and the sciences would be replaced by “foundations.” It indeed states that students should be enticed to pursue these more deeply, but puts the onus on instructors to persuade students “why and how to continue” developing these. Many of the instructors who would be given the responsibility for teaching foundation classes (at least in the humanities) are non-regular ranked, the most venerable members of our faculty, and the proposal puts them in the line of fire, and does not provide them with any support.

In our opinion, this would greatly compromise the intellectual integrity of foundation classes: To persuade students to take additional foundation classes in less popular disciplines, instructors would have to do acrobatics, entertain and bend backward, putting marketing over academic rigor. For if instructors fail to do so, not only their department would face grave consequences (in a smaller number of majors), but they personally (losing their job).

We are also concerned about the diminished requirement for foreign languages in the new curriculum.

In a report published on February 28 of this year, the American Academy of Arts and Sciences has called for increasing foreign language learning capacity throughout the education system. The current proposal miserably fails to stand up to the call. Rather than increase the language learning capacity at Duke, it seeks to effectively decrease the number of language classes and the number of students who pursue language work beyond the basic elementary level.
We therefore call on the committee to rethink the curriculum and to come up with a proposal on how to address the report of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Broverman: I want to also point out that any written statement can be entered into the minutes so if you feel you didn’t get a chance to say your statement or you want people to see it in another format, feel free to submit them and they will be incorporated.

Jennifer Ahern-Dodson (TWP): We appreciate Blue Print’s foundational writing course as well as the opportunities within Blue Print for students to build on that writing experience. However, Blue Print does not provide a structure to ensure students’ meaningful engagement with writing beyond the first course.

We are not arguing for more courses for the TWP or trying to build an empire. But based on our pedagogical expertise and decades of research in higher education and writing studies scholarship, we feel strongly that we need to develop a plan to intentionally and deliberately integrate writing in the disciplines and the curriculum as a whole.

We’ve been arguing for more structure that ensures students are writing beyond the first year in a meaningful way, such as in the major or connected to the mentored creative or scholarly experience.

We believe it’s faculty in the disciplines who are best positioned to know and share the conventions of writing in their fields, and we want to support faculty in doing this teaching effectively.

Whether or not Blue Print passes, we would welcome the opportunity to revisit the goals and implementation of W--now WS--coded courses to promote excellence in writing at Duke, add a public speaking dimension, and create a better, more meaningful experience for students and faculty.

Hasso: We’re going to be voting no on Blue Print as is unless it’s significantly revised. But I guess I was provoked to get up because I wasn’t planning to get up, there’s no need for you to know how our department is going to vote. I find this narrative of “the students we want” a little bit offensive because I actually deal with the students I have and the students we have, they are way more complicated than they are being represented in some of this discourse. They are relying on us to do certain work and I also want to say as a parent who went to events when my children were being recruited to colleges and Duke did stand out in a recruitment that focused on sports. I mean, it stood out in events that included maybe eight institutions that I would, I’m very curious about data since many of us get the faculty tuition grant where our children go to school. My sort of ethical motivation here is I want students in my classrooms to get at least as good an education as those other places where students who don’t come to Duke come, because honestly in that room, I think we’re underestimating who we have now at Duke. The other issue with requirements is if we didn’t think requirements were important, then we should reduce them in majors with a lot of requirements because obviously there should be this self neo-liberal choosing subject will make the right choices so we can go that way.

Walter: I just want to make it clear that Mary handed me this piece of paper. Nobody here is from Computer Science and they have a statement they want read. These are their words, not mine:

The faculty in computer science are grateful that we have a month to think carefully about the Blue Print proposal. There is much to like, and we are hopeful that the issues with which we are grappling are ones we can sort out so that we can come to a consensus as to whether this new curriculum is good for Duke, Trinity College of Arts & Sciences, and the Department of Computer Science. (We are implementing a
sorting algorithm just for this purpose. Just kidding.) We are working on understanding the opportunities and obligations this new curriculum might engender and require.

We would like to acknowledge the research, care, and openness of the IDC committee in crafting a proposal built on a philosophy of allowing students flexibility and giving students ownership in realizing the goals of a liberal arts education. We are optimistic with some trepidation that these goals and ideals will be realized with resources for faculty and with deliberate consultation and approval of the faculty in the implementation phase. We urge each member of the Arts & Sciences Council to vote yes or no – and without amendments. Changes and adjustments can be made in the implementation phase if we approve this new curriculum. If we do not approve, we should perhaps reconvene a new committee – but we note that the IDC was extremely open in accepting input from each and every one of us. Thank you.

So I wasn’t planning on getting up and saying anything, but since I’m here anyway and for diversity of opinion, I’ll let you know that we had a discussion about this in the Physics Department last week. I led a discussion of what the proposal looked like and people have some concerns and so there are some clarifications that I’m going to try to talk to you offline, but they are generally supportive of the plan, mostly because they feel you guys worked so hard and were so accepting of input and you tried to sort of do an impossible job. Thanks.

Robert Wolpert (Statistical Science): My department has instructed me to vote no. Science curricula are vertical or tiered in the sense that later courses build on earlier ones. If you take interesting courses in your senior year, challenging ones, you have to have done medium-level courses in your junior year. To take those, you have to have taken intermediate courses your sophomore year. To take those, you have to have taken calculus and linear algebra in your freshman year. So there is a considerable demand. It’s hard to do STEM stuff and I think that the proposal will make it harder. It will mean less success for Duke in the sciences.

A couple of specifics: the requirement to have every student do mentored individual studies we take issue with. Right now we offer the opportunity to do that and students who are suited to do that, whose gifts and motivation lead them to do that, have that opportunity and follow it. The ones who don’t are going to be very difficult students to mentor. They are going to take a lot of faculty time. It seems to be a bit of an unfunded mandate. We now have 85 percent of students pursue a second concentration, major, certificate, something like that. The 15 percent who don’t have reasons for not doing it. I don’t see why, what benefit there is to us, to forbid them from having the opportunity of doing something different from what the 85 percent of students do. They may want to take a deeper dive into a subject and be excellent at it; they don’t want to spend their other time doing music or something else that doesn’t fit into the structure of majors, so I see us taking away opportunities for students to make their own choices.

Full statement from the department:

The consensus of our faculty is that we will vote ’no’ on BluePrint absent satisfactory resolution of the following items:

Lack of Clarity/Detail: There is widespread concern among our faculty about being pressed to vote on this sweeping proposal absent a very clear and detailed description of: the new requirements imposed by the proposed curriculum on our students accompanied by an evidence-based motivation for each; its impact on our faculty, including but not limited to, rebalancing of teaching loads, time spent developing new courses and time spent on mentored research efforts; its impact on our degree program, especially as it impacts timely progression through the requirements of our major; and its impact on our service teaching.
Secondary Depth: Our faculty are opposed to the secondary depth as a requirement but are very happy to see it encouraged of those students who are interested in and will benefit from it. Specific criticisms include: The secondary depth is likely to become a check-box not taken seriously and completed without much thought or dedication by many (but clearly not all) students. It restricts a student’s flexibility to take what they want, especially in their later years. It will be plagued by operational problems. Namely, it will create headaches for scheduling and advising and will put some students in awkward positions. For example, what happens to the student who changes her mind about the secondary area in the third year? Is she forced to take classes that she doesn’t want to take? What happens to the stats/science student who wants to study abroad? How is she going to fit in the secondary depth requirement and complete the major? The proposal does not include evidence that (the 17% of) students who do not currently do a secondary degree (minor, certificate) have an educationally less valuable experience than those who do.

Mentored Experience: We believe that not every student needs or will benefit from a mentored experience and are concerned that this requirement will broaden the definition of mentored research in such a way that, for some students, the requirement will be a fulfilled in a check-box manner without a genuine interest in mentored research. We are also very concerned about the potential impact of this requirement on already stretched faculty schedules. The recently circulated FAQ states that this requirement is not expected to be "a significant additive burden" on faculty time, however in implementation it likely will be an additive burden on some faculty more than others.

Huston: I am a member of what clearly is an emerging socio-type of someone who supports Blue Print but has been instructed not to, to vote against it. Most of the objections of my colleagues have already been registered clearly, but I do want to emphasize one, which is I’m the fourth person to raise the issues of teachers as laborers. My colleagues and tenure-lined people are not so worried about what will happen to non-regular rank faculty, but they are worried about what many of them see as a move toward casualization of academic labor. My own feeling is that is way bigger than the curriculum and so I simply want to take this opportunity to say that this is something that I hope and intend to do something about and I’m putting out an appeal to other people who think this is important to get in contact with me so we can start informal discussions.

José María Rodríguez-García (Romance Studies): I’ve been empowered and instructed by the faculty in my Department to convey to the Council our fundamental disagreement with the proposal issued by the IDC Committee. Romance Studies voted (on separate ballots) NO on Blue Print as it currently stands and YES on a projected Subsidiary Motion to Amend key paragraphs in it. My remarks won’t touch on the Motion to Amend since we haven’t yet reached the approval stage at which such motions may be introduced to the floor of the assembly. In the interest of time, I’ll expand instead (see minutes from Feb. 9 meeting) on the reasons why the majority of the faculty in Romance Studies opposes Blue Print with the noteworthy exception of two Blue Print advocates – professors David Bell and Liliana Paredes – strategically chosen for membership on the IDC Committee. First, Blue Print constitutes a radical, unprecedented departure from any form of liberal arts curriculum which has effectively been implemented anywhere, yet the circulated document seems lacking in both substance and detail simply because it’s a requirement-light (almost requirement-free) course of study. Second (and relatedly), from the moment the first draft of the projected curriculum was circulated, each successive version has looked incoherent in relation to the preceding one while each draft has attracted as many expressions of disapproval as endorsements. In other words, points # 1 and # 2 highlight how divisive a detail-free proposal on a requirement-free curriculum has been and continues to be. This circumstance alone has sufficed to convince several departments that an UP or DOWN vote on Blue Print with no room for
Motions to Amend (and this was the initial position adopted by the Arts & Sciences Council Executive Committee) constitutes a “very weak” instance of inclusive democratic representation and decision-making. Third (and also related to #1 and #2), its sustained performance of mutual (active) listening notwithstanding, the IDC Committee has never addressed satisfactorily the implications of advancing a “lightweight” course of study (as it’s already been labeled) at Duke with too many “ways out” for those students who may not readily respond to Blue Print’s “invitation” to enroll in courses representing a significant portion of the eleven Modes of Inquiry and Areas of Knowledge identified in C2K. Fourth, neither a clearly defined plan on advising and implementation nor a detailed budget for financing the implementation phase of Blue Print are yet extant, or at least haven’t been shared with the faculty at large. “We’ll deal with that later without compromising excellence” is all we’ve heard as well from the Associate Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. And fifth, Blue Print provides no convincing pedagogical rationale for its proposed radical departure in educational practices other than a few papers in the very narrow field of applied neurosciences, whose findings are incompatible with either longstanding or recently adopted pedagogical protocols for teaching undergraduates in multiple individual disciplines, as other Blue Print critics have also noted.

Munger: I want to say something about where we are. So a proposal was received from the IDC and it had two parts. One was a substantive proposal for the amendment of the curriculum. The second was a procedure on which it would be voted, that it would be voted on an up or down vote. The ruling of the chair was that those two things would be linked. Now that means that the proposal is taking a chance because you might vote no because you object to the procedure or you might vote no because you object to the substantive proposal. But that is the ruling of the chair. An exception to that ruling was registered by Professor Gonzalez, an email was distributed on that question. My understanding is the chair has ruled that that should be taken in your decision about whether to decide whether to vote yes or no on these two that are linked. Afterwards, if you vote yes, there will be a chance to vote on amendments. If you vote no, someone else could raise a new motion which could include the entire proposal or some modification of it. So the problem with parliamentary procedure is that the goal is to make sure that the majority gets its way and the minority gets its say. So we’re trying to navigate very difficult chill waters here and I want Professor Gonzalez to think, to feel, to know that his objection was both heard and will be acted. But my understanding at this point is that the ruling of the chair is that the two things will be voted, the procedure and the substantive matter will be voted on together as was the request of the committee. Thank you.

Resolution to Support and Defend all Members of the Duke Community

Broverman: Next on the agenda, Frances Hasso wanted to do a discussion on the resolution that was raised in our last committee meeting. It was introduced briefly.

Hasso: Thank you for taking the time to collectively consider supporting this statement in defense of all members of the Duke community. The resolution is the same as previously shared last month, except it includes one footnote flagging the content of the March 6, 2017 executive order issued by the White House and that footnote just sort of describes it and gives you a link. As I stated at our last meeting, I think it’s important for us to use A&S Council actively as a governance body and to recognize the value of our own ability as faculty to speak to each other, to our students, and to our multiple audiences and communities. So what I’d like to do now is open it up for any questions. A lot of people participated by email and this version reflects some of their great comments, I was really pleased and then hopefully we can call the question and vote anonymously. Thank you. Do people have any questions or comments?

Matory: On page one of the proposal we saw before, it implied you would resist federal law enforcement aimed at affecting such students, but I’d like to urge us also to be aware that state authorities and local authorities are involved in this project as well, and this is both a statement about our concerns, I think it
would be appropriate to express our concerns about local law enforcement and state law enforcement as well. There are egregious cases related to local law enforcement.

**Hasso:** Basically, I cribbed language from multiple resolutions that came out maybe in the first week after the resolution by public libraries, university bodies, city councils, so I don’t know the law well enough to sort of mess with this, and then I kind of slightly revised it for the Duke context. So the parts that are resolved are actually on the back page.

**Huston:** I’m just wondering whether, I don’t know when this would be appropriate procedurally but whether Randy would be willing to offer a friendly amendment to that.

**Hasso:** If there’s a friendly amendment, are we allowed still to vote today?

**Munger:** If you interpret it as friendly, then we can.

**Hasso:** So be specific, though. Might as well write it in.

**Josh Sosin (Classical Studies):** May I ask, would simply striking the word ‘federal’ achieve the scope you have in mind, Randy?

**Matory:** Mm hmm.

**Hasso:** Okay, striking the word ‘federal’ in where …

**Matory:** Actually I haven’t seen this particular draft. It was a different draft, this is targeted specifically to Trump’s executive order.

**Hasso:** So is the federal thing resolved?

**Matory:** It is moot.

**Hasso:** Okay. Lee?

**Baker:** Can you just give us a couple of bullets of how this is distinguished from Dick’s statement that he’s made and Academic Council has done?

**Hasso:** I can’t speak to those things specifically. This is actually about this body as a governance body making a statement about what it feels and it believes. We have no policing authority, we have no judiciary, you know what I mean? So it’s symbolic but yet very, very important and many of us actually feel vulnerable and I think it’s important to recognize that here and now, and that’s different. We’re also asking the university to do certain things and not do certain things, but I still think it’s worthy, it’s important for us to make a statement as the Arts & Sciences Council.

**Leslie Digby (Evolutionary Anthropology):** You said something that made me a little nervous, that you cribbed it from other documents. The last thing we need is some websites kind of calling out that parts are actually literally plagiarized or taken from others. Could you clarify please?

**Hasso:** So that was a long time ago, it was like two days after the … but I actually did look at multiple resolutions from all over the country and I edited them. Some of it might match, but not in a way an entire sentence matches or … I mean basically there’s certain principles that a lot of people are sort of working around to deal with it.
Digby: So it’s not professors voting on plagiarized document?

Hasso: No, I promise you that. I just wanted you to know in a sense that I couldn’t literally think through all of the aspects of it that a university might want. I can look at it again. There’s no fully copied sentence. I mean, I did this in an hour and a half.

Matory: Sorry, I’ve had a further look and there are two specific places where we specify our principled resistance to certain requests from federal law enforcement agencies and with respect to federal immigration law, so I think it would be valuable to add ‘federal, state and local’ law enforcement and perhaps strike the final version which says ‘federal immigration laws.’ Though is the federal government the only one that issues immigration laws?

Hasso: Yes, that part is very important.

Matory: Whereas federal, state and local law enforcement activities on or around college property, whether by surveillance, interview, demand for information, arrest, detention, or any other means significantly interfere with the ability of all members of the Duke community to deliver, pursue and support education and knowledge and creative production, etc., etc., and that it’s resolved that and then the further principles, so that we include federal, state and local law enforcement agencies.

Hasso: In two locations?

Matory: No, just one.

Hasso: Okay. I take that as a friendly amendment.

Matory: It’s intended to be.

Munger: She has to agree it is.

Hasso: That’s why I did that.

Broverman: So people know, if we’re doing a vote, we’re doing it on the new amended version.

Hasso: Which is the top whereas on page two. So any other questions or comments?

Broverman: Is there a motion on the floor to vote on this? [A motion was moved and seconded. The following resolution was approved 21-3-4:]

Resolution to Support and Defend all Members of the Duke Community

Duke University
Trinity Arts & Sciences Faculty Council
February 9, 2017; footnote #1 appended March 7, 2017

1 This resolution was informed by multiple statements produced by city councils, schools and library associations, especially the “Safe Zones Resolution for Higher Ed Institutions” template from the National Education Association: http://educationvotes.nea.org/2017/01/14/schools-front-lines-nationwide-movement-protect-undocumented-students/.
Whereas on January 25, 2017, President Donald J. Trump signed the Executive Order BORDER SECURITY AND IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT IMPROVEMENTS which calls for “the immediate construction of a physical wall on the southern border” between the U.S. and Mexico and expedited removal of certain non-citizens;

Whereas on January 27, 2017, President Donald J. Trump signed the Executive Order PROTECTING THE NATION FROM FOREIGN TERRORIST ENTRY INTO THE UNITED STATES which suspends the admission of Syrian refugees indefinitely and all other refugees for 120 days and revokes existing visas and suspends for at least 90 days the issuance of visas and entry into the US of immigrant and nonimmigrant aliens from seven countries in Africa and Asia (Iran, Iraq, Yemen, Libya, Syria, Sudan and Somalia);  

Whereas many members of the Duke and Durham community are affected by these orders that do not keep us safe from violence;

Whereas the faculty of Duke University welcomes, supports and respects all students, staff, and faculty colleagues, holding equality and non-discrimination, including freedom of religion and religious expression, as core values;

Whereas we are a community committed to building bridges not walls and condemn Islamophobia and other forms of bigotry, xenophobia and racism;

Whereas the President of Duke has signed a statement asking D.J. Trump to rectify or rescind the travel ban;

Whereas federal, state and local law enforcement activities on or around college property, whether by surveillance, interview, demand for information, arrest, detention, or any other means significantly interfere with the ability of all members of the Duke community to deliver, pursue and support education and knowledge and creative production;

Whereas we are all committed to a safe campus and city and a learning environment free from violence, threats and harassment; and

Whereas many members of the Duke and Durham community have expressed legitimate fears, experienced harassment and are facing hardship because of their religion, racialization, or citizenship status; now therefore be it

Resolved that the Trinity College Arts and Sciences Faculty Council of Duke University:

---

Footnote:

2 Because this order “has been delayed by litigation,” on March 6, 2017, Donald Trump issued a new Executive Order titled, “Protecting The Nation From Foreign Terrorist Entry Into The United States.” Most significantly in its changes, the March 6 order drops Iraq from the list of sending nationalities: “until the assessment of current screening and vetting procedures required by section 2 of this order is completed, the risk of erroneously permitting entry of a national of one of these countries who intends to commit terrorist acts or otherwise harm the national security of the United States is unacceptably high. Accordingly, while that assessment is ongoing, I am imposing a temporary pause on the entry of nationals from Iran, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen, subject to categorical exceptions and case-by-case waivers, as described in section 3 of this order.” [https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/03/06/executive-order-protecting-nation-foreign-terrorist-entry-united-states](https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/03/06/executive-order-protecting-nation-foreign-terrorist-entry-united-states)
1. Reject the idea of a promised “wall” at the boundary between the US and Mexico and reject the premise that community and family members south of the border or with attachments south of the border are threats to our safety or livelihoods;
2. Condemn any discrimination or disparate treatment of individuals and groups on the basis of race, color, religion, gender, sexuality, national origin, or citizenship status;
3. Urge all offices of the University to do everything in their power to facilitate the core mission of education, research and creativity by offering needed support and sanctuary and assuring a safe zone for all threatened members of the Duke community so all can thrive and seek assistance as needed;
4. Urge the administration and Board of Trustees to adopt a policy requiring that any request by ICE or other immigration enforcement agents to visit campus should be presented to the President’s Office for review as to whether access is permitted by law, a judicial warrant is required, or any other legal considerations apply; this review should be made expeditiously, but before any immigration officer or agent appears on campus; and
5. Urge the administration and Board of Trustees to adopt a policy that campus police will not detain, question, arrest, or contact any individual solely on the basis of suspected undocumented immigration status or to discover the immigration status of an individual or to request information about immigration status from crime victims or witnesses; and that they not detain an individual in response to an immigration hold request from ICE or any other agency enforcing federal immigration law.

**Broverman:** Thank you and we’ll see you in April. Please remember if you want to submit a written statement, we’ll include it in the minutes.