

Curriculum 2000

INTRODUCTION

The curriculum of a university serves as its hallmark: within it are reflected the values of the faculty, the capabilities of its students, and the aspirations of the institution. Curricula evolve through a continuing process of change. As institutions and areas of knowledge develop, so do courses of study and faculty interests. Such has been the case from the medieval trivium (grammar, rhetoric, and logic which formed the lower division of the seven liberal arts in medieval universities) to the open curricula of the 60's and 70's to the emphasis on active and experiential learning of the 80's and 90's. So it must also be today.

We are currently living in a time of extraordinary and extraordinarily rapid change. This is signaled in everyday life by the technological advances of computers, e-mail, and instructional technologies, to the globalization of nations and markets, to advances in science and genetics, to the emergence of entirely new fields of scholarly investigation. All of these are transforming our world. As a result, the society into which our students will graduate and in which they will live is significantly different and more complicated than was true for generations past or even for us.

These transforming changes bring with them exciting challenges. Students are challenged to think in new ways and to bring multiple perspectives to bear on complex issues. Faculty are challenged to use new approaches to understand emerging fields of inquiry and to teach an increasingly diverse student body with new pedagogical methodologies. And institutions are challenged to re-examine their missions as well as priorities and practices.

Preparing to meet these challenges will require more both of students and of the educational institutions they attend. To lead productive and satisfying lives, students will need to have the capacity to deal with constant change and more complicated choices. They will need to be open-minded and see issues from a variety of perspectives, often global and cross-cultural. They will also need skills of integration to deal with the increased fragmentation of knowledge and specialization, on the one hand, and to be able to synthesize new issues and information, on the other. They will have to be even better at evaluating information and weighing competing claims to make reasoned choices and responsible decisions. Finally, they must learn how to learn, so that they develop fully the capacity for intellectual curiosity, lifelong learning, and community responsibility.

Faculty and the colleges and universities in which they work are already beginning to respond to this dynamic environment. This requires change both in what is taught and in how it is taught. American higher education is incorporating new substantive concerns into curricula,

assuring that students are exposed to the dynamic areas of knowledge and connections of these to the social, economic, cultural, and political processes in which the changes are embedded. Faculty and their institutions are also working to assure that how they teach incorporates the shifts in the teaching and learning paradigm, combining collaborative, active, and experiential teaching and learning with the more traditional modes. They are also affirming commitment to the more distant international and global communities as well as to their nearby neighborhood and local ones.

The curriculum can serve as a fulcrum for these changes, reflecting and promoting responsive substantive and pedagogical innovations. Many of our peer institutions have recognized this opportunity and have been adapting their curricula to contend with the challenges posed by this dynamic environment. Some, such as Princeton, have restructured and re-categorized general education requirements, while others, such as Stanford, have instituted non-Western requirements. Still others, such as Harvard and the University of Chicago, have instituted a common core, identifying both the areas and approaches to knowledge that all students should experience. And still others, such as Dartmouth, have endorsed senior culminating experiences, while Northwestern has mandated language requirements. **Appendix/Link 1 provides Selected COFHE Undergraduate Degree Requirements.**

THE DUKE RESPONSE

Recognizing the importance of the curriculum in establishing the educational agenda for Duke, Dean William H. Chafe set a review of the undergraduate curriculum as the major 1997-98 Arts and Sciences priority. This initiative arose in response to a variety of factors. First, the University underwent a year of planning discussions in preparation for its 1997 reaccreditation review by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. As a part of this review, faculty from across the university met for over a year to discuss the theme *Balancing the Role of the Research University*, and an undergraduate subcommittee focused on issues, such as writing and independent research, germane to the undergraduate curriculum. Augmenting these efforts were ongoing cycles of external department reviews and a series of reviews and discussions of the University Writing Program.

These factors were accompanied by cumulative modifications to the 1986 curriculum. The 1986 curriculum report *Structure and Choice in Liberal Education* became effective in Fall 1988, but components, such as *relatedness* and the number of courses required for the major, were modified with the 1993 review. Additional changes were adopted in subsequent Arts and Sciences Council actions: for example, the first-year seminar requirement was approved in 1994.

Another factor was the increasing tendency for students to omit certain areas of knowledge: a study prepared for our committee by Duke's Office of Institutional Research reveals that at least 47% of 1996/7 graduating seniors entirely omitted one area of knowledge

(19% of seniors omitted foreign language, 10% omitted quantitative reasoning, 13% omitted natural sciences, 3% omitted civilizations, 2% omitted social sciences, and 0% arts and literature). Trends suggest that foreign languages are being increasingly omitted and that, after a sharp rise in the omission of natural sciences and quantitative reasoning, further increases have slowed somewhat. **Appendix/Link 2 provides five graphic representations of ten-year trends in course omission.**

In fact, faculty themselves were recognizing new curricular needs. In recent years, the Duke faculty have shown a willingness and capacity to enhance the curriculum through new courses, new programs and alignment of courses, and new emphases within courses. Most telling in this respect, is the FOCUS program, Duke's signature program for first-year students that clusters seminar experiences around interdisciplinary themes. Other significant changes have occurred with innovations in majors, programs, and certificates, such as Biology, Women's Studies, and Markets and Management. In addition, there has been a significant increase in faculty participation in first-year seminars and capstone courses. Thus, there appears to be widespread internal momentum for faculty innovation in teaching and curricular development.

These observations intersect with another substantively important issue: the 1986 curriculum, and how students were using it, was becoming increasingly out of step with the world around us. The increasing pace of change, the growing fragmentation of knowledge, the increased frequency and intensity of encounters with other cultures, and the growing complexity of ethical choices argue for a curriculum which would be better adapted for preparing students for such a world. Perhaps ironically, what these considerations underline was the enhanced value of the qualities fostered by a liberal arts education in a world too often focused on pre-professionalism and technological training. Indeed, a strong liberal arts education is essential to assure that our students have the breadth of knowledge and skills and intellectual flexibility to prepare them to be leaders in their professions and communities and to have satisfying intellectual and personal lives.

Cumulatively, the changes in the world in which universities operate and for which they prepare their students, coupled with the piecemeal changes in the current curriculum and the interest of faculty, signaled a propitious moment for curricular review. What was needed was a comprehensive assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the current curriculum and an integrated vision for the years ahead.

In September 1997, Dean Chafe appointed a Curriculum Review Committee, chaired by Peter Lange (Political Science) and including Anne Allison (Cultural Anthropology), Robert Bryant (Mathematics), Alvin Crumbliss (Chemistry), David Ferriero (University Librarian), Julian Harris (Honor Council), Nancy Hewitt (History), Karla Holloway (English), Stephen Jaffe (Music), Benjamin Kennedy (Duke Student Government), Robert Thompson (Trinity College), Lee Willard (Trinity College), and Ellen Wittig (Trinity College). Dean Chafe's charge for the committee revolved around six issues:

- 👍 whether to move back to a core curriculum requiring all students to engage in all basic domains (humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences) of knowledge
- 👍 whether, in a world of increasing complexity and cultural interchange, to require students to be exposed to a diversity of world cultures
- 👍 whether to ensure that all Duke graduates are familiar with the principles of science and the scientific way of addressing intellectual problems
- 👍 whether, in a world that depends on international communication, to re-institute a foreign language requirement
- 👍 how to improve the University Writing Program
- 👍 how to enhance the senior experience of our students through capstone courses and independent research

As expressly stated in the charge to the committee, Dean Chafe emphasized that he did not seek a curriculum that imitated that of other universities. Rather, what he sought was a curriculum that would draw from our own traditions and speak on our own behalf as a premier educational institution. These issues were underscored in a November 1997 letter from the Provost published in the *Faculty Forum* which supported the agenda proposed by Dean Chafe and offered different models for the flow of the undergraduate curriculum and the strengthening, in particular, of the first and senior college years.

THE WORK OF THE REVIEW COMMITTEE: GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Over the past year, the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Review Committee, under the leadership of Professor Peter Lange, has met weekly. Throughout its deliberations, members unanimously affirmed their basic commitment to the view that the curriculum should be shaped by a vision of what a Duke graduate in the next century should carry into life beyond college. This required addressing several questions. What are the intellectual qualities that should be shared by all Duke undergraduates? What skills and experiences best prepare our students for a successful and satisfying future? What are the intellectual and educational values that should represent Duke University and serve as common coin?

The result of these discussions is embodied in the proposal that follows. The proposal reflects our belief that to serve our undergraduates better, Trinity College must educate its undergraduates differently, with a view to the skills and experiences that students will need when they graduate from Duke. To do so, we propose that the College adopt a new liberal arts curriculum, *Curriculum 2000*. While this title may evoke images of science fiction movies or state-of-the-art software, it has been chosen quite deliberately, signaling a curriculum which

represents a new beginning intended to be well adapted to the turn of the century and the coming age with its opportunities and challenges.

Curriculum 2000 is an ambitious curriculum, one that seeks to make the most of the kind of university Duke is and strives to become. Building on *structure and choice* and *breadth and depth* (the themes of Duke's past two curriculum reviews), it provides a template for how faculty in Arts and Sciences can better prepare Duke undergraduates for the new century. It provides definition for the types of issues with which we hope students and faculty will engage and for the type of educational leadership that Duke as a premier educational institution will provide. It also provides a basis for ongoing development of courses and curricula adapted to the preparation of students for a challenging and rapidly changing environment.

Curriculum 2000 challenges not only students but also faculty and departments. It prompts us to think further about how we teach our areas of expertise and makes it our collective responsibility to convey what excites us in our disciplines. Furthermore, we must be able to pass on that excitement not only to those to whom our subject matter comes easily or who have powerful pre-professional reasons for working hard and wanting to master what we teach, but also to those who are wary of our disciplines and the knowledge they embody.

CURRICULUM 2000

Based on the belief that the Duke educational experience ought to be one that is intellectually rigorous and distinctly formative, *Curriculum 2000* provides a pathway through the undergraduate course of study that is more coherent than the present curriculum. The basic element of the curriculum is, naturally, the course, but our proposal recognizes explicitly that courses can and do teach more than a specific substantive topic. They often also teach ways of knowing, specific skills and/or the relationship of a specific topic to a broader, often interdisciplinary, theme. *Curriculum 2000* explicitly recognizes and takes advantage of these features when instructors choose to employ them.

A curriculum, thus, is not simply the totality of courses offered but, rather an organization of the types and possible sequences of students' experiences leading to a rich and meaningful baccalaureate degree. The proposed curriculum is more structured than the current one, but continues to offer a great deal of choice within that structure. It also provides for more breadth – by requiring that students take courses in all areas of knowledge required for general education, but continues to emphasize the importance of attaining depth by coursework in the major. The combination of *structure with choice* and *breadth with depth* also assures that Duke undergraduates will likely share a number of educational experiences.

The Committee formulated a framework that combines four interrelated features of the curriculum: Areas of Knowledge, Modes of Inquiry, Focused Inquiries, and Competencies. The interrelatedness of these dimensions is an essential element of the proposal not only in terms of the curricular structure but also in terms of developing students' skills of integration and synthesis. The curriculum recognizes that a single course can have several intellectual goals and intended student learning outcomes and, thus, can simultaneously incorporate several curricular features. Hence, while courses fall within Areas of Knowledge, they can also provide educational experiences in up to two Modes of Inquiry, Focused Inquiries or Competencies.

We list the specific requirements here. They are discussed in greater detail below:

Required Courses:

Areas of Knowledge: All students must take 3 courses in each of the following:

Arts and Literatures

Civilizations

Social Sciences

Natural Sciences and Mathematics (at least 2 in the Natural Sciences)

Required Exposures within courses:

Modes of Inquiry: All students must take 2 courses designated as offering exposures to each of the Modes of Inquiry:

Quantitative, Inductive, and Deductive Reasoning

Interpretive and Aesthetic Approaches

Focused Inquiries: All students must take 2 courses designated as offering exposures to each of the three Focused Inquiries:

Cross-Cultural Inquiry

Science, Technology, and Society

Ethical Inquiry

Competencies: All students must take courses designated as offering exposures to the following competencies:

Foreign Language: All students must take at least one course in a Foreign Language. No student is required to take more than three courses in Foreign Language (see Appendix/Link 3: Languages Task Force Report)

Writing: All students are required to take three courses designated as offering an intensive opportunity to develop writing skills, one of which will be in the freshman year. The specific details of the requirement will be proposed to the Arts and Sciences Council in Spring 1999 by the Writing Task Force currently at work.

Research: All students are required to take two courses designated as offering a research-intensive experience, one of which must be in the major.

The total number of required courses is, therefore, a minimum of 13 and a maximum of 15 (if a student begins a language at the most elementary level and if a freshman writing course similar to the current UWC course is retained), as compared to 15 in the current curriculum (14 in areas of knowledge, plus UWC). It is expected that most students will satisfy several of their required exposures with courses in the major (e.g., research, writing and one of the Modes of Inquiry). It is also possible that many students will choose to complete their exposures with courses beyond those required to satisfy the Areas of Knowledge requirements.

In addition to this descriptive representation, *Curriculum 2000* may also be represented metaphorically as a matrix:

General Education Requirements								
	Modes of Inquiry		Focused Inquiries			Competencies		
	Quantitative, Inductive and Deductive Reasoning	Interpretive and Aesthetic Approaches	Cross Cultural Inquiry	Science Technology and Society	Ethical Inquiry	Foreign Language	Writing	Research
Areas of Knowledge¹ (Min.)								
Arts & Literatures (3)								
Civilizations (3)								
Social Sciences (3)								
Natural Sciences and Mathematics (3) ²								
Other ³								
Minimum Exposures Required⁴	2	2	2	2	2	1 ⁽⁵⁾ up to 2 more	3 ⁽⁶⁾	1 ⁽⁷⁾

¹Courses will be designated with regard to their Area(s) of Knowledge. Courses can be counted toward only one Area.
²At least two of these courses must be in the Natural Sciences.
³Courses offering exposures to Modes of Inquiry, Focused Inquiries or Competencies that do not count toward Areas of Knowledge under current or proposed Arts and Sciences regulations.
⁴The minimum required refers to exposures. Professors can designate up to three exposures beyond the Areas of Knowledge for which a course qualifies; students can receive credit for any two of the designated exposures.
⁵The requirement is based on a required level of proficiency and it will be the case for many students that satisfactory performance in one 100-level course will be sufficient to meet the requirement. No student will be required to take more than three courses. Foreign language courses below the 100-level (other than FLAC courses) can not be used to satisfy requirements in areas of knowledge, other competencies, or focused inquiries. The details of the foreign language requirement are described in the report of the Language Task Force.
⁶It is currently anticipated that students will be required to have three intensive writing experiences, one of them in the First year. The specifics of this requirement await the recommendations of the Writing Task Force and approval by the Arts and Sciences Council.
⁷Students entering in 2000 and 2001 will be required to complete one RI exposures, either in General Education or the major. Subsequently, students will be required to complete two RI experiences, at least one of which must be in the student's major.

In either representation, descriptive or graphic, the interrelated structure of *Curriculum 2000* has several specific advantages. First, it explicitly recognizes that courses in many departments and divisions may offer exposures to similar competencies and/or substantive knowledge. Quantitative skills are not just taught in mathematics courses, nor is comparative knowledge about different cultures only taught in social science departments. If our desire is to have students gain exposure to different competencies and thematic foci, and to offer them ways to gain these exposures in ways of their own choosing, given their interests, the proposed structure provides an excellent curricular vehicle. Second, the structure encourages professors to develop courses that match their disciplinary interests in ways that also meet our collective curricular priorities. The modes of inquiry, focused inquiries, and competencies should not become the bailiwicks of single departments or even divisions. Third, the structure promotes

flexibility in curricular design and implementation, guided by a set of basic principles and ongoing faculty oversight.

Curriculum 2000's structure assures that students have sustained engagement with each of the areas of knowledge, and that they have sufficient exposure to each of the modes of inquiry, focused inquiries, and competencies to develop a moderate and integrated understanding of what they entail. We turn now to a detailed discussion of each component of *Curriculum 2000*.

AREAS OF KNOWLEDGE

Historically, the ways in which knowledge has been organized reflect both differences in subject matter and methods of discovery. This delineation is dynamic, marked by increasing differentiation and an array of academic disciplines. Disciplines have traditionally been grouped into three divisions: Humanities, Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences. At Duke, we have chosen to further to divide the Humanities into two areas of knowledge, Arts and Literatures and Civilizations, to assure that undergraduates engage the full range of substantive concerns and approaches in the Humanities. In addition, Duke has identified the Social Sciences and Natural Sciences and Mathematics as areas of knowledge. Each of these areas shares somewhat overlapping substantive concerns and/or approaches to knowledge. *Curriculum 2000* adopts the following division of courses (and generally, departments) reflecting this Duke tradition in liberal arts education.

The four Areas of Knowledge are:

- **Arts and Literatures**
- **Civilizations**
- **Social Sciences**
- **Natural Sciences and Mathematics**

These four areas of knowledge are recognized as traditional divisions in the organization of knowledge and have a long curricular and administrative history at Duke. The committee felt that to provide the breadth of exposure necessary to assure its curricular goals, **all students should be required to take three courses in each area**. This obviously represents a significant departure from the current curriculum which allows students to avoid courses in one area of knowledge, permits them to take only two courses in a second, and requires them to take no more than three courses in any area outside that of their major. Recognizing the trend among Duke students to omit one of the areas of knowledge, the committee felt strongly that to be an informed and educated person in the 21st century, engagement with each is essential, not optional. The committee also sought, thereby, to achieve more commonality in the Duke undergraduate experience.

MODES OF INQUIRY

In addition to Areas of Knowledge, *Curriculum 2000* also organizes the curriculum in terms of Modes of Inquiry. There are many ways to acquire, transform, and communicate knowledge, and to reach understanding. The array of academic disciplines reflects this diversity in modes of inquiry. Underlying the diversity is a spectrum anchored, at one end, with reasoning rooted in logic and mathematics and, on the other, with approaches to knowledge which emphasize interpretation and the interaction between interpretation and aesthetic sensibility.

It is essential that our students be aware of this diversity and adept with several modes of inquiry. We have chosen to organize the relatively broad and familiar modes of inquiry around the two anchors: Quantitative, Inductive, and Deductive, Reasoning (QIDR); and Interpretative and Aesthetic Approaches (IAA).

These modes of inquiry are associated differentially but not exclusively with the areas of knowledge and with their constituent disciplines. Mathematics and the Natural Sciences are most strongly associated with QIDR and the Humanities with IAA. The Social Sciences are associated with QIDR and also with interpretative reasoning. Consequently, courses from a number of disciplines can provide exposure to each of the modes of inquiry.

There are two modes of inquiry: 1) Quantitative, Inductive, and Deductive Reasoning and 2) Interpretive and Aesthetic Approaches. For each of these two Modes of Inquiry, as well as for the Focused Inquiries and Competencies described below, the committee has defined a rationale, a set of objectives, the requirement, and the criteria by which courses qualify to meet the requirement. *Objectives* are the learning outcomes we seek to promote. *Criteria* establish the conditions under which a course can qualify for a mode of inquiry, competency, or field of inquiry designation.

Quantitative, Inductive, and Deductive Reasoning (QIDR)

Rationale: QIDR encompasses three broad areas: data acquisition and description; quantitative methods; and concepts or frameworks of deductive and inductive reasoning. QIDR forms the cornerstone of mathematics, the physical, computational, and biological sciences, and many aspects of the social sciences. It plays an essential and growing role in our increasingly technological society, as well as in the formation and design of political and economic policies that profoundly effect quality of life. Consequently, a familiarity with the body of ideas and techniques that constitute QIDR is an essential part of what it means to be an educated person today.

Just as important as the knowledge of QIDR techniques is an awareness of their limitations and the possibility of their improper application. This is essential, even for those whose careers will not directly involve quantitative applications; it is important, for example, for students to understand how truth claims based on quantitative reasoning are developed and contested, as well as why there can be (and often are) conflicting views on important issues, each of which may be based on quantitative analyses of the same available data.

Objectives: We seek for students to acquire:

- 👍 knowledge of the requirements for reliable and valid data, its description and the conditions for valid descriptive and casual inference
- 👍 understanding of descriptive and inferential statistical methods and their use in analyzing data and testing hypotheses
- 👍 comprehension of the concepts and constructions of mathematical models
- 👍 knowledge about application of analytic techniques, such as calculus, to those models. A student should learn not only to compute solutions to problems designed to teach these techniques, but also how to decide when these techniques are appropriate.
- 👍 engagement with the process of deductive or inductive reasoning itself in courses, such as philosophy, that concern formal logic and its place in reasoning
- 👍 experience with particular formal systems, such as computer programming or music composition, where a system of formal rules serves as a framework for creative work

Requirement: Students must complete two QIDR exposures, one of which must meet Criterion 1.

Criteria: A course offering exposure in QIDR meets one of the following conditions:

1. It has as its main purpose instruction in a quantitative skill, such as proficiency in some aspect of mathematics, statistics, or computer science. Among its secondary purposes should be the development of an understanding of appropriate uses of such techniques.
2. It emphasizes instruction in the practice of working in a deductive, inductive, or formal system, such as computer programming or linguistics, symbolic logic, or music theory/composition.
3. It emphasizes the development and critical evaluation of mathematical or deductive/inductive models appropriate to the analysis of problems in a particular field, such as the sciences (natural and social), engineering, or mathematics.

Interpretative and Aesthetic Approaches (IAA)

Rationale: A curriculum aiming at an integral education of the person is incomplete without offering exposure to ways of understanding which are primarily experiential and interpretive. The understanding of cultural modes of expression can be active and performative as in theater, dance, music, the visual arts, and creative writing, or interpretative and hermeneutic, as in literary and cultural studies, the history of art, philosophy, and religious studies.

Objectives: Duke aims for students to develop an awareness and appreciation of the styles, designs, performances, arts, and narratives by which societies -- in this and other cultures -- organize their lives. The objective here is for students to be able to experience, perform, and interpret specific social texts, historical events, and cultural practices. We seek for students to:

- experience and understand specific arts, performances, or practices in terms of their stylistic modes and/or histories
- engage with conceptual tools developed in various disciplines as well as across disciplines to study the styles, meanings, and effects of expressive behavior

- study critical and theoretical perspectives for unraveling the complexities between practice and composition of expressive arts and texts.

Requirements: Students must complete two IAA exposures.

Criteria: A course offering exposure in IAA meets at least one of the following conditions:

1. It involves experience of creative practice (as in the arts), as a means to develop aesthetic understanding of human interactions and creativity.
2. It emphasizes explicit instruction in the philosophies and methods of understanding in the humanities in relation to other modes of inquiry.
3. It stresses the teaching of how to construct interpretative arguments.
4. It focuses on the teaching of critical interpretation as a method of understanding texts, practices, or artifacts within a social, religious, political, or historical context.

FOCUSED INQUIRY

In addition to Modes of Inquiry, there are important cross-cutting intellectual themes about which Duke students need to be knowledgeable. These themes represent enduring focal points of inquiry and application of knowledge to which many disciplines speak. The three areas of focused inquiry are: **1) Cross Cultural; 2) Science, Technology and Society; and 3) Ethical Inquiry.** We have selected these themes for focused inquiry because of the expectation that Duke students will need to address these issues throughout their lives and careers, and because Duke's faculty is well-poised to address them.

Cross Cultural Inquiry (CCI)

Rationale: Globalization is reshaping political and economic regimes as well as social and cultural relations in the United States and throughout the world. Students living and working in the 21st century need to become aware of the ways in which different and shifting political economies, cultural identities, and social issues and conflicts are negotiated. To be successful, Duke students need formal and academic experience in the processes of exploring, understanding, and analyzing differences among peoples and among social systems within both national and international contexts.

CCI provides an academic engagement with the dynamics and interactions of culture(s) in a comparative or analytic perspective. This type of inquiry provides a scholarly, comparative, and integrative study of political, economic, aesthetic, social and cultural differences. It seeks to provide students with the tools to identify culture and cultural difference across time or place, between or within national boundaries. This includes but is not limited to the interplay between and among material circumstances, political economies, scientific understandings, social and aesthetic representations, and the relations between difference/ diversity and power and privilege within and across societies. CCI encourages critical and responsible attention to issues of identity, diversity, globalization, and power so that students may evaluate complex and difficult issues from multiple perspectives. In fulfilling the CCI requirement, students are encouraged to undertake comparisons that extend beyond national boundaries and their own national cultures and to explore the impact of increasing globalization.

Objectives:

We seek for students to:

- increase understanding of the ways in which identities and notions of difference are constructed, reinforced and changed
- develop an understanding of different national cultures, institutions, and policies and the ways that these are being affected by and, in turn, influencing global processes
- recognize stereotypes and to evaluate critically complex and competing ideas about individual and group differences
- understand the processes by which categories of difference change over time and in relationship to material circumstances, political economies, social power and privilege and social and cultural definitions of justice and right
- explore the role of scientific, medical, religious, aesthetic, legal and other modes of analysis in constructing notions of difference and diversity in particular cultures and societies
- examine commonly accepted notions of the normative through analyses of cultural systems, political economies, and social relations

Requirement: Students must complete two CCI exposures.

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

1. Courses investigate 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).
2. Courses have either a significant explicit and systematically comparative component across different national or cultural groups or across distinctively different historical periods; or an in-depth, intensive examination of a given cultural group, cultural region, or nation in a comparative or analytic perspective.

Science, Technology, and Society (STS)

Rationale: Advances in science and technology have wrought profound changes in the structure of society in the modern era. They have fundamentally changed our world, both its philosophical foundations, as in the Copernican or Darwinian revolutions, and in its practical everyday experience, as in the rise of the automobile and television. In the second half of the 20th century, the pace of such change has accelerated dramatically, and we have every reason to believe that science and technology will play an even greater role in shaping society in the coming century.

If Duke is to prepare its graduates to critically analyze and evaluate the scientific and technological issues that will confront them and to understand the world around them, they will need exposure to basic scientific concepts and to the processes by which scientific and technological advances are made and incorporated into society. They must come to understand

the interplay between science, technology and society -- that is, how science and technology and society have influenced the direction and development of society and, conversely, how the needs of society have influenced the direction of science and technology. Grappling with this interplay is essential for understanding both the outcomes of the basic scientific enterprise and how they apply to everyday life.

Objectives:

We seek for students to:

- know the historical and/or philosophical development of a given scientific or technological subject. Students need to develop the analytical skills necessary to examine the scientific, political, and/or societal factors that ultimately came to bear on the development and application of the particular topic.
- understand contemporary issues relating to the development and application of a particular area of science and technology. Exposures should address current and future issues by critically assessing the aesthetic, ethical, sociological, and political, in addition to scientific, factors that bear on the issue.

Requirement: Students will complete two STS exposures.

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

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

Ethical Inquiry (EI)

Rationale: Undergraduate education is a formative period for engaging in critical analysis of ethical questions arising from the world in which we live. Students need to be able to assess critically the consequences of actions, both individual and social, and to sharpen their understanding of the ethical and political implications of public and personal decision-making. Thus, students need to develop and apply skills in ethical reasoning and to gain an understanding of a variety of ways in which ethical and political issues and values frame and shape human conduct and ways of life.

Objectives:

We seek for students to:

- develop the capacity for discernment and choice about diverse systems of values and competing courses of action
- acquire a critical understanding of diverse meanings of justice, goodness, and virtue across time, place, and communities

- develop the capacity to articulate ethical questions, to assess competing claims and approaches to ethical thought, and to engage in careful and critical reflection about individual and social behavior, institutions, and ways of life

Requirement: Students must fulfill two Ethical Inquiry (EI) exposures.

Criteria: A course offering exposure to Ethical Inquiry meets at least one of the following conditions:

1. It explores ethical arguments and beliefs within one or more cultures, religions, or philosophical, dramatic, or literary texts or traditions from a critical standpoint.
2. It examines ethical and political issues and controversies within a particular historical, disciplinary, professional, or policy context.
3. It combines coursework and service experiences with rigorous reflection and writing on the ethical issues.

COMPETENCIES

Competencies represent fluencies, expertise, and skills that students will need to develop in order to live and work successfully in a rapidly changing, complex world. Students will need to be able to communicate both within their own cultures and across cultures. They will need to understand how knowledge and disciplines are organized and to have developed a capacity for the critical evaluation of knowledge and participation in the methods of discovery. The three Competencies are: 1) Foreign Language; 2) Writing; and 3) Research.

Foreign Language (FL)

Rationale: Duke has set internationalization as an institutional priority in order to prepare students to live in an increasingly diverse and interdependent world. Internationalizing the institution means that students must be given opportunities to engage with other cultures and to be exposed to ways of thinking other than their own. These perspectives come not only from around the globe but also from multicultural communities within the United States. By developing proficiency in a foreign language, students can develop cross-cultural competency and become more successful members of their increasingly complex local, national, and international communities. Through foreign language study, students have access to materials and cultures not otherwise available and which inform and enrich both the undergraduate experience and post-graduate life.

Beyond providing an additional language resource for communication, foreign language study substantially broadens students' own experiences. As students engage another language, thought, and culture, they can develop their own intellect, gain respect for other peoples, and learn new ways of thinking. Students need an awareness of how language frames and structures understanding and effective communication, and a study of foreign language improves students' native language skills.

Objectives:

We seek for students to:

- 👉 develop sufficient proficiency in a second language to engage foreign cultures, histories and literatures
- 👉 gain an understanding of the nature of culture in as far as it is embodied in language
- 👉 bring a cultural perspective to bear to enhance understanding of issues of similarity and difference

Requirement: Students must complete one of the following:

1. 100-level course in a foreign language (including equivalent courses in study abroad).
2. Three semesters of study or the equivalent (including study abroad experiences). This might particularly be appropriate for non-cognate languages (less commonly taught languages) or if a student begins a new language at the collegiate level.

Criteria:

1. Criteria will be determined based upon the Fall 1998 report of the Task Force on Languages appointed by Dean Robert J. Thompson (**Appendix/Link 3**).
2. The requirement will be based upon a required level of proficiency. Satisfactory performance in one 100-level course will satisfy the requirement.
3. No student will be expected to take more than three courses.
4. The 100-level course may be offered in a department outside a foreign language department but taught in a foreign language. These courses will be designated as Foreign Language Across the Curriculum (FLAC) courses (**Appendix/Link 3** provides criteria for FLAC courses).
5. Study abroad experience will qualify as follows:
 - 👉 a summer session/semester/year abroad engaged in course work in a foreign language
 - 👉 a semester/year abroad in a foreign country with intense use of a foreign language (course work in the language not necessarily required)

Writing

Rationale: Effective writing is central to both learning and communication. As a result, almost all institutions of higher education across the country give an important role to writing in general education requirements. To function successfully in today's, much less tomorrow's world, students need to be able to write and speak clearly and effectively. To accomplish this, students need to have a sustained engagement with writing throughout the undergraduate career.

Learning to write effectively is a hard-earned skill that needs constant practice; it is reflective, analytical, and iterative. An early experience develops the intellectual skills and habits of critical thinking appropriate to university study. Advanced writing-intensive experiences, on the other hand, link writing to various fields of study, providing students with opportunities for

self-conscious writing, sustained interaction with faculty members, and significant independent thought.

Objectives:

Duke seeks to provide multiple writing experiences for all Duke undergraduates. We seek for students to be able to:

- 👍 read in a scholarly and critical fashion
- 👍 distinguish between expressive and argumentative forms of writing
- 👍 analyze, integrate, and synthesize information and ideas
- 👍 learn how to use original and source materials through traditional library research and the use of computers and the World Wide Web
- 👍 develop familiarity with the format of academic papers
- 👍 develop, support, critique, revise, and refine arguments
- 👍 write clearly and engagingly
- 👍 distinguish between and operate within different disciplinary contexts and traditions

Requirement and Criteria: A proposal regarding specific requirements and criteria is currently being developed by the Writing Task Force appointed by Dean Robert J. Thompson. That report will be submitted to the Arts and Sciences Council in the spring 1999 semester and subject to independent deliberation and decision. It is anticipated that the recommendations of the Writing Task Force will embody the principles regarding writing expressed above.

Research

Rationale: As a research university, Duke seeks to connect undergraduate education to the broad continuum of scholarship reflected in its faculty. Such a rich setting provides students with opportunities to become involved in a community of learning and to engage in the process of discovery. We seek for our students to move beyond being the passive recipients of knowledge that is transmitted to being an active participant in the discovery, critical evaluation, and application of knowledge and understanding. Given the mission of Duke's faculty, its student-faculty ratio, and the presence of outstanding graduate programs, the University is well-positioned to provide this formative kind of undergraduate experience.

Engagement with research can be viewed along a continuum. At the most basic level, students can learn the procedures and methods for analyzing materials in research courses, producing a research paper or project appropriate to the discipline. On a more sophisticated level, students can engage in mentored projects, planning a project in conjunction with a faculty member, implementing the study, and analyzing results, as it typical of an independent study, lab project, or a capstone experience. Further along the spectrum, students can emulate experiences available to graduate students, generating problems and projects themselves, planning the design of an essay or hypothesis, and actively producing an original analysis, interpretation, or

discovery, as typically constitutes an honors project. At each of these levels, the research process develops in students an understanding of the process by which new knowledge is created, organized, accessed, and synthesized. It also fosters a capacity for the critical evaluation of knowledge and the methods of discovery. Engagement with the research process better prepares not only undergraduates who wish to pursue further study at the graduate level but also those who seek employment in a rapidly changing and competitive marketplace. It equips them to be active citizens and leaders of the communities in which they are about to assume responsibility.

Objectives:

We seek for students to:

- 👉 formulate a question, analyze material, and integrate their findings
- 👉 engage research resources, both through libraries and electronic means, to understand how information is accessed
- 👉 participate in a mentoring relationship with faculty through the interplay of independent and collaborative work
- 👉 develop a product that describes or exemplifies their research, whether it be in written form or presentation in a public setting

Requirement: For the first two years (classes entering in 2000 and 2001), students must complete one Research-Intensive (RI) exposure, either in General Education or the major. Subsequently, students must complete two Research-Intensive exposures, at least one of which must be in the student's major.

Criteria: A course offering a Research-Intensive exposure meets all of the following criteria:

1. RI courses will encompass a broad engagement with the ways in which research is undertaken within a given field, with some attention to competing methodologies within a discipline. A RI course should impart an understanding of how knowledge in the discipline is generated, organized, presented, and accessed.
2. Students can pursue research-intensive work in a variety of ways, including:
 - general education courses requiring a research paper, project, or product;
 - research-intensive courses, such as preceptorships, project-oriented laboratories, and departmental courses focusing on disciplinary research methodologies;
 - a structured series of small projects which convey disciplinary procedures and cumulatively fit the student to work in a field. These may include written critiques of original research or written assignments designed to convey disciplinary research procedures;
 - independent studies, preceptorials, and capstone experiences
3. Courses designated as RI must yield a major document (or its equivalent) such as a research paper, a series of reports that build upon each other, poster session, or performance, as deemed appropriate.

CURRICULAR STRUCTURE AND ITS INTERRELATEDNESS

Curriculum 2000 emphasizes various dimensions to learning: the direct substantive knowledge one receives in a discipline or area, the ways of learning and knowing how to express and use knowledge, and the thematic connections of knowledge across disciplines. It, thereby, underlines the integrative, rather than disparate, features of an education appropriate for a Duke undergraduate at the outset of the next century.

As noted earlier, for General Education requirements, students are required to take a minimum of **three courses in each Area of Knowledge**. In addition, students will be required to **have 2 exposures to each of the Modes of Inquiry, Focused Inquiries, and Competencies** through courses they take in any of the Areas of Knowledge. The only exceptions are with regard to foreign language and writing for which the requirement is more flexible, depending on student proficiency upon Duke matriculation.

Each of the courses in the areas of knowledge may (but need not) also provide exposure to one or two of the modes of inquiry, focused inquiries, and/or competencies. For example, an Anthropology course on comparative ethnicity would carry a Social Science (SS) area designation with a Cross Cultural Inquiry (CCI) exposure. If it required a sustained research exercise due at the end of the semester, it would also carry a Research Intensive (RI) designation. Hence it would count toward fulfillment of the Social Science (SS) area and the Cross Cultural Inquiry (CCI), and Research Intensive (RI) requirements. **Courses may carry up to two Modes of Inquiry, Focused Inquiries or Competencies**. As noted above, while area requirements represent individual courses in departments and programs, Modes of Inquiry, Competencies, and Focused Inquiries will be exposures, and courses can embody up to two exposures per course.

Benefits of the curricular structure for general education requirements include the fact that it provides incentives for departments to develop courses offering exposures in the various fields and competencies. Over time, students' choices about how to gain these exposures should increase. This will be especially important in some fields of inquiry, such as Science, Technology, and Society, in which there may not currently be sufficient courses. If this is the case, we will need to encourage departments to develop such courses in ways beyond the incentives that the curriculum itself generates.

Another benefit is the fact that using an integrative structure for the curriculum provides a representation of Duke's core educational values. It emphasizes the institutional priority placed upon breadth and depth of disciplinary and cross-disciplinary teaching and learning. The curricular framework, by its very nature, encourages interaction among courses, departments and divisions. For example, a student might fulfill one QIDR exposure in an upper-level Economics

course that used quantitative methods or complete one Foreign Language exposure in a History or Literature course taught in French.

Finally, *Curriculum 2000* preserves the strength of student choice in the general education curriculum. Rather than presenting a common course or common core that every student takes, students have freedom to choose exposures through courses they themselves select and which faculty members have designed to meet the requisite criteria. Moreover, despite preserving student and faculty choice, *Curriculum 2000* achieves another important goal: it provides communality as students share a common framework for their educational experiences.

THE RELATION OF GENERAL EDUCATION TO THE MAJOR: THE FLOW OF AN UNDERGRADUATE CAREER

Practically speaking, what does the curricular structure mean in terms of a student's passage through Duke? First, because the general education requirements have been couched in terms of the skills and experiences that are necessary for successful and satisfying lives in the coming century, the traditional bifurcation of the college curriculum between general education courses and course work in the major is inappropriate and, indeed, this way of thinking is counterproductive -- a point underscored in *AC&U's* first discussion paper in a new series exploring *The Academy in Transition, Contemporary Understandings of Liberal Education* (Carol Geary Schneider and Robert Shoenberg):

As long as general education was conceived predominantly as a study of a range of subject matters, or *breadth*, with study in a designated major representing *depth*, the conventional sharp division between general education and majors made some sense. But with the new educational focus on helping students develop intellectual skills, understand a range of epistemologies and their various strengths and limitations, and increasing their ability to negotiate intellectual, cultural, civic, and practical topics and relationships, the assumed separation between general education and the major is no longer useful. On the one hand, that fraction of the curriculum allocated to general education is simply inadequate for developing, practicing, and integrating, at a reasonable level of proficiency, the complex forms of learning important to a contemporary liberal education. On the other, the development of those skills and awareness...is just as much the business of the major and just as essential to a baccalaureate level of mastery in a field as it is to general education. (p. 16)

Indeed, the proposed curricular structure serves to identify graphically components of a more integrated liberal arts education and to link general education with learning in the major. For example, the interconnected structure promotes the development of writing skills through an increased requirement for Writing-Intensive courses -- and it does so not just in the first year, but across the curriculum and in the major. Similarly, Ethical Inquiry becomes not simply a requirement to be checked off and dismissed in the first two years, but developed as an area of

inquiry applicable to all majors. Research-Intensive skills also proceed from investigation of topics at the introductory level to internships and mentored projects or independent study, and so forth. Thus, we see the undergraduate course of study as an intellectual and developmental progression, where courses and skills build upon, and are not separate from work that has gone on before, and where students can enter study at a developmentally appropriate level.

Moreover, the responsibility for constructing a coherent plan of study that meets any one individual student's needs becomes a shared responsibility between faculty and students. The locus of ownership is a joint one, and faculty as well as advisers (both pre-major and major) are stakeholders in the system. Indeed, the long-range plan becomes more sensitive to each student's academic and personal development, and it promotes a more integrated engagement in academic, professional, and career planning. Thus, **the Curriculum Review Committee recommends that the Dean for Undergraduate Affairs work with departments, pre-major advisers, and major advisers to assure that they provide appropriate advising for the new curriculum and decision-making about curricular choice.**

Additional recommendations for the curriculum focus on the sorts of experiences students need and the flow or interrelation of coursework to achieve them. Many of these recommendations reaffirm features of the current requirements. Others represent changes intended to enhance the new curricular experience. **Appendix/Link 4: Trinity College Degree Requirements: Current and Proposed Curriculum** outlines those rules in the current curriculum that have been retained and those that have been changed.

First among these is the small group learning experience. **The Curriculum Review Committee affirms and sustains the current requirement that all students enroll in a seminar during their first two semesters.** The success of the FOCUS Program and the First-Year Seminar Program, in particular, underscores the value of engaging intensively with a topic or discipline early on and in-depth. Such an experience promotes active participation in the learning process within a small group setting; it sets up the expectation for students to learn from their peers and to interact one-on-one with a member of the Duke faculty.

Second, because the committee feels that this pattern of interaction and learning is significantly different from the types of experiences students will have had in high school, **the Committee endorses the current requirement that Advanced Placement courses not count for General Education requirements.**

Third, because much of the learning process occurs in classroom interactions and with peers, as is the case now, **independent study may not count toward fulfillment of General Education requirements, with the exception of the Research-Intensive Exposure.**

Fourth, as is now the case, **a course may carry two Areas of Knowledge Codes, but the student may apply the course to only one area** to be selected at the time the course is taken. As mentioned above, **a course may carry up to two Modes of Inquiry, Focused Inquiry, or Competency codes.**

With regard to the development of an undergraduate career, the **Curriculum Review Committee recommends no change in the number of courses required for the major (a minimum of 10) or minors (5) and certificates (6)** (We also make no changes to Program II). **It does advocate, however, that departments examine course offerings and, in particular, the pathway to the major to take full advantage of the new curricular structure of requirements and of skills and experiences students will have developed in prior years.** Does the introductory course or courses provide an intellectually coherent and foundational gateway to the discipline? Do intermediate courses provide requisite knowledge and skills to draw students upward into the major? Do upper level courses assure appropriate experiences in important subfields? Do offerings in the major offer appropriate opportunities for writing and training in disciplinary research methodologies? Are there opportunities for independent study and work-in-depth between students and faculty who share common interests?

One central component in the requirements for a rigorous and full major is the opportunity for each student to have an appropriate capstone experience. Capstone experiences currently encompass a wide array of course types and contents. Some departments offer a series of honors seminars, while others seek to extend the perspectives of their disciplines by interdisciplinary, team-taught courses. And, almost all departments and programs currently offer opportunities for mentored projects and independent study. **The Curriculum Review Committee recommends, then, as a part of an intellectually coherent course of study that all departments consider how best to provide appropriate senior capstone experiences.** Through such an experience -- whether it be participation in a seminar with peers sharing common interest or execution of a research project with a faculty mentor -- students take advantage of opportunities relate to their chosen discipline, synthesize what they have learned, and participate with fellow majors in a common culminating experience.

Because of the importance of the undergraduate curriculum in defining and shaping the quality of the undergraduate experience, the Curriculum Review Committee recommends that the College develop an assessment mechanism to assure that *Curriculum 2000* meets its intended goals. In particular, **the Committee recommends that curriculum be reviewed in its fourth**

year of implementation (2003-4). This formal review will complement ongoing evaluation of the Arts and Sciences Council's standing curriculum and course committees as well as the annual review of departmental instructional profile that is currently a part of the budget process.

IMPLEMENTATION: WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

Over the past year, the Curriculum Review Committee has attempted to devise a curriculum that would best prepare Duke students for life in the coming century. It has, in its proposal, sought to map knowledge into a framework that reflects the priorities and values of the institution. The task is daunting -- but no less necessary -- and prompts short-term goals and long-term implications.

Short Term Goals: With respect to short-term goals, the Committee recommends that the **Dean for Undergraduate Affairs develop a structure to accommodate the implementation and management of the new curriculum.** Trinity College currently has effective mechanisms for linking with departments, through its academic deans and departmental Directors of Undergraduate Study, and for the coding of courses and curriculum approval through the Arts and Sciences Council's Course Committee and Curriculum Committee. What is needed, then, is an elaboration and expansion of these functions, which builds on, rather than replicates, the current organization.

To shepherd resources wisely, the College must devise an efficient and effective process for the coding of courses. We see the designation process as a shared responsibility between the faculty member, the department, and the College. (**Appendix/Link 5 provides a plan for Course Designation as well as a Sample Designation Form**). The individual instructor will be responsible for determining the intellectual content, learning objectives, and pedagogical approach for his or her course. The department will be responsible for assuring the breadth and depth and coherency among courses within a discipline and field of study. And the College will be responsible for assuring that courses are assigned numbers and classification designations in accordance with college criteria and regulations as legislated by the Arts and Sciences faculty through its various committees.

Specifically, with regard to areas of knowledge, courses might, for example, automatically fall within the areas into which the department or program currently falls, unless the instructor wishes it to be listed differently. With regard to modes of inquiry, focused inquiries and competencies, faculty would propose designations, while considering individual course objectives more closely. Departments and programs, likewise, will need to consider offerings from a

broader, more comprehensive perspective. They will need to evaluate how various courses meet designated criteria, and they must critically assess pathways to the major.

These types of focused discussions about requirements for general education and the major may lead to additional related recommendations. For example, the Curriculum Review Committee did not see sufficient argument to justify at this time a change in course credits versus semester hours. While many of our peers employ a course credit system similar to Duke (Brown, Dartmouth, University of Pennsylvania, Princeton, and Yale), others (Emory, Johns Hopkins, UNC, and the University of Virginia) accumulate semester hours, and still others (Cornell, Georgetown, and Rochester) have a combination of credit hours and courses, quarters (Chicago) or quarter hours (Stanford). While the Curriculum Review Committee does not wish to support a change to a credit hours system at the current time, it recognizes that its flexibility might match the structure of the proposed new curriculum. The standing Curriculum Committee or Academic Affairs Committee could, therefore, consider this in terms of flexibility for language study and laboratories, study abroad/internationalization, and comparability with the Graduate School courses. We would urge, however, that this issue be addressed only after the new curriculum has been approved.

In addition, as a part of the consideration related to hours and instructional load, the Curriculum Review Committee recommends that consideration be given to an increase in the number of courses required for graduation from 34 to 36. Because such an increase directly relates to the discussion about courses/semester hours, the Review committee likewise recommends that this question be addressed only after the new curriculum has been approved and appropriate data gathered.

Another issue for future consideration might well be inconsistency in course numbering. Over the years, courses have been numbered for a wider range of criteria (some FOCUS courses, for example, carry a 100-level designation), and the standing Curriculum Committee might recommend that an appropriate committee consider guidelines for the fit between course content and a more consistent numbering system.

Yet another issue is the need for assessment capabilities and, in particular, the College's ability to assess levels of student learning and the effectiveness of courses to produce certain outcomes and objectives. We must significantly enhance our ability to gauge whether we are advancing effectively the goals of student learning. To assist in this endeavor, the newly reconfigured Center for Teaching, Learning, and Writing will work with faculty in the development of new courses, the revision of existing courses, the incorporation of instructional technologies, and the assessment of effectiveness in teaching and learning.

From the beginning the Curriculum Review Committee has seen its recommendations as a part of a complete package. It has offered what it feels is a comprehensive and integrated plan for what would best prepare students for the coming century, and it has endeavored to articulate linkages and connections between its component parts.

Long Term Implications: We believe that the ramifications of *Curriculum 2000* extend well beyond what we envision for students entering in 2000. The proposed curriculum serves not only as a blueprint for the kind of education that Duke can and should provide, but as a symbol of its ability to meet the cognitive, developmental, and experiential needs of all its students. It serves as a signpost for organizational and institutional change. Colleges and universities are faced with new challenges and opportunities. Duke will need to meet the educational implications of a changing world and the challenges of emerging fields, the introduction of new instructional technologies and pedagogical techniques, and the expectations of a more diverse cadre of prospective students.

The proposed curriculum looks boldly forward, yet builds on the tradition of excellence that has long characterized Duke as an institution. A recent report of the Boyer Commission of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching is entitled *Reinventing Undergraduate Education: A Blueprint for America's Research Universities*. In that report, the Commission addresses how research universities can best sustain their commitments to undergraduates consistent with their critical role as centers of research and innovation in society. Much of what is proposed in that report is currently underway at Duke; much more will be so, if

we implement the proposed curriculum. In advancing their recommendations, the Commission concludes:

Research universities cannot continue to operate as though the world around them is that of 1930 or 1950 or 1980. As everyone knows, it is changing with dizzying rapidity. These universities must respond to the change; indeed, they ought to lead it. Their students, properly educated for the new millennium, will be required as leaders while that world continues to transform *itself*. (p.38)

The proposed *Curriculum 2000* will allow us to meet this challenge. It will also be challenging curriculum on a variety of levels. It will challenge faculty to think further about how they teach their disciplines and to examine what they are transmitting to students in terms of knowledge as well as integrative themes that cut across disciplinary boundaries. It also challenges faculty to focus on students and to address the question of how can we invest them with a broad excitement for learning and best prepare them for the world in which they will have to work and live. It will challenge our undergraduates to do more with, and make more of the opportunities that a Duke undergraduate education can offer. It will challenge us as Duke faculty and administration to assure that the principles of the curriculum we offer are implemented in a way that is consistent with our curricular goals and institutional mission. Finally, it will challenge Duke as an institution to provide resources -- in time and talents -- to make the educational experience provided here fully successful.

APPENDICES/LINKS

Appendix/Link 1: Undergraduate Degree Requirements at Selected COFHE Schools

Appendix/Link 2: Course Data by Areas of Knowledge

Appendix/Link 3: Languages Task Force Report

Appendix/Link 4: Trinity College Degree Requirements

Appendix/Link 5: Procedures and sample form for course designation into Areas of Knowledge, Modes of Inquiry, Focused Inquiries and Competencies