Final Report
Adaptable Academic Structures Committee (AAS)
2030 Teaching Excellence & Innovation Initiative (2024 – 2025)
11 June 2025

Submitted by:

Frank Blalark
Dean Bruno
Jennie De Gagne
Yakut Gazi
Jeff Glass (co-chair)
Didem Havlioglu
David Johnston
John Klingensmith
Sarah Komisarow
Shana Lassiter
Russ Morgan
Noah Pickus
Andrea Marritt-Pabalate
Emma Rasiel (co-chair)
Dan Scolnic
Patrick Smith
Len White

Table of Contents

Table of Contents:

I. Executive Summary

In August 2024, the Adaptable Academic Structures (AAS) committee* was charged with exploring options for both increased modalities (online delivery) and enhanced modularity (calendar flexibility) within the Duke curriculum.

After completing initial research into both options, the committee focused primarily on modality over modularity. The committee observed that there are a number of concerns among the faculty about offering online courses in the undergraduate program at Duke, with members of A&S in particular expressing concerns about including fully digital options into Duke's core undergraduate curriculum. The committee therefore concluded that further exploration of online courses is necessary, and that guidelines and guardrails around online offerings are essential. Duke already has numerous online offerings, but these are largely in graduate programs, summer terms, or unique situations. This committee's principal recommendation is for some additional testing of undergraduate online courses to occur at Duke through pilot courses in the fall and spring semesters.

The purpose of pilot courses in the near term is to run some thoughtfully planned and thoroughly evaluated experiments in Duke's undergraduate programs. The goal is to expand understanding of the benefits, costs, resources needed, and best practices of making some online offerings more generally available. Pratt has recently discussed the potential for pilot courses and is preparing to move forward in a limited way. Pilot courses are not yet approved for Arts and Sciences. Moving beyond pilots would be a separate decision, and the pilots are intended to help inform any future decision on online undergraduate offerings at Duke.

The AAS committee therefore proposes extending AAS's work into the next academic year in collaboration with a newly appointed sub-committee from the Arts and Sciences Council.

* AAS Committee members were nominated by the Provost and approved by ECAC

II. Introduction & AAS Committee Charge

The 2030 Teaching Excellence & Innovation Initiative is a set of three interconnected university-wide committees that have been charged by the provost with exploring issues related to teaching excellence and innovation. This report provides responses to the charges given to the Adaptable Academic Structures (AAS) committee, as provided in the 2030 Implementation Initiative (pp 7 – 9).

The AAS committee was charged with developing clear standards for introducing, experimenting with, and assessing options for both increased modularity and enhanced modalities, with a particular focus on optimization of digital engagement, in educational delivery at Duke for undergraduate and graduate students.

Background Research

In Fall 2024, the AAS committee conducted reviews of the literature on online learning and calendar flexibility and benchmarked how other R1 universities are deploying both alternate modalities and modularity.

Digital Learning (Modality):

The pandemic illuminated both the limitations and the possibilities for delivering instruction through technology; however, this experience was not intentionally designed for online[1] or hybrid[2] learning, and as a result, was often not high-quality. This committee was charged with identifying ways that digital learning in all its forms (online, hybrid, or blended[3]) might enable Duke to deliver an enhanced educational experience while also reaching more and different learners.

Calendar Flexibility (Modularity):

This aspect of the committee charge is to examine how Duke might strike a distinctive balance between the common spaces and pacing of the traditional semester structure and a more flexible, modular academic calendar. The goal is to produce more integrated and accessible learning experiences and to increase research flexibility and education innovation opportunities for faculty.

After reviewing the literature and discussing preliminary issues relating to both modality and modularity, the committee chose to focus first on the former topic and carried out a deep dive on the benefits and challenges of online education. The work in this area dominated the committee's time for the remainder of the school year.

Online Pilot Proposal Developed

The committee then considered how a limited introduction of online courses might benefit students, faculty, and the university. For example, both students and faculty may benefit from flexibility of timing, location, and synchronous/asynchronous delivery. From the university's perspective, a limited number of online courses

[1] In this document, "online" courses are assumed to be 100% digital, with no in-person interaction.

[2] The term "hybrid" in this context refers to courses that have *both* in-class *and* online delivery for all students – possibly including asynchronous online material in place of some synchronous meetings. (The term "hybrid" is also sometimes used to mean that instructors are delivering content to both in-person and online students simultaneously; but in this report, "hybrid" refers to the former definition unless otherwise specified.)

[3] "Blended" learning indicates that online content is included in the course, but synchronous meetings are primarily in-person rather than virtual.

could alleviate campus teaching space constraints – especially given upcoming building closures – as well as benefitting remote campus locations such as the Marine Lab and DKU.

The committee also identified various risks associated with online coursework, including: potential limitations on one-to-one interactions both among students and between students and faculty; greater need for student self-discipline; and the increased importance of course design, requiring additional time and effort from instructors and Duke's instructional design resources. Additional concerns included the possibility that faculty teaching online might come to campus less often, with implications for the academic environment of their departments.

After assessing the potential benefits and risks associated with online learning, the committee felt that it would be prudent to pilot a small set of online courses in the fall and spring semesters in order to assess effectiveness, develop risk mitigation strategies, identify unforeseen challenges that Duke might face in deploying this strategy, and learn more about the contexts in which online learning can best complement Duke's existing educational strengths.

The committee therefore developed a proposal to pilot a limited number of online courses of varying sizes and disciplines, as well as an RFP for faculty who could volunteer for the pilot based on their experience and interest in online pedagogy. Faculty would remain the architects of the course and its content and Duke Learning Innovation and Lifetime Education (LILE) would provide support to help ensure effective course design. All online courses in the pilot would be thoroughly evaluated, with an assessment plan developed with input from faculty governance bodies (e.g., the Courses Committee and the Committee for Undergraduate Teaching in A&S) as well as from LILE and the Office of University Assessment (OUA). A link to the full Pilot Proposal is provided in Appendix 5.[4]

Presentations to Faculty Governance Committees

The AAS committee chairs presented the pilot proposal to Arts & Sciences Council (A&S Council) in the fall, and the Engineering Faculty Council (EFC) and the Academic Programs Committee (APC) during the spring. The committee's pilot plan has been approved by EFC, and a preliminary RFP (included as Section 6.2 in the Pilot Proposal, see Appendix 3) has been drafted for faculty to participate in the pilot. For A&S Council, further engagement is needed before a decision is made about pursuing the proposed pilot program. With this in mind, A&S Council is forming a sub-committee, to be co-chaired by Connel Fullenkamp (chair of the Committee for Undergraduate Teaching) and Eliana Schonberg (chair of the Courses Committee), to explore further the benefits and challenges of digital education for Duke undergraduates. Denise Comer, current chair of A&S Council, will also be on the sub-committee, along with 2 – 3 other faculty members. Please see Section IV for recommendations relating to continued evaluation of online courses within the Trinity curriculum.

Enhanced course design & assessment of Duke's online courses in summer 2025

Separately, the committee also noted that LILE has been working with faculty who are teaching for-credit online courses at Duke during the 2025 summer terms 1 and 2. This effort has been focused on faculty development in teaching online, enhanced course design for a fully online modality, as well as a more extensive assessment plan to gain additional insights into the strengths, shortcomings and opportunities of online

[4] Much of the material in the Pilot Proposal is provided in Section III of this document.

instruction. Assessment outcomes from the summer session will be analyzed in the fall semester and shared with appropriate committees (including the new AAS committee for 2025-26 as proposed in Section IV), as well as relevant stakeholders among faculty governance committees. These outcomes will also be used to improve faculty development and course design practices as well as future decisions related to online education.

III. AAS Committee Deliverables

In this section, we address the end-of-year deliverables that were requested in the original charges to the AAS Committee. Those included three general deliverables, as well as deliverables specific to the two branches of this work: modality & modularity.

1. General Deliverables

The following three items were listed as general deliverables in the committee's original charge. These have either been incorporated into the separate modality & modularity deliverables sections, or put on hold, as follows:

1.1. A review of digital learning and calendar flexibility across higher education and at Duke

We provide literature reviews and overviews of the current higher education landscape of calendar flexibility and digital learning separately in the Modality and Modularity deliverables sections.

1.2 Recommended policies & practices for modularity and modality

We provide detailed principles addressing benefits, risks and potential guardrails for online courses in Section 2 (2.2). In Section 3 (3.3) we provide the committee's initial thinking on policies for increased modularity within the curriculum.

1.3 An analysis of the relationship between increased calendar modularity and digital learning

This work is ongoing. We suggest including it as part of the charge to the proposed new AAS committee for AY 2025-26. Please see Section IV.

2. Modality Deliverables:

Responses to the modality-specific deliverables request are provided here in Sections 2.1, 2.2 & 2.3.

2.1: Literature review, peer schools' online instruction and online learning at Duke

The relevant literature reveals that there is no evidence of a reduction in quality based solely on whether a course is offered online or in-person; but does suggest that effective course design is an important factor in determining student outcomes. When looking at practices at other universities, the committee has found examples of limited online learning for undergraduates being deployed during the academic year at a number of our peer schools. Meanwhile, Duke itself utilizes online education in some Master's and PhD programs, as well as in some undergraduate summer courses. The committee also noted that over the last two decades, various Duke faculty governance committees have proposed exploring the risks and benefits of online learning as a new pedagogical modality for undergraduates.[5] On the basis of these findings, the AAS committee felt that further exploration of online learning for undergraduates at Duke would be appropriate.

(a) *Literature Review*

[5] Please see Appendix 1 for a detailed timeline

(b) *Examples of [peer schools' undergraduate online instruction](#).*
This site provides a a detailed assessment of the top 30 US schools' exploration of both online and modular course offerings. Some examples from that list are provided here.

- *[Brown University](#)* offers a range of online synchronous undergraduate courses during fall and spring semesters (sometimes for both on-campus and remote students combined) in multiple disciplines including: computer science, biology, and environmental science.
- *[UPenn](#)* offers fully online courses with synchronous components for undergraduate credit in [Data Analytics](#), Math, English, Neuroscience and other disciplines.
- *[Johns Hopkins](#)* teaches online math courses to undergrads and graduate students.
- *[The National Education Equity Lab](#)* is a national education nonprofit providing access and opportunity for high-achieving high school students in marginalized communities. They have formed a consortium of selective colleges to deliver college credit-bearing courses into teacher-led Title 1 high school classrooms, at scale. Among peers: Brown, Columbia, Cornell, Harvard, Penn, Princeton, Stanford, and Yale participate in this program by offering undergraduate online courses.

(c) *[Examples of Online Learning at Duke](#)*
This site provides details and statistics relating to Duke's in-person, hybrid and online offerings. Some examples are provided below.

- Undergraduate: 2023 – 2024
  - *Summer 2 2023 & Summer 1 2024*: Around 40 courses (~15 fully asynchronous) in multiple disciplines (Psych, Neuro, Writing, CultAnth, CompSci etc.; many are crosslisted between departments)
  - *Fall 2023*: 12 hybrid courses, majority in less commonly taught languages (Creole, Turkish, Swahili) – typically include weekly in-person sessions; 3 fully asynchronous (in Biology, NavalSci, and Writing disciplines)
  - *Spring 2024:* 10 fully online courses, majority again in less commonly taught languages; 2 fully asynchronous (one in Languages, one in Environmental Science)
- *[Online professional master's and doctoral degree](#)* programs
  - This site provides details of online and hybrid programs in Allied Health, Divinity, Pratt, Fuqua & Nursing at Duke
- Graduate (research) master's and doctoral degree programs.
  - Less Commonly Taught Languages graduate level courses (500+)
  - As of Fall '23, A&S Graduate faculty governance must approve exceptions to prohibition on online graduate courses (previously, none were allowed)
  - No online degree programs are currently offered in The Graduate School, but there is interest from a few academic units in exploring the possibility.

2.2 Recommended policies and practices for digital learning that enable Duke to deliver an improved educational experience, reach more and different students, and offer more sustainable financial models for learning. Should include suggestions for substantive pilots and assessment mechanisms for those undertakings at the undergraduate and/or graduate level.

_2.2(a):_ Table of benefits and opportunities for improved educational experience through online learning

	SUMMARY	***Flexibility/convenience***	***Accessibility***	***Different learners' needs***	***Real-time feedback***	***Pedagogic advantage***
Students	Both pedagogical & practical benefits	Can work, address family obligations, participate in internships, attend conferences, learn from subject matter experts in other locations, carry out offsite research while still earning course credits.	Enables access to courses despite (temporary or permanent) mobility issues. Text-to-speech and mobile-friendly interfaces increase inclusivity. Faster progress through degree reduces tuition cost.	Asynchronous content allows learners to engage with course content at different paces.	Digital tools facilitate immediate feedback on some assessments: learners more easily assess their progress. [Note: this applies to any course that includes online assessed content.]	Can enhance education by engaging students through multimedia, interactive content, breakout rooms.
Faculty	Timing & location flexibility, more tools for assessing students' progress	More flexible timing/location given enhanced options for asynchronous content. Faculty can still meet synchronously online with students. Permits completion of teaching requirements regardless of location; more flexible timing.	Enables access to courses despite (temporary or permanent) mobility issues.	Improved tools for assessing individual students' differential progress.	Data from digital platforms facilitate timely & targeted instructor intervention for students who need extra help. [*Note:* can also be available in in-person classes that utilize digital assessments]	Expand faculty skillset
Programs	Easier to staff courses	Can staff courses with off-site instructors whose expertise is not readily available at Duke, thus more options in any given semester. Enables topics and/or content that are not currently available at Duke.		Enhanced inclusivity broadens the pool of applicants and has the potential to enhance the diversity of perspectives, experiences, etc. within a program.	Improved learning enhances program "brand"	
University	Course scheduling flexibility	Removes constraints from physical teaching space needs	Greater inclusivity broadens pool of applicants, with potential to enhance diversity within a program. These goals align with the Duke values of Inclusion and Excellence.			

_2.2(b):_ Table of Concerns and Suggested Mitigants for Online Course Offerings

Students	***Lack of Social Interaction***	***Attention Issues***	***Student Characteristics***[6]
Concerns	Limited in-person interaction with peers and instructors can make it harder to build relationships, collaborate in teams and network with peers.	Maintaining attention during synchronous sessions may be harder online than in person; many unavoidable distractions (instructors cannot tell students to close their computers). Requires strong self-motivation and time management skills.	Variation in students' receptiveness to online delivery vs in-person
Suggested Mitigants	- Online breakout rooms put students in small groups to enhance sense of connection. - Team-based projects are beneficial, even if students are conducting these remotely. - If students are co-located (e.g., at Duke), in-person team projects can accompany online class. - Discussion boards, small group online TA sessions, and faculty office hours promote student-student and student-faculty engagement. - Consider limiting quantity of online courses towards overall degree requirements	High quality online design: - Asynchronous short videos with embedded active learning. - Both individual and group-based tasks (latter in breakout rooms) throughout synchronous sessions - Regular assignments and assessments.	- Faculty skills increasing; technological advances will enhance delivery. - Propose policy that no student should be *required* to take an online course. - Hence core and required courses should always offer sufficient in-person sections.
Faculty	***Perception Concerns***	***Course Design Challenges***	
Concerns	Some schools/departments view teaching online as "easy" and "lower quality than in-person education."	Online teaching requires proficiency with various digital tools, learning management systems, and multimedia resources. These can impact course design, content delivery, and communication.	
Suggested Mitigants	- Evidence from the literature[6] identifies examples in which online courses outperform in-person in terms of outcomes and student satisfaction - Pilot program will include faculty development in best practices for online teaching; robust assessment of content and delivery to evaluate students' relative learning outcomes and satisfaction - Assessment design should be developed with input from: A&S Council; Courses Committee; Committee for Undergraduate Teaching (CUT); other Assessment groups as applicable.	- Faculty guidance: instructional designers, assessment office staff and faculty peers assist in creation, assessment post-instruction and subsequent updating of online material to achieve learning objectives[7] - Faculty autonomy preserved in preparation and delivery - Faculty experience will lead to greater skill, lower needs for instructional design assistance over time - No *requirement* for faculty to teach online	

Note: many of the Mitigants are discussed further in Section III, 2.2(c): *Proposed Institutional Considerations and Guardrails*

[6] Hachey, Conway, Wladis, Karim (2022) "Post-secondary online learning in the U.S.: an integrative review of the literature on undergraduate student characteristics," Journal of Computing in Higher Education (2022) 34:708–768

[7] Eight factors for Learning Objectives: adapted from the Quality Matters rubric, a national benchmark for online quality course design

***2.2(b) continued:* Table of Concerns and Suggested Mitigants for Online Course Offerings**

Departments & Units *Concerns* Suggested Mitigants	***Intellectual Community*** Greater likelihood of faculty working remotely; possible implications for department's intellectual community - Limit the number of courses that faculty may teach online (Duke-wide or department-specific) - Departmental policies regarding faculty presence on campus	
Technology & Infrastructure *Concerns* Suggested Mitigants	***Reliable Wifi*** Students/faculty must have reliable internet & access to resources such as tech support (ideally 24/7) and online tutoring. - Duke should provide active support for students (via LILE, OIT etc.) - Dependable internet access increases all the time - might not be an issue in future years - No student should be *required* to take any online courses	***Robust LMS*** A robust LMS is essential. Online infrastructure changes rapidly, potentially requiring frequent updates of content delivery - adds effort for both instructors and instructional designers. - Provide required orientation for students in the use of the platform and tech - Platform need not always be state-of-the-art; updates only when essential
Regulatory *Concerns* Suggested Mitigants	***Student Visa Limitations*** International students on F-1 visas may be limited in the quantity of online courses that they are permitted to take in any given semester. - Institutional limits on numbers of online courses students may count towards graduation could help to equalize the playing field across student populations.	

Note: many of the Mitigants are discussed further in Section III, 2.2(c): *Proposed Institutional Considerations and Guardrails*

2.2(c) Proposed Institutional Considerations & Guardrails

We propose below a list of potential guardrails (i.e., policies and rules) that could ensure online education is utilized most effectively and has a positive impact on the student experience and Duke in general. Note that these are posed as questions, and we have not proposed specific details, as we feel that these should be informed by the pilot studies and are best left up to the school curricular governing bodies.

Student Policies

- Should quantity of online courses counted towards graduation requirements be constrained?
- Should criteria be set for Duke students completing online courses at other institutions for Duke credit?
  - How would these combine with existing criteria for maximum number of transfer credits?
- Should policies be set on the percentage of contact hours that must be synchronous? If so:
  - Might this vary by school or unit, or be course-specific?
  - Should there be additional limits on fully online, fully asynchronous courses?
  - Should the policies be different for full vs half credit class?
- Should there be a policy of no requirement for *any* undergraduate to take online courses?
  - Should this always be at the student's discretion? If so, should there be a requirement that core courses in every major/minor/certificate must always have in-person sections (even if some sections are online)?
- Should tuition costs for online courses be identical to equivalent in-person courses?
- Should online courses be open for transcriptable credit to non-Duke students? At whose discretion?
- Should there be reciprocity agreements with certain other institutions?
  - Precedent: institutional agreements between Duke/UNC/State & other geographically close institutions.

Faculty Policies

- Should there be a policy that no faculty member should ever be obliged to teach online?
- Should faculty always have full discretion over their delivery modality?
- Should there be a policy on the maximum number of courses any faculty member may teach online?
  - How many?
  - Should it vary by school / department?
  - Who determines the limit?

Additional Considerations

- Tradeoffs between equity and inclusion (potentially enhanced by online options) vs intellectual community of departments / schools (enhanced by physical presence of faculty on campus) and faculty service considerations
- Accreditation and other regulatory policies
- Assess requirements to ensure Duke's continued SACS accreditation (e.g., "regular and substantive interaction" rules)

2.2 (continued)

(d) Assessment of online delivery via limited pilots of online courses, to enhance Duke's understanding of the tradeoffs between in-person and digital delivery.

The pilot proposal developed by the AAS committee is provided via the link in Appendix 3. The AAS committee chairs presented the pilot proposal to Arts & Sciences Council (A&S Council) in fall 2024, and the Engineering Faculty Council (EFC) and the Academic Programs Committee (APC) during spring 2025. The AAS committee's pilot plan has been approved by the EFC, and a preliminary RFP has been drafted for faculty to participate in the pilot (see Appendix 3 for a link to the Pilot Proposal, which includes the RFP draft in Section 6.2). For A&S, further engagement is needed with the A&S Council before a decision is made about pursuing the proposed pilot program.

Effective online teaching during the pilot will be ensured through effective course design, faculty preparation to teach online, robust delivery support, and assessment of outcomes, as follows:

- All online courses for the EFC pilot program (and A&S pilot if approved in the future) will be evaluated through standard course approval processes, including: EFC / A&S Council; Courses Committee; and Committee for Undergraduate Teaching (CUT). Furthermore, other applicable 2030 Committees (including the proposed ongoing AAS committee) would be kept informed of the process which will be implemented in collaboration with Duke Learning Innovation and Lifetime Education (LILE).
- Online course design will include LILE's Rubric/Checklist for Online Course Design,[8] and Faculty Development programming
- Assessment plan will include:
  - Student learning, community engagement and performance outcomes (individually and via focus groups conducted by LILE), to include both students' perceptions of learning, and, whether students believe that they have learned skills transferable to other settings (e.g. in-person courses).
  - Faculty self-reflection on design, student engagement and classroom community
  - Faculty peer evaluation
  - End-of-course student evaluations.

2.3 A timeline for undertaking specific next steps in the evolution of digital learning at Duke

Please see Section IV: Proposed Next Steps, which itemizes new and ongoing committees to continue the evaluation of digital modality for undergraduates.

[8] Modeled on the Quality Matters international rubric for online course design

3 Modularity Deliverables

As noted in the Executive Summary, the committee's main focus for much of the year has been on online education, given the complexity of the issues surrounding its use (especially in the undergraduate curriculum). Our work in response to the requested deliverables on modularity is provided below. If there continues to be interest in exploring more flexibility in the calendar, this could be part of the charge to a new AAS committee in 2025-2026, as proposed below in Section IV.

3.1 A review of the higher education landscape relating to calendar flexibility

- *(a)* *Definitions of alternative calendar flexibility* provides examples of schools using the various structures (we have noted that many of the schools referenced are not those that are traditionally considered "peer" institutions).
- *(b)* *Benchmarking: 12 top schools* provides top 12 US universities' descriptions of varying course lengths and course credits.
- *(c)* *Benchmarking: 20 schools* provides a broader list.
- *(d)* *Literature Review* on Flexible Academic Calendars. The committee noted that most of the literature in this space focuses on relative outcomes between semester vs quarter systems, or relative to block scheduling (e.g. J-terms). There appears to have been very little research into partial course credits or stackable structures.

3.2 A clear list of options that increase flexibility while enhancing depth, integration, and access

In fall 2024, committee members ranked the viability of/importance of pursuing a series of alternative structures beyond the standard 14-week, 1 credit model for undergraduates. The ranking of these options is provided below (1 = highest priority for consideration).

1. Variable length courses
2. Variable course credits (e.g., fractional credits, stackable combinations with partial credit courses as prerequisites for subsequent full or partial credit courses)
3. Block scheduling (taking one course at a time)
4. Asynchronous format (student takes the amount of time that they need/want to complete the material)
5. Partial completion options, with potential to earn partial credit

Committee members noted that several of these flexible options are already offered for undergraduates at Duke (e.g., we have many ½ credit courses; we also have four week "block scheduling" classes on some summer study abroad programs).

3.3 Recommended principles, policies, and practices to support increased flexibility and a three-year timeline for concrete next steps, including suggestions for substantive pilots and assessment mechanisms for those undertakings

The committee noted that there are many factors which could complicate the introduction of more flexible course lengths and credits. A few are listed below; the committee recognizes that much more work is needed to flesh out the benefits and concerns, as well as policies and best practices, before proposing greater flexibility in the curricular calendar.

- Federal guidelines and laws (e.g., in-seat time vs. out-of-seat time, Title IV) with which Duke must comply.
- Having courses of varying lengths works within a school/program, but creates more difficulties when working across schools, especially when the calendars of the two schools are not aligned.

- Dual degree programs generally have students taking courses in one school at a time; truly joint programs are more difficult to administer.
- Class availability can become an issue (e.g., a student might take the first half of a course in one semester, and then find that the second half is not offered in the anticipated semester).

IV. Proposed Next Steps

The committee proposes the following next steps to continue the committee's work in AY 25-26:

4.1 *New and reconstituted committees*

(a) *A&S Council subcommittee:* A&S Council has created a subcommittee for continued evaluation of online courses within the Trinity curriculum, to be co-chaired by Connel Fullenkamp (chair of the Committee for Undergraduate Teaching) and Eliana Schonberg (chair of the Courses Committee). This committee's work will take place during the 2025-2026 academic year, in conjunction with the proposed new AAS committee and various faculty governance committees. (see Appendix 2 for the charge to the A&S Council subcommittee). Denise Comer, current chair of A&S Council, will also be on this sub-committee, along with 2 – 3 other faculty members.

(b) *Appoint a new AAS committee:* One recommendation of this current AAS committee is for the Provost to appoint a new AAS committee to continue the work on modality and modularity exploration. This new committee should ideally have representatives from multiple schools within Duke. The new charge for 2025-2026 could be some combination of the following:

- *Modality*
  - To provide feedback and support to A&S Council's subcommittee on online education.
  - To evaluate the data from the assessments and evaluations of the LILE-assisted summer 2025 online courses.
  - To provide input to whomever oversees the Pratt online pilot.
- *Modularity*
  - To continue the initial exploration by the 2024-25 AAS committee on modular education.
  - To respond to the 2024-25 AAS committee's general deliverable request (as outlined in the original charge) to "analyze the relationship between increased calendar modularity and digital learning as new modalities of teaching and learning."
- *Additional AAS committee goals could include*:
  - Survey Duke undergraduate students to assess the extent of student interest in online courses, as well as potential concerns.
  - Deep dive into how education may look in the future, in line with Duke's stated mission of "wide-ranging educational opportunities, on and beyond our campuses, for traditional students, active professionals and life-long learners using the power of information technologies."

V. Appendices

A1: History of faculty governance committees' evaluations of online delivery

2001: Duke's Board of Trustees approved a Mission Statement for Duke University that included the need to "provide wide ranging educational opportunities, on and beyond our campuses, for traditional students, active professionals and life-long learners **using the power of information technologies**" [*emphasis added*]

2013: Arts & Sciences Council approved a proposal for faculty "who wish to innovate and experiment with a new technological platform…" to teach online while noting that other faculty who "wish not to engage with it…[can] carry on with their established methods of teaching…no one will be forced at all [to participate]."[9]

2017: The "Together Duke" strategic plan exhorted the university to "…explore the use of evidence-based, active learning teaching models and self-paced study with digital materials, which will personalize learning for individual needs, support student success, and allow more free time for projects." (See Goal 1.)

2022: Duke's "Strategy Team 2030" was asked by the President & Provost to articulate Duke's future needs and aspirations in four key areas, one of which was Duke's educational mission. In response to this, The 2030 committee's Summary Report recommended that Duke "strike a distinctively Duke balance [between]…modalities facilitated by advances in online technologies…and the high-touch, in-person residential experience." (See page 22.)

2023: Discussions in the Academic Programs Committee (APC) centered around how online learning could be used to improve Duke's unique value proposition, and whether there are lessons to be learned from online teaching that could enhance *all* of our educational offerings.

2024: The 2030 Teaching Excellence & Innovation Implementation Initiative presented its goals to the Academic Programs Committee (APC), which included: "We must also implement a cohesive strategy for sustaining excellence in teaching and mentoring that allows Duke to take full advantage of evolving digital learning opportunities…"

A2: A&S Subcommittee Charge

Explore the current state of online learning in Trinity College of Arts & Sciences to make recommendations and/or guidelines for Trinity's approach to online learning moving forward. The committee will assess existing practices, opportunities, and challenges, and will develop recommendations to ECASC and A&S Council. The committee will consult as needed with Trinity faculty, Trinity senior leadership, A&S Council, and its Executive Committee (ECASC), and the Provost's Adaptable Academic Structures Implementation Committee, as well as other relevant stakeholders deemed necessary.

(a) Membership:

The committee will consist of 4 – 6 Trinity faculty, with representation from Arts & Humanities, Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences. One member will serve as Chair. One member of ECASC will serve Ex-Officio. All Trinity faculty, of any rank, were eligible to serve on this committee, and were invited to express their interest to the A&S Council Coordinator. Committee membership decisions were made by ECASC, in accordance with A&S Council Bylaws.

(b) Timeline and Reporting:

The committee will report to ECASC and have an initial meeting in May 2025, with expectation to conduct one meeting per month during AY 25-26 and to complete work and make recommendations by 1 May 2026. No summer work required.

A3: Pilot Proposal for fully online undergraduate courses, May 2025

[9] Minutes of the Regular Meeting of A&S Council, Thursday April 25, 2013.