

# REPORT OF THE CURRICULUM 2000 REVIEW COMMITTEE

Trinity College of Arts and Sciences  
Duke University

February 2004

## **COMMITTEE MEMBERS:**

Anne Allison (Cultural Anthropology)  
Edna Andrews (Slavic Languages & Literature)  
David Beratan (Chemistry)  
Peter Feaver (Political Science)  
Elizabeth Fenn (History)  
Devon MacWilliam (Student representative)  
Stephen Nowicki (Biology), *Chair*  
Avery Reaves (Student representative, DSG VP for Academic Affairs)  
Robert J. Thompson Jr. (Dean of Trinity College)  
Maurice Wallace (English)  
Ellen Wittig (Associate Dean, Trinity College)

## SUMMARY OF PROPOSED RECOMMENDATIONS

- I. Revisions to Areas of Knowledge
  - A. Rename “Arts & Literature” as “Arts, Literature & Performance”
  - B. Create new Area of Knowledge called “Quantitative Studies”
  - C. Require only two courses in each of the five Areas of Knowledge
  - D. Allow 2nd-year FL courses (60 & 70 level) to carry an Area of Knowledge code
  
- II. Revisions to cross-area (“inquiry/competency”) requirements
  - A. Eliminate the IAA and QID designations
  - B. Unify all requirements under a single designation called “Modes of Inquiry”
  - C. Allow students to count all Modes of Inquiry codes carried by a course
  - D. Allow transfer credit to be applied to Modes of Inquiry requirements
  - E. Allow both R designations to be obtained outside a student’s major
  - F. Clarify criteria for STS and CCI Modes of Inquiry codes
  
- III. Recommendations to the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences
  - A. Establish an ad hoc faculty committee responsible for coding of transfer credit courses for a period of at least two years
  - B. Work with Pre-Major Advising to improve communication of the goals and requirements of the curriculum to first-year students
  - C. Work with Pre-Major Advising to ensure that individual Departments and multi-department groups are involved fully in the development of area- specific advising recommendations
  - D. Address problems associated with support of the foreign language requirement
  - E. Address problems associated with support of the “Writing in the Disciplines” requirement

## COMPARISON OF CURRENT AND PROPOSED CURRICULAR REQUIREMENTS

<b>CURRENT</b>		<b>PROPOSED</b>	
<b>Required Courses</b>		<b>Required Courses</b>	
Areas of Knowledge		Areas of Knowledge	
AL 3 courses		AL&P 2 courses	
CZ 3 courses		CZ 2 courses	
SS 3 courses		SS 2 courses	
NS/M* 3 courses		NS 2 courses	
* at least 2 in NS		QS 2 courses	
	<b>Total = 12</b>		<b>Total = 10</b>
<b>Required “Exposures”</b>		<b>Required “Exposures”</b>	
Modes of Inquiry		Modes of Inquiry	
QID 2 courses		CCI 2 courses	
IAA 2 courses		STS 2 courses	
Focused Inquiries		EI 2 courses	
CCI 2 courses		FL 1-3 courses	
STS 2 courses		W 3 courses	
EI 2 courses		R 2 courses	
Competencies			<b>Total = 12-14</b>
FL 1-3 courses			
W 3 courses			
R 2 courses	<b>Total = 16-18</b>		

**KEY:** AL = Arts & Literature, CZ = Civilizations, SS = Social Sciences, NS/M = Natural Sciences/Mathematics, AL&P = Arts, Literature, & Performance (proposed), QS = Quantitative Studies (proposed), QID = Quantitative, Inductive, & Deductive Reasoning, IAA = Interpretative and Aesthetic Approaches, CCI = Cross-Cultural Inquiry, STS = Science, Technology, & Society, EI = Ethical Inquiry, FL = Foreign Language, W = Writing, R = Research

## INTRODUCTION

The concept of a liberal arts education is central to what it means to be an American university. The curriculum of a university, in turn, is central to how that institution imparts its view of what it means to be an educated person. Although it is difficult to settle on a single set of credentials that define an ideal liberal arts education, most would agree that some framework must be provided to ensure that students are exposed to a broad range of subjects and ways of thinking about the world during their undergraduate education. Within this framework, however, a balance must be struck between specifying the particulars that embody the institution's educational goals and allowing the flexibility needed for students to add depth and breadth to their nascent intellectual interests.

Four years ago, Duke University introduced an innovative and ambitious new curriculum, one that was intended to reaffirm Duke's commitment to the ideal of a liberal arts education and to signal Duke's leadership in higher education in the 21st century. This new curriculum was given the name "Curriculum 2000" to reflect its forward-looking nature. Curriculum 2000 was indeed bold and far-reaching. It has contributed to Duke's continued prominence among the elite universities of our nation and the world, and it has made a clear statement to those outside our community that Duke is serious about its commitment to forward-looking undergraduate education. At the core of this new curriculum was the recognition that courses often teach more to students than the substance of a particular topic. In addition, courses offer exposure to different ways of thinking that transcend the topic under discussion. Thus, Curriculum 2000 introduced a novel curricular framework in which courses may be designated not only in terms of their subject matter (representing more traditionally defined areas in the humanities, social sciences and natural sciences and referred to as "Areas of Knowledge" in the Duke curriculum) but also in terms of the perspective or intellectual approach taken to that subject matter (currently referred to as "Modes of Inquiry," "Focused Inquiries," and "Competencies"). This new curriculum, through its implementation of these "cross-cutting" designations, both emphasized the importance of pedagogical approaches to the development of deep intellectual skills and provided a platform for affirming the importance of writing, research, and instruction in foreign languages as "ways of knowing" in a liberal arts education.

Like any bold and far-reaching plan, Curriculum 2000 carried with it some degree of uncertainty as to exactly how it would unfold. No ambitious plan is without risk. Part of the wisdom of the original implementation of Curriculum 2000, however, was to call for a review of the curriculum following its fourth year. To this end, a committee was formed in 2003 to assess the progress of the curriculum and to recommend any adjustments needed to correct unanticipated shortcomings of the new curriculum. What follows is the report of that review committee, identifying several unforeseen complications that have emerged and recommending several revisions to Curriculum 2000 intended address those shortcomings.

## **THE DELIBERATIVE PROCESS**

The review committee was formed in April 2003 and charged by Dean William A. Chafe to gather information about the successes and failures of Curriculum 2000 and to recommend adjustments to the curriculum as needed to address issues that were uncovered. The summer months were occupied largely by information gathering – obtaining data from Registrar records to analyze trends in enrollments and the completion of curricular requirements by students, conducting a formal survey of student reaction to the curriculum, and soliciting written input from faculty. Commentary was solicited from Directors of Undergraduate Studies, department Chairs, Pre-Major advisors, and a number of administrators. This request for input yielded written commentary from a wide variety of other faculty members as well. Over fifty individuals submitted over 100 single-spaced pages of written remarks on their views of Curriculum 2000, both positive and negative. This input also included a proposal for modifying the curriculum submitted by the Chairs of science departments to Dean Chafe in February 2002.

The Committee began its deliberations in earnest at the beginning of September 2003, meeting weekly throughout the fall semester. During the fall, the Committee also sponsored three forums for undergraduates and two forums for faculty as an additional means of gathering opinion about the curriculum. Two additional formal surveys were conducted, one aimed at Pre-Major advisors and the second targeted at students involved with Study Abroad programs. The first two months of deliberations were occupied with analyzing the large volume of information available to the Committee, in an effort to identify major concerns with the curriculum.

The Committee decided early on in its deliberations that the review process would proceed best as a dialogue that allowed ample opportunity for input from the community not only at the outset, but throughout the process as ideas for addressing identified concerns were developed. To that end, the chair of the review Committee began to meet with various interest groups (e.g., the Academic Dean staff, department Chairs, key administrators) and also with the Executive Committee of the Arts and Sciences Council (ECASC) to begin to discuss major issues the Committee had identified and possible revisions to the curriculum intended to address those issues. After a number of such preliminary discussions, the Committee unveiled a draft of its final recommendations to a combined meeting of department Chairs and Directors of Undergraduate Studies in mid-December of 2003. The Committee returned to its deliberations in January, revising some of its proposed recommendations in response to the concerns and insights of Chairs and Directors of Undergraduate Studies. Significant additional input in response to the initial draft of recommendations was also received from a meeting with the Languages Committee in December 2003 and a meeting of the Chairs of humanities departments in January 2004, as well as from further discussion with ECASC.

## RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE REVIEW COMMITTEE: OVERVIEW

The Committee agreed that the fundamental conceptual framework of Curriculum 2000 as it was originally implemented is sound, and that this framework provides an excellent venue for representing Duke's distinctive commitment to undergraduate liberal arts education. This agreement followed discussion of the role of curricula in general and, more specifically, of the goals and rationale provided by the Lange committee's final proposal for Curriculum 2000. At the same time, input from faculty, students, and administrators led the Committee to conclude that some aspects of the curriculum as it is currently implemented place excessive constraints on students' course choices, with the unintended consequence of diminishing opportunities for students to explore more than a single interest in depth, such as by double-majoring in disparate subjects. This interpretation is consistent with an observed decrease in the number of double-majors, from 17% in the Class of 2003 (the last class to graduate under the previous curriculum) to 12% in the Class of 2004.<sup>1</sup> A related negative consequence has been to prevent students from exploring a single area in enough detail to prepare them for graduate studies. These constraints have been experienced most clearly by students having their primary major in the sciences.

In addition to concluding that some aspects of the curriculum have imposed unintended constraints on students, the Committee also concluded that a number of concerns expressed about Curriculum 2000 have as much to do with the perceived complexity of the curriculum as they do with any real limitation. To put it simply, the apparent complexity of the curriculum made it difficult for some students and faculty to connect the details of the requirements they must satisfy with the overarching rationale and goals of the curriculum. Some of this misunderstanding, of course, must be addressed by better communicating the conceptual framework of the curriculum to the Duke community (see "Recommendations to the Dean" below). However, the Committee concluded that some aspects of the curriculum are indeed unnecessarily complex.

Given these general conclusions, the Committee adopted as a guiding principle the imperative to simplify the curriculum in a way that would offer meaningful additional degrees of freedom in students' course choices and clarify the conceptual goals of the curriculum, while at the same time maintaining the intellectual framework articulated originally for Curriculum 2000. With additional degrees of freedom, students will be better able to achieve both breadth and depth within the structure of the curriculum. Although it is of course impossible to predict with certainty the outcome of relaxing curricular requirements, all indications suggest that the most likely consequence – one viewed as highly desirable by the Committee – will be an increase in the number of double-majors, especially in the number of students having double-majors in disparate areas such as in the humanities and the sciences.

---

<sup>1</sup> This and other quantitative statements concerning registration trends and progress of students completing curricular requirements are from "Curriculum 2000 Analysis," an analysis of data obtained from Registrar records prepared by the Curriculum 2000 Review Committee. Document available online at: <http://www.aas.duke.edu/trinity/c2k-analysis>

A variety of alternatives for achieving the goal of simplifying curricular requirements while at the same time maintaining the intellectual framework of Curriculum 2000 were discussed in light of the data and commentary available. It became apparent from these discussions that the most effective way to relax unintended constraints imposed by the present curriculum was to reduce the total number of courses required across Areas of Knowledge. It also became apparent that the most effective way to simplify the structure of the curriculum without undermining its conceptual organization was to streamline the “cross-cutting” requirements (currently “Modes of Inquiry,” “Focused Inquiries,” and “Competencies”) by eliminating functionally redundant requirements and by grouping the remaining requirements into a single, unified category. The committee developed five specific recommendations for modifying the organization of the curriculum that are intended to achieve these goals (I A-C and II A&B in the Summary found on page 2). These five revisions are outlined in more detail in the section “Increasing Degrees of Freedom and Reducing Complexity,” below.<sup>2</sup>

In addition to recommendations concerning the organization of the curriculum, the Committee also developed an additional five recommendations intended to address a set of more specific concerns that have arisen with the implementation of Curriculum 2000. These proposed revisions further reduce unintended constraints imposed by the curriculum, but they more specifically target concerns raised with regard to the implementation of the foreign language requirement, the transfer of credit from other institutions, the implementation of the research requirement, and clarification of the criteria used by the Arts and Sciences Committee on Courses to assign some cross-disciplinary codes (I D and II C-F in the Summary of Proposed Recommendations found on page 2). These five revisions are outlined in more detail in the section “Additional Proposed Adjustments to the Curriculum,” below.

It also became clear to the Committee that several issues and concerns uncovered in the course of its deliberations do not reflect difficulties the curriculum *per se*, but instead reflect failings in some aspects of how the curriculum has been implemented over the last four years. Overall, the implementation of this ambitious curriculum has been largely successful in terms of the ability of the faculty to develop new courses and new ways of thinking about the roles of existing courses in the curriculum, in terms of the ability of the administration to support these developments, and in terms of the ability of the Class of 2004 to successfully complete both their general education and major requirements. Nonetheless, some work remains to be done, most notably in the areas of providing further logistic support for implementing the foreign language and Writing in the

---

<sup>2</sup> The “Summary of Proposed Recommendations” found at the beginning of this report separates proposed revisions of the curriculum into two categories according to whether they modify aspects of the curriculum involving Areas of Knowledge (recommendations I A-E) or modify aspects of the curriculum involving cross-cutting requirements (recommendations II A-E). These two dimensions of the curriculum correspond to what has been referred to the “rows” and “columns” of the “matrix” representation of Curriculum 2000. Note that the review Committee decided to minimize reference to the “matrix” in the presentation of its recommendations because it was felt by many that the “matrix” itself, while being a useful visual tool for keeping track of progress toward completing requirements, actually contributes to misunderstanding of the goals and overarching principles of the curriculum.

Discipline requirements, and in the area of better communicating the philosophy and goals of the curriculum to incoming students. To address these concerns, the Committee developed a specific set of five recommendations to the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences (III A-E in the Summary of Proposed Recommendations found on page 2). These recommendations are outlined in more detail in the section “Recommendations to the Dean,” below.

## **INCREASING DEGREES OF FREEDOM AND REDUCING COMPLEXITY**

Five proposed revisions to the curriculum are intended both to increase flexibility in students’ course choices and to simplify the conceptual framework of the curriculum, without fundamentally changing the overarching goals originally proposed for Curriculum 2000. These five revisions represent the most substantive changes proposed by the committee and their impact on the structure of the curriculum is best considered in aggregate.

### ***Recommendations:***

- I A. Rename the “Arts and Literature” (AL) Area of Knowledge as “Arts, Literature, and Performance (AL&P)
- I B. Create a new Area of Knowledge called “Quantitative Studies” (QS)
- I C. Require only two courses in each of the five Areas of Knowledge (AL&P, CZ, SS, NS, and QS)
- II A. Eliminate the “Interpretive and Aesthetic Approaches” (IAA) and “Quantitative, Inductive, and Deductive Reasoning” (QID) designations
- II B. Unify all cross-area requirements (currently “Modes of Inquiry,” “Focused Inquiries,” and “Competencies”) under a single designation called “Modes of Inquiry”

### ***Rationale:***

The most urgent and important goal of the proposed revisions is to allow for a greater number of degrees of freedom in students’ course choices by relaxing the number of requirements imposed by the curriculum. Although data from the Registrar demonstrate that the first cohort of students to graduate under Curriculum 2000 was able to meet the requirements of this more demanding curriculum, there was a strong sense expressed by both students and their faculty advisors that students felt forced to choose some courses simply to “fill in the matrix” It appears likely that the reduction in the number of double majors is a consequence of this pressure to complete curricular requirements, a trend that also correlates with the reduction in the number of majors in several humanities departments. This negative impact of curricular constraints has been felt most by students having their first majors in the sciences and by students in other majors requiring significant number of co-requisite courses. The Committee concluded that the single most effective means of increasing degrees of freedom is to reduce the total number of required Area of Knowledge courses. The science Chairs proposal sent to Dean Chafe in

February 2002 suggested an alternative means for reducing curricular constraints that would be applied specifically to students completing B.S. degrees, but the Committee did not support the idea of creating separate curricular requirements for B.S. and A.B. degrees. The proposal to reduce Area of Knowledge requirements from 12 to 10 courses accomplishes the same end, but does so in a way that relaxes constraints equitably for students in all disciplines.

The second most important goal of the proposed revisions is to reduce the real and perceived complexity of the curriculum. Here, the Committee concluded that most progress could be made by simplifying the “cross-cutting” dimensions of the curriculum. To do so, the Committee sought both to remove redundancy in these dimensions and to unify all dimensions under a single rubric. Although faculty and students commented extensively on the implementation of the STS and CCI “Focused Inquiries” (see “Additional Proposed Adjustments to the Curriculum” below), the Committee concluded that both of these designations make essential contributions to the curriculum as cross-cutting intellectual themes. However, it became clear that the IAA and QID “Modes of Inquiry” are not serving their intended functions in the curriculum. Designed originally as a mechanism to highlight different modes of thinking and ways of reaching understanding in a discipline, both designations have become viewed as being largely redundant with Areas of Knowledge. To put it another way, students are satisfying their IAA requirement, and to a lesser extent their QID requirement, simply by satisfying their Area of Knowledge requirements. IAA also suffers from becoming effectively redundant with the cross-cutting CCI designation as well. The redundancy of these curricular designations is illustrated by the fact that, at present, 64% of courses carrying three codes having *both* an IAA and CCI code (with 39% of *all* coded courses at Duke carrying the IAA code). Overall, it was clear to the Committee that the “Modes of Inquiry” designations are not challenging students to enroll in courses they might not choose otherwise. Thus, these codes are at best only adding a redundant dimension of complexity to the curriculum; at worst, they are contributing to a cynical view that cross-cutting designations in general add no meaningful value to the curriculum overall.

The proposed elimination of the IAA and QID Modes of Inquiry presented the Committee with an additional opportunity for conceptually simplifying the overall structure of curriculum by unifying all cross-cutting dimensions of the curriculum in a single category. As originally conceived, the cross-cutting dimensions of Curriculum 2000 fell into three categories – Modes of Inquiry, Focused Inquiries, and Competencies – each of which was thought to provide a different kind of connection across more traditionally defined Areas of Knowledge. The presence of three cross-cutting categories in the curriculum has made it unnecessarily difficult to articulate their value overall, however. Further, the choice of the name “Competencies” was regrettable because it unintentionally suggested that the curricular elements represented in this category are mere skills and not fully valid ways of thinking and knowing. Uniting all cross-cutting dimensions under a single rubric titled “Modes of Inquiry” both greatly simplifies the conceptual structure of the curriculum and corrects this perceived imbalance in the intellectual value of different cross-cutting dimensions.

At the same time, the proposed elimination of IAA and QID presented the Committee with two new challenges to be addressed. The first of these challenges was to ensure that the visibility of the creative and performing arts as an important element of the Duke curriculum was not diminished by the loss of the IAA designation. It is important to bear in mind the fact that the IAA designation does not in any functional way ensure that students gain exposure to the arts. Most tellingly, only 37% of courses bearing the IAA code are associated with the creative and performing arts. Nonetheless, the presence of IAA in the curriculum is viewed by many faculty as an important flag. Concern over this issue was expressed by faculty in the creative and performing arts during and following the initial presentation to Chairs and Directors of Undergraduate Studies in December 2003. The culmination of this discussion was a meeting of humanities Chairs held in January 2004 that generated a resolution sent to the Committee. This resolution, first, strongly endorsed the Committee's efforts to relax requirements overall and, second, recommended changing the name of the Arts and Literature Area of Knowledge to better emphasize the creative and performing arts. The Committee adopted this suggestion.<sup>3</sup>

The current description in the Bulletin of the two Areas of Knowledge that span the humanities at Duke states "Through courses in arts and literature students learn about the creative products of the human intellect; courses about civilizations ask students to attend to the analysis and evaluation of ideas and events that shape civilizations past and present." The proposed addition of the word "Performance" to the title of "Arts and Literature" is intended to emphasize the creative and performing arts as an important facet of the Area of Knowledge. Thus, the committee recommends emending the description of this area in the Bulletin to read "Through courses in arts, literature, and performance students learn about the creative products of the human intellect and their artistic expression; courses about civilizations ask..."

The second challenge raised by the elimination of IAA and QID as Modes of Inquiry was the loss of a mechanism to ensure exposure to quantitative studies, including mathematics, statistics, and computer science. A major goal of the original formulation of Curriculum 2000 was to require exposure to several aspects of liberal arts education that were deemed critical but were being missed routinely by Duke students under the previous curriculum, most notably exposure to foreign languages and exposure to quantitative studies. Although the foreign language requirement of Curriculum 2000 has clearly addressed the former concern, the original implementation of the curriculum fell short of the latter goal. Under the current curriculum, students are effectively required to take only a single course in quantitative studies throughout their entire undergraduate career, through the somewhat awkward addition of the "M" ("mathematics") sub-requirement in QID. The creation of a new Area of Knowledge in "Quantitative Studies" will subsume the intended exposure to quantitative thinking embodied in the original formulation of Curriculum 2000. This proposed change also reflects the conclusion of

---

<sup>3</sup> The specific name suggested by the humanities Chairs was "Arts, Literature, Performance, and Creative Practice." The Committee was concerned that the length of this name might devalue its iconic impact and thus settled on the shorter "Arts, Literature, and Performance." It should be stressed that the Committee would accept the originally proposed name or alternative names for this Area of Knowledge proposed with the consensus of the humanities Chairs.

the Committee that quantitative studies in mathematics, statistics, and computer science (as well as other disciplines that rely on these areas for understanding and creating knowledge) are more validly represented in the Duke curriculum as an Area of Knowledge, subdividing the broad area of the “sciences” into two subdivisions (“Natural Sciences” and “Quantitative Studies”), in parallel to the current subdivision of the “humanities” in the Duke curriculum into “Arts, Literature, and Performance” (to use the proposed new name) and “Civilizations.”<sup>4</sup>

The committee recommends the following language be added to the current description of Areas of Knowledge in the Bulletin to describe the newly-created ‘Quantitative Studies’ area: “Courses emphasizing quantitative studies have as their main purpose instruction in a quantitative skill, such as proficiency in some aspects of mathematics, statistics, or computer science, or the use of explicitly quantitative methodology in the analysis of problems.”

### **ADDITIONAL PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS TO THE CURRICULUM**

Five other proposed revisions to the curriculum, in addition to providing more flexibility and further simplifying curricular requirements, also target more specific issues and concerns uncovered in the Committee’s deliberations, as follows:

#### ***Recommendation:***

I D. Allow 2<sup>nd</sup>-year foreign language courses (i.e., 60 & 70 level courses) to carry an Area of Knowledge code if the curricular content of the course merits such

#### ***Rationale:***

A hallmark of foreign language courses at Duke is the strong emphasis on curricular content beyond the introductory level, as compared to a more traditional “skills acquisition” approach to intermediate language instruction. For this reason, the Committee felt that it was appropriate to allow foreign language courses beyond the introductory level to qualify for an Area of Knowledge designation, should those courses offer sufficient curricular content to warrant the designation. Ultimately, the Committee on Courses will make the decision as to whether a particular intermediate level foreign language course has sufficient content to merit such a designation, but the review Committee concluded that this type of evaluation should be enabled, not rejected out of hand.

---

<sup>4</sup> Of the 765 courses bearing the CZ Area of Knowledge designation at Duke, 509 (67%) are offered in departments more traditionally aligned with the “humanities” at peer institutions, including: Art and Art History, Asian and African Languages & Literature, Classical Studies, Dance, English, Germanic Languages & Literature, Medieval & Renaissance Studies, Music, Philosophy, Religion, Romance Studies, Slavic Languages & Literature, and Theater Studies.

***Recommendation:***

II C. Allow students to count all Modes of Inquiry codes carried by a course (up to 3, which is the present maximum)

***Rationale:***

The original formulation of Curriculum 2000 allowed courses to carry up to three cross-cutting designations, but restricted students to claiming only two of these three designations for credit towards their requirements. The reasoning behind this restriction was to ensure a broader range of experiences in students' course choices. The problem with this restriction, however, is that it is difficult to justify on intellectual grounds. If a course has been deemed appropriate to provide exposure to three Modes of Inquiry (to use the proposed term for all cross-cutting designations), then why should a student successfully completing this course be deemed to have only experienced a subset of these exposures? In fact, the issue also becomes moot under the proposed revisions. At present, 20% of courses carry three cross-cutting codes, but if IAA only were eliminated, only 5% of courses will carry three codes. Elimination of QID will reduce this percentage even further.

***Recommendation:***

II D. Allow transfer credit to be applied to Modes of Inquiry requirements

***Rationale:***

Modes of Inquiry codes represent a unique feature of the Duke curriculum and these codes therefore should be reserved for those courses that conform to the standards developed for Duke courses. Even with this premise, however, there is no fundamental reason why a course taught at another institution could not possibly satisfy the stated criteria for a Mode of Inquiry designation. A primary reason for prohibiting the awarding of Mode of Inquiry codes to non-Duke courses in the original Curriculum 2000 proposal was because of concern over the magnitude of work needed to code Duke courses when Curriculum 2000 was initially implemented and the difficulty of obtaining the specific information needed to evaluate non-Duke courses.<sup>5</sup> Now that the initial coding of Duke courses is complete, it is feasible to consider evaluating codes for non-Duke courses as well.

The Committee emphasizes with this recommendation its expectation that only a relatively small number of non-Duke courses will receive a Mode of Inquiry designation. Specifically, the Committee expects that codes will be awarded primarily in cases where significant numbers of Duke students benefit from a particular course or program, such as non-Duke study abroad programs, summer school programs, or inter-institutional

---

<sup>5</sup> Personal communication by Peter Lange, Chair of the Curriculum 2000 Committee, to the review Committee on October 28, 2003.

agreement programs (such as the Robertson Scholars exchange program with UNC-Chapel Hill) that enroll significant numbers of Duke students over time. Thus, the Committee does not envision the application of Modes of Inquiry credit as being the rule for transfer credit courses, but rather the exception, with the onus placed on the student to provide the same materials needed to evaluate the suitability of a course as a Duke faculty member would have to provide the Committee on Courses.

Recognizing that the initial implementation of this recommendation may involve considerable work, the Committee further recommends that an *ad hoc* committee be established to consider requests for Modes of Inquiry coding of non-Duke courses. This recommendation is stated below, under “Recommendations to the Dean.”

***Recommendation:***

II E. Allow both R designations to be obtained outside a student’s major

***Rationale:***

The Committee’s proposal to relax the requirement that at least one research (“R”) course be in the student’s major reflects three issues: First, it is clear that the vast majority of students will naturally take at least one, if not both, of their R courses in their major, so there is little need to enforce this pattern with a curricular restriction. Second, the very small minority of cases in which a student might obtain both R codes outside their major largely reflect valid exceptions, such as when students change majors. Finally, relaxing the restriction that one R course must be in the major eliminates an unintended imposition of general education requirements on the prerogative of departments and programs to determine their own major requirements.

***Recommendation:***

II F. Clarify criteria for the STS and CCI Modes of Inquiry codes

***Rationale:***

In the written and oral commentary received by the Committee, considerable concern was expressed over the implementation of the “Science, Technology, and Society” (STS) designation and, to a lesser extent, over the implementation of the “Cross-Cultural Inquiry” (CCI) designation. With regard to the STS designation, many faculty suggested that courses were more likely to receive this code if “society” was the primary emphasis of the course, even if the connections made to “science” and “technology” were relatively weak. By contrast, it appeared that courses with “science” or “technology” as their primary emphasis were *less* likely to be granted an STS code, even if they made consistent connections with “society.” The concern expressed about the CCI designation was of a different nature. Here, the concern was that the criteria for assigning this

designation are so broadly worded that the Committee on Courses often had difficulty judging whether a particular course was appropriate for the code, thus potentially losing the value of this designation as a meaningful element of Duke's curriculum.

In the case of both the STS and the CCI designations, the Committee concluded that the issue was *not* the result of a problem with the decision process of the Committee on Courses, but rather was the result of difficulties with the specific criteria the Committee on Courses was given to make their decisions. Thus, the review Committee developed specific recommendations for modifying the criteria to be used by the Committee on Courses in their deliberations. The Committee recommends that these new criteria be applied *only* to decisions concerning *new* proposals for assigning the STS and CCI Modes of Inquiry designations to courses, because of the difficulty of reviewing all existing courses in a *post hoc* fashion. This restriction likely will have no effect at all on the implementation of the STS requirement because the proposal slightly *broadens* the criteria in this case and therefore would not exclude current STS courses, and it will have a only a small effect on the implementation of the CCI requirement because only a minority of CCI courses appear be outside the intended criteria for this designation.

The committee recommends that that the following changes be made to the criteria used to evaluate the suitability of a course for the **STS designation**:

***Current criteria:***

A course offering exposure in STS meets *one* of the following conditions:

1. The course examines in a sustained fashion the impact of major scientific or technological developments on political, economic, philosophical, ecological or sociological aspects of society; *or*
2. The course addresses in a sustained fashion the historical, social, political, and/or economic roots of scientific or technological field or phenomena.

***Proposed criteria:***

A course offering exposure in STS meets *one* of the following conditions:

1. The course examines the impact of scientific or technological developments on political, economic, philosophical, ecological, or sociological aspects of society; *or*
2. The course examines the impact of historical, social, political, and/or economic processes on the development of scientific or technological fields or phenomena; *or*
3. While the course focuses on science and/or technology, the application of science and/or technology to society is integral to and consistently addressed in the course.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> In its presentation to the Chairs and Directors of Undergraduate Studies in December 2003, the Committee initially recommended broadening the definition of STS to include courses that emphasized a linkage between "science" and "technology" in addition to courses that linked "science" or "technology" with "society." Subsequent discussion with faculty led the Committee to modify this recommendation so as to necessarily include a sustained linkage to "society," as was the intent of the original formulation of this cross-cutting designation. The intent of the currently proposed criteria is to emphasize that "science"

The committee recommends that the following changes be made to the criteria be used to evaluate the suitability of a course for the **CCI designation**:

***Current criteria:***

A course offering exposure in CCI meets *both* of the following conditions:

1. The course investigates culture and identity as they are socially constructed through nationality, relations of race, gender, ethnicity, class, sexuality and/or shared world views (behavior, arts, beliefs and institutions); *and*
2. The course has *either* (a) a significant explicit and systematically comparative component across different national or cultural groups or across distinctively different historical periods, or (b) an in-depth, intensive examination of a given cultural group, cultural region, or nation in a comparative or analytic perspective.”

***Proposed criteria:***

A course offering exposure in CCI meets *both* of the following conditions:

1. The course investigates culture, identity, and difference as socially constructed through nationality, relations of race, gender, ethnicity, class, sexuality, and/or shared world views (arts, religions, and institutions); *and*
2. The course does so *either* a) through an explicit, significant, and systematic comparison across specific national or cultural groups, *or* b) through an intensive analysis of the cultural ideals, assumptions and/or conflicts within a given cultural group or a nation.

The Committee recognizes that the proposed changes in criteria for the CCI designation are minor, but they are deemed by current and former members of the Curriculum Committee and Committee on Courses who were part of the review Committee to be helpful to provide the needed additional specification, without infringing on the underlying rationale of this requirement as envisioned in the original implementation of Curriculum 2000.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE DEAN**

The following five recommendations to the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences concern issues affecting implementation of the curriculum:

***Recommendation:***

- III A. Establish an *ad hoc* faculty committee responsible for coding of transfer credit courses for a period of at least two years

---

or “technology” can represent the dominant curricular content of an STS course, so long as its significance for “society” is consistently addressed.

***Rationale:***

The proposal that courses taught at other institutions may receive credit for Duke Modes of Inquiry designations carries with it a potentially large burden for evaluating requests for transfer credit. As stated above, the Committee expects that the transfer of Modes of Knowledge credit should be a relatively rare event, applied most frequently in cases involving non-Duke programs that enroll many Duke students. Nonetheless, it is likely that the first one or two years following the implementation of this recommendation will entail a serious workload as these programs are identified and analyzed. To avoid overburdening the existing Arts and Sciences Committee on Courses, the review Committee recommends that a separate committee be established under the auspices of the Dean of Trinity College to handle this transition period. After two years, the Arts and Sciences Council, in consultation with the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, can evaluate whether the work of this *ad hoc* committee should be folded into that of the Committee on Courses (assuming that number of non-Duke courses that continue to need to be examined has dropped considerably, as is the expectation of the review Committee).

***Recommendations:***

- III B. Work with Pre-Major Advising to improve communication of the goals and requirements of the curriculum to first-year students
- III C. Work with Pre-Major Advising to ensure that individual Departments and multi-department groups are involved fully in the development of area- specific advising recommendations

***Rationale:***

A curriculum can only be successfully implemented if its conceptual framework and goals are fully understood by students and faculty alike. It was clear to the review Committee that many students and even some faculty are unaware of the rationale behind Curriculum 2000, leading to some degree of confusion if not cynicism concerning the value of curricular requirements. The Committee recognizes that some of this confusion is the result of unnecessary complexity in the curriculum itself and has proposed changes to reduce this complexity. At the same time, it is clear that a better job needs to be done in providing students with information about the curriculum and how to move through it to best advantage. At Duke, the burden of providing this information falls on the Pre-Major advising system. Thus, the Dean should ensure that Pre-Major advisors are providing information and advice that more thoroughly supports the curriculum.

A related concern expressed by many faculty was that students are sometimes given advice about how to approach their interests in specific majors (or other disciplinary programs) that is at variance with the views of those responsible for administering those majors or programs. To this end, the Dean should further ensure that Pre-Major advising

work closely with departments and other appropriate academic units as they develop advising recommendations.

***Recommendations:***

III D. Address problems associated with support of the foreign language requirement

III E. Address problems associated with support of the “Writing in the Disciplines” requirement

***Rationale:***

The Committee fully endorses both the foreign language requirement (FL) and the writing requirement (W) introduced as part of Curriculum 2000, and sees no need to recommend modifications to the curriculum in either case. However, a considerable amount of concern has been expressed by departments over their ability to implement these requirements. The bottom line here concerns the level of tangible support available to departments needed to create and sustain courses that allow students to fulfill their FL and W requirements. The burden for supporting FL courses obviously falls more narrowly on departments offering language instruction, with an especially heavy burden felt by Romance Studies because of burgeoning student interest in Spanish instruction. The burden for supporting W courses (more specifically, “Writing in the Discipline” courses) is shared more equally across departments in Arts and Sciences. It is imperative for the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences to provide relief for what is seen as an “unfunded mandate” as quickly as possible in order to secure the continued cooperation of departments in the implementation of the curriculum overall. The Committee recognizes that the issue of support is not an easy one to solve given financial constraints, but it emphasizes the importance of addressing this problem head on and urges the Dean to work with departments to find workable solutions.