Academic Council

201 Flowers Building
Campus Box 90928
Phone: (919) 684-6447
E-mail: acouncil@duke.edu

Minutes of the Academic Council Meeting
Thursday, January 16, 2025

Trina Jones (Chair, Academic Council / Law School): Good afternoon. Welcome and Happy 2025! I hope you all had a relaxing holiday season, that the start of the new year is going well and that it will continue to go well for all of you. Let me begin with a couple of informational items:

The annual election of Council members will begin later this month for representatives to be elected for the 2025-26 academic year. All faculty who are eligible to serve will get an email with information about the process from the Council's office. We have a multi-step process. The first step is to secure nominees. The next step involves an election from among these nominees. Note that all eligible faculty are opted-in to the election process with the exception of our School of Medicine colleagues in the Clinical Sciences who are opted out and must opt in to appear as a nominee willing to serve. This is because of the incredibly large number of eligible to serve faculty in the Clinical Sciences, which numbers about 2100. For those of you in the other 11 schools or divisions, if you do not opt out, and we hope that you and your colleagues will not opt out, then you could receive enough votes that would allow your name to be on the nomination ballot and then possibly, the subsequent and last step in the process, the election ballot. This is an important moment for higher education.

Please encourage your colleagues to consider service on the Academic Council! Unless there are questions about the election process, let's proceed to the approval of the minutes from our last two meetings held on November 21st and December 5th. Both sets of minutes were posted with today's agenda. Are there any corrections to either of these minutes? May I have a motion to approve both November 21st and December 5th meeting minutes?

(minutes approved by voice vote with no dissent)

Our next agenda item is to hear from Professor Kerry Haynie, who chaired the Academic Council from 2019 to 2021. Importantly, that was during COVID. Kerry, thank you for your leadership. Kerry also chaired the recent nominating committee for the next Chair of the Academic Council. My term ends on June 30th, and our bylaws state that the next Chair is to be elected by the February meeting of the Council and to take office on July 1st.

Kerry Haynie (Political Science and African, African-American Studies / Dean, Social Sciences): Thank you, Trina. Good afternoon and Happy New Year! According to the bylaws of the Academic Council, any member of the university faculty is eligible to be considered for Chair. The bylaws indicate that the Executive

Committee of the Academic Council shall appoint a nominating committee to select two people to run for Chair. In addition, additional nominations can be made from the floor during this meeting. You can see the members of the nominating committee who worked with me to come up with the slate. (refers to slide) I'd like to thank them for their service. We did a wonderful job, a quick job. I also want to thank Sandra Walton, the Executive Assistant to the Academic Council, who provided the committee with institutional history and memory and other assistance while we did our task. Thank you, Sandra.

The committee began by reviewing the criteria and the duties of the Academic Council Chair. Let me mention a few of those. The Chair serves a two-year term. As you notice, the Chair convenes and runs this meeting once a month during the academic year. The Chair plans and convenes weekly meetings of the Executive Committee of the Academic Council (ECAC). They also serve as an ex officio member of multiple university committees, which include the University Priorities Committee, Global Priorities Committee, Academic Programs Committee, a Board of Trustees subcommittee and others. Twice a year, the Chair reports to the Board of Trustees on the activities of the Council. The Chair regularly meets and consults with the President, Provost and the Executive Vice President. The Chair also serves as the University Faculty Marshal, participating in undergraduate and graduate convocations, baccalaureate and commencement services. The Chair meets and corresponds frequently with members of the faculty, students and members of the administration, on a wide range of topics seeking faculty input. As I hope it's clear, the Chair of our Council is a position of great importance to the faculty and the university. They often act as the faculty's voice on a wide range of matters.

The committee, as we began our work, we thought that the ideal candidate would be a person with a history of active engagement in faculty and university affairs, including experiences outside their own department and with an understanding of the broader university, including our traditions of faculty governance. We also believe the ideal candidate will show strong leadership and communication skills, empathy and above all, demonstrate the core Duke values of respect, trust, inclusion, discovery and excellence.

After reviewing these criteria, we created a list of several potential candidates. The committee was able to very quickly reach a unanimous consensus on two nominees for Chair. I'm happy to report that they both graciously agreed to serve. The two colleagues that the nominating committee presents to you today as candidates for the next Chair are Merlise Clyde and Mark Anthony Neal. Merlise and Mark, will you stand, please? (candidates stood, followed by applause from audience)

Merlise Clyde is Professor and Director of Graduate Studies and the Department of Statistical Science. She has been a member of the faculty at Duke since 1993, following her PhD in statistics from the University of Minnesota. Merlise's research is focused on how model uncertainty and selection impact inference and decision making from parametric regression models to high dimensional Bayesian nonparametric models. She has been at the forefront of developing Bayesian methods and theory to address these questions, motivated by problems arising in astronomy, health, environmental sciences, chemistry and genomics. Merlise has been recognized for

her research as an elected Fellow of the Institute of Mathematical Statistics, Fellow of the American Statistical Association and Fellow of the International Society for Bayesian Statistics, where she previously served as President.

Merlise has been involved in teaching at Duke at all levels throughout her career from undergraduate courses and master's courses to advanced topics for PhD students. She served as Chair of Statistical Sciences for six years, during which she helped develop and launch the successful Master of Statistical Sciences program. She is currently Director of Graduate Studies, and a Faculty Champion of the Sloan supported Duke University Center of Exemplary Mentoring. Merlise Clyde has served as a member of the Academic Council for two terms, and on the ECAC for the last two years. She has served as a member and Chair of the Faculty Compensation Committee, a member of the Executive Committee of the Graduate Faculty, co-chaired the 2024 Duke Campus Culture Survey, also co-chaired the Climate and Assessment subcommittee of the Racial Equity Advisory Council (REAC). Outside of Duke, she has served on the Canadian Statistical Science Institute Scientific Advisory Board, Project Euclid Advisory Board and the JASP Advisory Board that is an open source, publication advisory board. Thank you, Merlise. (applause)

Mark Anthony Neal is the James B Duke Distinguished Professor of African and African-American Studies. He holds secondary appointments in the Department of English and the Program in Gender, Sexuality of Feminist Studies. His research focuses on interdisciplinary approaches to the study of popular culture, popular music, Black masculinity, and the Digital Humanities. He has been widely published in both scholarly and public venues.

Mark has served as the Chair of the Department of African and African-American Studies since 2017. His second term ends June 30th, 2025. He joined the faculty at Duke in 2004, after being previously tenured at the University of Texas at Austin in the Department of American Studies and the State University of New York at Albany in the Department of English. Mark is a three-time graduate of the State University of New York -- the largest public comprehensive system of higher education in the United States.

Mark has been a member of Academic Council since 2018 and served on ECAC from 2018 to 2020. His university service includes the Academic Programs Committee; the Duke University Press Advisory Board; Duke and Durham, Today and Tomorrow Strategic Task Force, the University Committee on Honorary Degrees; Co-Chair Communications Sub-Committee for the Racial Equity Advisory Council; the President's Committee on Black Affairs, and Co-Convener of the Black Faculty Caucus. Mark has served on hiring committees for the Vice Provost / Vice President for Student Affairs, the Director of the Nasher Museum of Art, the Executive Vice-President, the Dean of Trinity College of Arts and Sciences and the Executive Vice Provost.

You will hear more, and learn more, about Merlise and Mark when the election begins. We do believe that faculty governance will be in great hands with either of these as Chair of our Council. I'll now, pursuant to Academic Council rules, open the floor for other nominations -- are there any other nominations? Hearing none, please join me

in thanking Mark and Merlise for agreeing to serve. (applause)

Jones: Thank you, Kerry and the nominating committee. The Chair election will launch in a few days. Those eligible to vote are Council members for the 2024-25 academic year. The result will be announced at the February 20th Academic Council meeting.

Our next item on the agenda is to learn more about the process for and the evolution of master's degrees at Duke. In January of 2023, the then relatively new Dean of Duke's Graduate School, Suzanne Barbour, addressed the Council and there was some conversation about the growth of master's degrees through the years at Duke. However, the last time the Academic Council had an extensive, broad-based discussion related to master's degrees was in March of 2015 when then Dean of the Graduate School, Paula McClain, discussed a report that was produced by the Graduate School and the Master's Advisory Council (MAC). We shared this report as background information with today's meeting agenda.

If you were in attendance at our last two Academic Council meetings when the Council considered a joint master's degree between Fuqua and Nicholas, you may recall that questions were raised about the potential effects that another master's degree at Duke could have on the university and community resources and various aspects of student life at Duke. These types of questions and concerns have been raised in the past, especially when the Council is presented with a new degree. Instead of considering these larger questions with a specific degree proposal on the table, ECAC thought that the better and the fairer course would be to postpone discussion of these broader matters for another day, and that is today.

To frame the discussion, ECAC asked senior administrators to provide information concerning the following matters and these administrators graciously and readily agreed to supply this information. First, the number of master's degrees at Duke. We asked for longitudinal data on the growth in master's degree programs over the past 12 to 15 years, in the aggregate and by school. We also asked for the number of PhD degrees at Duke and longitudinal data concerning their growth over the last 12 to 15 years. To the extent available, we asked for information about the demographic profile of master students, including information about gender, nationality, race, age and economic status, among other factors. We asked for a short description of the review process for master's degree programs. How often are these programs reviewed after they are established? By whom are they reviewed? What is the role of the graduate school, including MAC and the review process? Does a review backlog exist, and if so, how is that backlog being addressed? We asked for lots of things. We asked for a general description of support services, for example, transportation, housing, safety, visa assistance, mentoring, counseling, career services, that sort of thing, and other resources that are available to master's students, including an assessment of the adequacy of these services and the impact of any significant growth that master's degrees may have on the provision of these services for all students at Duke. We sought a general description of any assessments to determine how and if master's degree programs are adequately equipping students to pursue both professional opportunities as well as additional educational opportunities, so you might think about research versus professional master's programs as you think

about that issue. We asked for information about how master's degree programs advanced Duke's research mission, for example, by supporting the hiring of faculty, the provision of lab space, etc. Finally, we didn't specifically ask for this information, but in the back of everybody's mind are always questions about the cost, right? How do master students pay for their education? Are they getting sufficient return on that investment? What we're going to do now is to hear from senior administrators for about 15 minutes total and then we will open the floor to Q&A from all of you. Does that sound okay? All right. We're going to start with Suzanne.

Suzanne Barbour (Dean of the Graduate School): Good afternoon, everybody. First, I want to thank you all for asking these important questions and for taking the time to talk about master's programs and master students. I really appreciate that. It's a very important part of what we do, and it's important for us to have these discussions. I also want to thank the people who worked very hard to pull the information together that you requested. As you'll see, we were able to gather some of it, but not all of it. We hope we have enough to get a fruitful conversation going today and hopefully, if there are additional questions, we can have some more time to pull additional information together. I especially want to acknowledge Mohamed Noor and John Klingensmith, who are really instrumental in putting this presentation together. I'm just representing for everybody.

You asked about growth in master's programs over the last few years. The data I'll show you first are some enrollment trends. What you see here are data showing over the last decade or so, the number of students enrolled at the baccalaureate level. That's the light blue line at the top. At the doctoral level, that's the dark blue line kind of in the middle. This red line is breaking out PhD students from the doctoral. What you see in gold, obviously, are master's students. As you can see, there's been a steady increase in master's students on campus with quite a sharp increase starting in about 2021. The largest master's enrollments are in the following schools: Fuqua, the Graduate School and the Pratt School of Engineering. In terms of master student growth, I'm going to show that to you in two ways. On the left-hand side, we're looking at growth in terms of the percentage change in enrollment. In that case, the baseline was the number of master students in each of these schools in 2014. Then we're just looking at the percentage increase by 2024. Then we're looking at it a little differently on the right-hand side. Instead of looking at percentage we're looking at numbers. Obviously, the baseline is going to be different for different schools. Now whether we analyze the data in terms of percentage or in terms of the number, the long and the short of it is, there are three schools that stand out as having the biggest increases in enrollment. They are Pratt, Fuqua and the Graduate School. Again, those are the schools that are enrolling the largest number of master's students to begin with.

That's about demographics. Here's a snapshot of demographics. Again, we'll take a look at demographics over the last decade. 2014 is on the top and 2024 is on the bottom. I'll start by showing you domestic master students' enrollments here on this first slide. We'll look at international students on the next slide. Back in 2014 we were about 47% female, 52% male. By 2024, that's basically flipped, so we're close to 50-50, but now we are more female than male.

When it comes to the ethnicity that the students report, that's kind of changed over time. Long story short, you've noticed that there's a significant decrease in the number of students who report themselves as being white, about 52% in 2014, down to 32% or 33% in 2024. What's significant, though, is more and more students are not reporting their race or ethnicity, and that's actually a trend we see across the country, not just in students. For example, the National Science Foundation, they're seeing that more and more PIs or I should say fewer and fewer PIs are willing to report their race or ethnicity. Not clear why that's the case, but again, it's a trend that's happening nationwide. Small increase in the percentage of students who report themselves as being Black or African American. Hispanic or Latino students are about the same in 2024 as they were in 2014. Asian students are about 28%. That's a snapshot of enrollment comparing 2014 to 2024.

In terms of enrollment of international students, that's what's shown on this next slide. Again, we'll compare 2014 to 2024. Back in 2014, you can see what the ratio of male to female was. We weren't quite 50-50. We're getting closer to 50-50 in 2024. Now in terms of the enrollment of international students, that's increased dramatically. Back in 2014, about 28% of master students identified as international, we're up to 44.5%. The vast majority of those individuals come from two countries, either China or India. About 70% of our international students come from those two countries. Something to keep in mind when we start thinking about the potential that there may be some challenges for students to get into the country. But that is where we are right now. Again, it's just a snapshot of where we are relative to 2014.

You asked about master's program review processes, and I'll try to summarize them on the next couple of slides. First of all, the professional master's programs very often are reviewed by accrediting bodies that accredit the degree. When it comes to other master's programs, in particular the research master's programs, they are reviewed together with the academic unit. That's something that's been true all along. It's part of the new review process that you all talked about this time last year.

In terms of backlogs, I'll show you in just a few minutes. We're not sure exactly what the backlog is right now, but the long and the short of it is that most master's programs get reviewed either by an accrediting body that's external, or they get reviewed with the unit that they're involved in. There are a number of master's programs, however, that need a separate process because they kind of sit outside of departments. In those cases, master's programs are typically reviewed by their host schools. There was a master's review committee. That's kind of been sunset now. But between 2017 and 2020, it reviewed ten master's programs. There's a process that's been developed by the Academic Programs Committee (APC) this semester. Long story short, the processes that are being used to review master's programs are the kinds of things that you see right here in the middle. They include completion rates, job placements, student services, student satisfaction surveys, examinations of performance of students and other measures. Now, we're not certain what the backlog is right now, but there certainly is a backlog. We're still trying to catch up from the pandemic. At least four reviews will be performed during this academic year. Right now, we're really focusing on developing this unit level process, because that's the process that's going to be used to review master's

programs going forward. We're in the process of trying to catch up, and it's going to take us a while to get there, but we will get there.

Another thing to make you aware of is a different kind of review that we did this past year. The Provost Office very kindly bought us a subscription to an organization called Hanover Research. We worked with them to do a landscape analysis of master's programs to get a sense of student demand for our master's programs and workforce demand for master's programs. We've just gotten those data. They basically classified our master's programs in the categories that you see here, and we'll go through them in detail. By reviewing this information, this is going to help us to get a sense of not only how much the degree to which the students want to be in our master's programs, but also the degree to which the workforce is demanding people who have those skills. This is going to help us a lot in terms of prioritizing master's programs and master's program growth as we go forward.

Next, about support services. A little bit about that on the next couple of slides. Student Affairs has a number of support services. One really important thing that we didn't put on this slide, is the graduate and professional student services group in Central Student Affairs here at Duke. As you probably know, I've been a graduate dean at three other institutions. I was a faculty member at another institution before that. I have never seen a central student affairs office have a team specifically dedicated to helping graduate and professional students. That is a wonderful innovation and it's one of the reasons I came to Duke. It's a really, really exciting innovation and it's very unique. You all should be very proud of that. And they do a wonderful job. They help all graduate students and in particular master students in a variety of ways. These include providing programing related to health and wellness, providing programing related to community development, belonging and inclusion. There's a group that works with housing and all the off-campus community, and does some work related to crisis response. There's the career center that helps students with their post-graduation plans. This is a central resource that's available to all graduate professional students, including master's student. Within the Graduate School (TGS), we have another group that specifically focuses on master students who are enrolled in graduate programs that are not managed by the graduate school. Remember, those are the research master's programs, so we have a group that focuses on professional development. They do a variety of things for both master's and PhD students. Some of these are master's students specific. For example, we have master student workshops. This *Beyond Graduate School* is an online resource that we subscribe to for master's students. There is the Dean's Research Award for master's students as well. We also run the English for International Students program that supports international students, not just masters, but at the PhD level as well. For our academic team, we have academic support and advising that basically complements the kinds of things that you do in your departments. Notably, the Graduate School is not the only school that has resources to support master students. Pratt, for example, has this wonderful group called the Graduate Student Programs and Services Group. There are about 25 people in that group, and they support all kinds of things for master's students, including career development, intercultural programing, health and wellness support. They even have a group that supports students who are abroad developing skills with English language

skills. This is just meant to be a snapshot of the kinds of support services that are available around campus. We don't have time to go through them all, but almost every school has some sort of mechanism that provides local support for graduate students, including master students.

Just to give you a snapshot of master's student usage of some of these support services, we thought we would focus in on, specifically some of the services that are provided by Central Student Affairs. We're about 35% master's students in terms of the percentage of our student body. Back last fall, about 30% of the Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) appointments were taken by master's students. They constituted about 14% of student health appointments, about 38% of the folks who went to the food pantry were master's students and about 28% of approved applications for student emergency funds came from master's students. And about 14% of incident reports were about master's students. Again, this is just meant to be a snapshot to give you a sense of the services that are available and the degree to which master's students are using them. There's a lot more detail that we could go into and there are a number of people in the room who can speak to some of it. This was just intended to get the conversation going.

You asked about professional development and outcomes, and that's what I'll talk about in the next couple of slides. In terms of professional development, of course, we have the Duke Career Center, which primarily services master's students in the Graduate School and in Trinity. And it turns out that most of the other schools, including the Graduate School, have their own local support mechanisms for graduate students, both doctoral and master's students that are local. That's important because a local unit can tailor its resources, so they specifically meet the needs of the students. Just to give you some examples, in the Graduate School, we have a graduate student affairs team that does a lot of work on professional development for master's students. You saw some of it on the previous slide. Remember we talked about Pratt. They've got their graduate student programs and services group that I talked about previously as well. I'm just showing you those examples because again, those are the three schools that enroll the largest numbers of master's students. In addition, there are a number of things that these units provide. For example, there are career exploration opportunities. To give you one example there of what I think is a really neat way for students to figure out what the right career path is. We have a certificate in college teaching in the Graduate School. It's the largest graduate certificate on campus. Of course, most of these unit based professional development units provide some kind of connection to alumni with the idea that that's not just an opportunity for mentoring for graduate students, but ultimately can help them to land jobs as well. In terms of outcomes and career paths again, just a snapshot for you.

We thank you for prompting us to do the exploration to find that there are some programs that don't systematically collect data about completion rates, and that's really important. Attrition is something we need to be mindful of. We don't have all the data. We need to assess that now. That's something I'd like to come back and report on sometime in the future.

We did learn, however, that most programs, many programs systematically collect information about outcomes. In some cases, this is mandated by the accrediting body. But it's always an important thing to have a sense of what happens to your students. In

general, 75% to 100% of students who come to our master's programs have placements. They're in jobs within six months of graduation, and they are employed all over the country and all over the world doing all kinds of wonderful things.

Finally, you asked about the impact on research. Remember that our master's students, particularly the research master's students in the graduate school, do thesis projects. Many of those thesis projects are aligned with the research mission of the university, so there's a direct connection to the research mission. In addition, despite the fact that we don't guarantee any financial support to master's students, many of them actually are employed as RAs and in their RA positions, they're typically working on research that's related to the research mission of the university, and therefore supporting that mission.

Then finally, the tuition stream that comes from master's students, just as is true for the tuition that comes from undergraduates and professional students, all feeds into a pool that support all kinds of things related to the research mission, including such things as faculty hiring, research facilities, and even supports and feeds back and provides more staff for our research mission. I think I'd be remiss to not comment more broadly on the impact of master's students on our campus, and that's what this slide is meant to do.

Beyond the research mission, some additional things the impacts of master's students have are, junior and senior undergraduate students very often enroll in master's level courses. In fact, there's something like 2500 instances of that over the last academic year. Master's students also serve as near-peer mentors to our undergraduate students. Between the kinds of interactions they have as near-peer mentors and the interactions they have with undergraduates in the courses. We like to think they're one of the recruiting tools we have for inspiring our undergraduates to go to graduate school.

And then finally, many schools leverage master's program tuition. They feed it back, and they provide scholarship for master's students. Good example of that, the daytime MBA in Fuqua has scholarships for over 90% of its students, in part, through revenues that come from the tuition stream.

I hope that very quick overview gives you a sense of where we are. The goal now, and I'm looking forward to it, is to have conversation from you, get your feedback, get your ideas, and hopefully, come up with a way that we can take what I think is a really great baseline, a great start in terms of the way we engage master's students and make it even better. Again, I thank you all for giving us the opportunity to have this conversation, and I look forward to your questions. (applause)

Jones: I do have a question. If you go back to your first slide, with the permission of the Council, may I ask a question? We see a large increase in the number of master's degrees, but the PhD degrees seem to be sort of flat over time. The question is, is this ad hoc, sort of random? Is this intentional? The secondary question is what is the enrollment vision of the university's investment in academia? You see this increase in the master's programs, but the PhD programs are flat. What does that mean about Duke's commitment to academia?

Barbour: That's a great question. The PhDs are flat. That's in part because we're limited in the number of PhD students we can employ, because we have limited resources to pay their stipends and their tuitions. There

really is a financial fiscal limit on the number of PhD students we can bring to campus. We're very careful about that every year. The Graduate School does calculations. It sends those calculations off to the schools, and then the schools ultimately decide how they want to use their tuition revenues and the other revenue streams they have to support PhD students. But the bottom line, there is a ceiling, for sure. That's because it takes a lot of money to support a PhD student. Last year, that amount of money was northwards of a $450,000 commitment to PhD students for five years. That's a lot of money. And again, it limits the number of students who can be in this red line.

In terms of masters, each school and each faculty make a determination about the number of master students it wants to admit. I imagine a number of factors go into that. There's probably some discussion about revenues, again, and the degree to which some of those students can be supported as RAs. We all recognize that the tuition burden here is quite high, and the master's students are concerned about that. I'm sure factored into that decision in terms of the numbers of master's students who are enrolled, I should say accepted, is this idea that we want to be able to support as many of them as we possibly can. I also think increasingly, in part because of the kinds of conversations you all have had here, that people are thinking about the more general resources that are available across campus, and the degree to which they can support the number of master's students who are on campus. This bump, I would say, has been fairly well compensated for in terms of expanding by way of expanding the resources, the staff resources that are available to manage master's students. But I think you could probably talk to almost anybody on campus and they'd say we could always use more people to help support our master's students.

The last thing I'll say is, there's a national effort now, through the Biden administration, called the Gainful Employment effort. What Gainful Employment is doing is basically, it's going to require us to report on not just master's students, but all our graduate students in terms of the number of students we graduate, the salaries that they command and the debt that they are pursued. Essentially, what the Biden administration is trying to do is make sure that our graduate students get the bang for the buck that they deserve. To be honest, I think Gainful Employment was prompted by the more predatory for-profit master's programs. There are a lot of those that are out there now. Sadly, they very often don't provide students with the bang for the buck that they deserve. Duke is certainly not an institution that does that. But at the same time, we do have a very high tuition rate, so it becomes important for us to be very responsible about the number of students we admit, in hopes that we can support as many of them as possible. Perhaps not fully, but we'd like to scholarship as many as possible. I hope that helps. Thanks.

Jones: Yes.

Cam Harvey (Fuqua / member of ECAC): I have two questions that are related to strategy, and I'll ask them sequentially. In an email, we received a copy of the 2015 Master's Review Report. The number one recommendation in that review was that the master's strategy be explicitly detailed in Duke's strategy. I don't see it detailed in our strategy, the 2030 plan. This question is perhaps more for the President and Provost. It does seem that things have changed, and I have looked at the data. On our longer

horizon, if you look back to 2001, which is not that long ago, the proportion of master's degrees at Duke is 38%. If you look in 2024, it's 58%. With your presentation, we are seeing a snapshot of ten years. But the trend is very steady. The question really is where's this going. Is it 60%, 70%, 80%? This fundamentally changes Duke University and is happening. This seems like a strategic issue given this vast change. I am wondering whether this will be part of our strategic planning.

Barbour: I can answer part of that, and then I might turn to my colleagues to help me as well. One of the reasons we were prompted to ask the questions we did with Hanover Research is exactly what you're describing. In the end, if we're going to educate master students, we want to make sure that they are going to have gainful employment. Employment that's aligned with the degree that they've earned and that they're ultimately going to be successful in that employment. That snapshot that Hanover Research has given us is going to be very helpful there. I can't give you all the details on what the snapshot has told us. What I can tell you, though, is in general, there's more room for growth in professional master's programs than there is in research master's programs. The growth tends to be more technical master's programs than the master's programs that aren't technically based. The more quantitative the master's program is, the more likely it is that there's a demand out there, not just on the student level, but on the workforce level as well. I think that has to be a big part of our conversation, and 2030 does kind of skirt that issue. It may not specify a number of master's students who should be enrolled, or a number of master's programs that should be available on campus, but it does hint at the idea that we need to be responsible stewards of our master's programs and ensure they meet the needs of our students and ultimately prepare them for rewarding careers. I'll turn to my colleagues if they have more to share?

Harvey: Thanks, well, let me ask my second question and please indulge me. Looking over the past 15 years, the growth in master's degrees is 83%. If you look at other data at Duke University, you see that our assets adjusted for inflation have grown by 101%. But if you look at other data, like capital spending adjusted for inflation, it's down, -58%. The thing that's most important to me is the number of faculty and the number of tenure track faculty over the last 15 years has decreased by 4.2%. You had a slide on how the master's program interacts with the research mission. And we heard last month from the Deans of Nicholas and Fuqua saying that if their master's programs were successful, that they could add five new tenure track lines each. We have a long history here, but the degrees have increased by 83%, yet the number of tenure track faculty is down. I am wondering if the President and Provost will make it different going forward in the future so that a master's is not just contributing in terms of research assistants, but also opening up lines for growth in our tenure track faculty?

Barbour: I don't want to put words in the President's or Provost's mouths, but just to give you a little sense of where I stand on that. Obviously, I wasn't here 15 years ago when those conversations were had. But I have been in other places where those kinds of conversations are happening. I'll start by saying the growth we're seeing in master's enrollment is not unusual. It's something we see across the country. There is a demand for master's degrees. The master in some cases is becoming kind of the entry level degree, particularly for some of the technical fields. I'll start with that. The second thing

I'll say to you is almost every school we surveyed, and we went out to all the schools to get answers to your questions. When they answered the question about the research mission, the first thing they said was that the master's tuition revenues in general help to support the growth of the faculty. When they talk about faculty growth, they talk about it not just in terms of the number of faculty, but also in terms of startup packages of the renovations that have to happen to laboratory and other facilities and other infrastructure type issues like that. So, the long and the short of it, I'm not disagreeing with you. All I'm saying is when you see tuition revenues being funneled into support for faculty, it's not just about the number of faculty, it's also about faculty research needs. I don't know about you, but what I've seen over the last 15 years is a huge increase in the size of startup packages, so it costs a lot more now to recruit a faculty member than it did 15 years ago. I think that's part of the reason you're seeing what you're seeing. But I really do appreciate you're running those numbers. And if you wouldn't mind sharing them, I'd love to have those data. Thank you.

Shai Ginsburg (Asian & Middle Eastern Studies): Thank you for your presentation. I was struck by two numbers. First of all, you noted that 38% of the MA students rely on Feed Every Devil program. The second one is that 90% of Fuqua students receive some kind of scholarship. That indicates to me that there's something skewed in the way we charge tuition. If tuition for most students is lower than the scholarship, why not charge lower tuition? That would make the math easier and more transparent, right? I'm really struck by the 38% who rely on Feed Every Devil, that means that they pay tuition at the expense of their well-being. That's a very disturbing figure to think about. Perhaps that should indicate that that's not an insignificant number.

Barbour: I couldn't agree with you more. That number concerns me a lot. Even with the 38% being very close to the 35% of students who are master's students, I'd prefer that to be 0%. No question about it. The other thing I'll tell you is, just to use the Graduate School as an example, our resourcing, our support is really founded on the PhD mission right now, not on the master's mission. One example, we have a hardship fund, but we can only provide it to PhD students. We can't provide it to master students because we just don't have that. That's true. That's why in the upcoming campaign, a master's hardship fund is among our campaign goals. I'm with you on that 100%. I get it.

Terry Oas (Biochemistry / member of ECAC): As I understand it, you as Dean of the Graduate School are not in charge of all of the master's programs that exist on campus. Is that correct?

Barbour: That's correct.

Oas: What fraction of the growth that you showed us in the last ten years has been due to programs that you are in charge of versus are not?

Barbour: I can give you a snapshot of that. Here's the Graduate School. The vast majority of the growth is from Pratt. But the Graduate School is not too far behind it, whether you look at it in terms of the percentage enrollment or number of enrollments.

Oas: Any of the bars that are not TGS are not involved in master's programs that you do not support or manage?

Barbour: That's correct. But I'm Vice Provost for Graduate Education, so I have oversight for all of these.

Oas: I see. Okay, thank you.

Betsy Albright (Nicholas School of the Environment): While we're on this slide, I'm just curious what the story is with Divinity, if that was a purposeful loss or was that loss for some other reasons? Are there lessons learned there that we should be thinking about?

Barbour: I would have to ask my colleagues in Divinity about that. Could be driven by workforce, maybe they're training fewer master's students because there's less demand on the workforce. I honestly don't have an answer to that question. Is there anybody here from Divinity who could address that?

Unknown Speaker: I had the same question. I have no idea. I am saddened by that, but I cannot explain it.

Barbour: The long and the short of it is even for the programs that we manage in the Graduate School, where I have more direct oversight, it's ultimately the programs that make the determination. For many of those programs, I can't answer that question. I certainly can't answer it for Divinity.

Kathy Andolsek (School of Medicine): Thank you so much for this. As one of the people who had to quickly accumulate some data on a master's program, I'm grateful for the opportunity. I also would urge caution in interpreting it because it was done quickly. I'm also curious to what percentage of the master's programs that are there that did present data back to you. You said it wasn't all of them. So, are we talking about 50%, 75%, 90%, 99%? I guess just a rough ballpark. I am just curious because that would help us interpret this. I don't know, like mater's enrollment group. Is that by numbers? Do you know, that was independent of the thing?

Barbour: These are numbers from the Registrar's website.

Andolsek: Okay. So, some of this data look like it was collated from information you already had and some whatever.

Barbour: This all comes from the Registrar's website.

Andolsek: The other part that I was just curious about is I think we all do SACs reports. For the SACs report in the fall because we are all accredited with them, even if we don't have an external credit for our own program. What happens to those? Because in answering those questions, I kind of got the sense that nobody ever read them.

Molly Goldwasser (Associate Vice Provost of Academic Affairs): I read them all.

Andolsek: Oh, good. Good. Maybe you could have given them the answers and saved me an opportunity to do that. You know, because I do think we do put things into that.

Goldwasser: The enrollment portfolios are aggregated and sent into iPads and we don't keep that information. I don't keep that information. Just aggregated, and lives with the Registrar's Office.

Andolsek: It just struck me that it might be a great opportunity to give us a good template for the SACs reports we could all fill out in a very standardized way, and then keep it in a way that would be useful to you in data reporting. Because otherwise, I feel

like I'm doing something that's not particularly useful.

Barbour: I agree. What I would love to have is a systematic way of collecting all these data. Right now, as Dean of the Graduate School, even as Vice Provost for Graduate Education, I can see the data from one school. That's the Graduate School. I can't see any of these data, which is why I had to bug you to get them.

Andolsek: But I think when you ask us to report to you all in various ways, SACs was one of the ten programs that I reviewed, so I had a report in 2018. It seemed like some of those sources should be able to be findable and extractable to be meaningful moving forward, rather than just sit in a separate compartment.

Roxanne Springer (Physics): This is fascinating. Thank you. I have a clarification question, and then I want to come back a little bit to the alignment with academic mission issue. In the clarification, my understanding of that chart is that it was 38% of the people who use the food bank, so there could just be like three people who use food bank?

Mary Pat McMahon (Vice President / Vice Provost of Student Affairs): Yes, it's a small n and you are correct.

Springer: Thank you. You talk about the external consulting that you did and that they talk about student or potential student desire and also workplace desire. But I think you'll agree that this does not typically align with the academic mission. If what we wanted is to employ a lot of people or make the world a better place, you'd shut down the Physics department and they'd be in nursing or something. (laughter) So, I want to know how that concept of our academic mission is folded in.

Barbour: I need to ask you a question. Why do you not see this as part of the academic mission?

Springer: It's not that a master's program doesn't necessarily not align with the academic mission, but it's not at all automatic. As you know, in some places, simply an additional revenue stream.

Barbour: Well, I'm going to disagree with that. I think the reason the Biden administration launched the Financial Transparency Initiative is because of exactly what you're describing, because institutions aren't thinking of master's programs as being part of their mission. I don't think that's where we are at all as an institution. In fact, I would say, relative to other institutions where I've been, we embraced the master's programs in ways that are much more substantial than what I've seen before. Again, going back to the idea that there are people embedded in central student affairs who look after master's students and other graduate and professional students. I'm not agreeing with the central premise, but maybe I just don't understand your question. Maybe someone else can ask it and help me understand?

Andrew Janiak (Philosophy): First, I'm against shutting down the Physics Department. (laughter) I'm in Philosophy. I would just say what seems to be missing from the conversation is that as far as I know, I've been here 22 years, whether it's here, the Academic Programs Committee, every master's program was advocated for by faculty, often very strenuously, with good arguments about their fields and so on. I can't think of one that wasn't advocated for by faculty. That has to be part of our

understanding what the academic mission of the university is, unless we are presupposing that the faculty don't grasp that.

Mine Cetinkaya-Rundel (Statistical Science): When we see the numbers of master's students increasing, personally, I'm not alarmed by that increase. If we're able to educate more people, I think that's great. I feel like the statistics that are missing here is what's the impact of that increase when we have a steady number of undergraduate students and PhD students and not an increase in faculty. You articulated really well the influx might be beneficial in other ways, but I'd love to see what has this done to the average number of courses a department has been able to offer, or what the class sizes have been throughout this time, because I imagine those would be increasing numbers. And some of those goes very much against some of the things we're trying to do, say, in the undergraduate program. There is a cost to these increasing numbers if there isn't a balance. I'm just wondering, have you looked at or is there plans to look at what the impact of this has been given the increasing resources on the other programs?

Barbour: We actually haven't done those analysis. It's a great point. The other thing it puts me in mind of is, I think Cam mentioned that the number of tenured faculty has declined over time. I'm going to trust you on that, Cam.

Harvey: It's in the Duke Annual Reports.

Barbour: OK. I imagine there's also been an increase in adjunct faculty as well. That's happening across academia. That's kind of the trend across academia. The other thing I think we have to think about as an institution is our relative commitment to regular rank faculty versus adjunct faculty and the degree to which we want to engage, our very important teaching mission with adjuncts. So, your point is well-taken. I appreciate that.

Mohamed Noor (Executive Vice Provost): First, going back to Andrew's point, which I love that, I agree completely. In addition to faculty, putting out a rationale for these new master's programs as they launch, there's a very rigorous review process for every new master's program. For example, the Master's Advisory Council, which is again, composed of a big, wide swath of faculty from across the university who vet it, and they're not vetting it just to see is it going to make money. Of course, they're looking at the financials to it, very much looking at the academic rationale. A lot of them go through the Academic Programs Committee, not professional as necessary, but all the academic ones go through the Academic Programs Committee. There's a very heavy look on, is there value to these students? Is there value to the academic mission, beyond just the money-making aspect?

To the last question about faculty aspect. Again, there has been growth in the non-tenure track, regular rank faculty. As I understand, actually Merlise you might know this, I think Statistics is one of the ones that actually has some long tenure track regular rank faculty lines that are funded directly by the master's program. I know that's true in several other departments as well.

Merlise Clyde (Statistical Science / member of ECAC): Three tenure-track faculty.

Noor: Yeah. Three tenure-track. It varies across the units, but there definitely have been a lot of faculties directly supported by this revenue. Thank you.

Barbour: One other follow up I'd say to what Mohamed has said, faculty were involved certainly in the launching of all these programs. One thing we don't do well as faculty, in general, we don't sunset things. (laughter) Let's be honest, I know we don't. We like to build. We don't want to take down. Sometimes programs run the course, so there's probably some merit in thinking about that.

Josh Sosin (Classical Studies / member of ECAC): I wanted to add a sort of a footnote to Mine's excellent point. You sit in this room long enough, you see that there are a lot of great programs that always have compelling justifications, and people do their homework. Even if we are reluctant to sunset things, my guess is that most do pretty well in performing more or less as planned and hoped for. But that's not actually the thing that I worry about, it's the carrying capacity of the entire environment. Not just in terms of teaching capacity, but seats in classrooms. We're mostly pretty smart people who are pretty serious about the things we propose. You can have a universe in which every single master's program we propose is excellent and thrives, and nonetheless, the accumulation of them when measured at the level of the community is unsustainable. My question is about what is the work that we're doing to try to get a read on what our total capacity is in what Mine says and in other ways as well, because that's when you have to start asking questions about allocation of scarce resources. Are we giving more seats to a segment of the student population at the expense of another? Are we willing to make that trade?

Barbour: Great. Really an important question. I agree completely, Josh. That's the reason every master's program proposal flows through the MAC. We have folks on MAC who represent the libraries, who represent Student Affairs, the Graduate School, and all the schools. The kinds of conversations we have at MAC are not about, is this the right course; do they have the right faculty member teaching the courses; do we have the resources necessary to launch this program and do it not at the expense of the other programs we already have now. Do we always have all the data at hand that we need? That's come up a couple times. This data thing. Not always. I think one of our challenges as an institution is systematically collecting data and making them available in a way that we can analyze them. But those are exactly the kinds of conversations we have on that.

Sosin: On the undergraduate side, we have a sense of the ceiling. You might call it artificial, but it's imposed by a commitment to residential learning, so that there's at least an intellectual basis for the number above which we can't go. But on the graduate side, what is the ceiling?

Barbour: I don't know. I can't give you a formula. I can't give you a ceiling. What I can tell you, though, is that we do have a very thoughtful group that spends time with each proposal and has exactly the kinds of conversations you're describing. Again, I think our conversations are limited in part due to a lack of availability of systematically collected data.

Tyson Brown (Sociology / member of ECAC): To provide a little bit of context for our numbers and growth in master's students, I was wondering if the recent landscape analysis provided data comparing our number and percentage of master's students to our Ivy Plus peers?

Barbour: Not directly. What it did was compare our master's programs to a regional sample and a national sample, but it didn't call out specifically the Ivy Plus. I understand where we are going with that. At the master's level, the regional analysis is probably one of the most important ones because our master students, a good percentage of them go out, they go directly into the workforce. We don't like to think of ourselves as a workforce institution. But for some of our master's students, that's exactly what we are. The key issue there is to ensure that there are jobs out there waiting for the students we train. Again, that's why the Biden administration launched the Gainful Employment Initiative, which hopefully will survive, what's about to happen on January 20th. The concern was that master's students were not only paying a ton of money, they ultimately weren't being employed as a result of having paid all that money. I'll leave it at that.

Justin Wright (Graduate Dean, Trinity College of Arts & Sciences): There is some additional data from another consulting report that has done a landscape analysis comparing ourselves to our Ivy Plus peers. Just so everyone is aware, over the last couple of years, at least in Arts and Sciences, Duke has experienced about a 5% compounded annual growth rate. Our Ivy Plus peers in the master space have been growing at over 10%, so we're growing at less than half the rate of our Ivy Plus peers in the master space.

Barbour: I'd love to see that report too.

McMahon: Just quickly on the food piece, because Shai's right to say, how do we think about, what are our sort of greater needs for our graduate student population. More broadly, like Josh says, undergrads have a sort of a baseline financial aid package. They all have a meal plan, and we make sure everybody gets food. That 38% is small and is pretty hard to extrapolate. We do know that about 650 students use the food pantry for the semester, so 650 out of the base of 10,000 graduate students. We try to meet food insecurity needs. We've been surveying that more broadly just to raise the point that there's a huge variation in our master's population around who is price sensitive, for whom they're making every dollar count versus their job, their programs, getting paid for by their employer or something. We've been trying to focus those centralized graduate student services on students for whom the experience of being here, the costs are really factored week to week. That's where we target our efforts, and I'm happy to say more as needed.

Jones: Final questions. Comments? Observations? Josh?

Joshua Socolar (Physics): Just curious, back in 2015, when we were doing this, there's the question of the total number of master's students. There's also a question of proliferation of master's programs. I'm just wondering, in the growth of the total number of students, does that represent just master's programs, the existing ones taking more students, or does that mean we're offering more programs?

Barbour: It's a combination of the two. Thank you.

Nicolas Cassar (Nicholas School of the Environment): How can we justify a system where master's students pay tuition while sitting in the same classrooms as PhD students who not only attend for free but are also financially supported? That is the way things have always been done does not make it just, nor does it mean it should continue unquestioned.

Barbour: Yeah, it's a good question. This is a decision that not just Duke University, but research universities in general have made, and that is that we invest in PhD students because we have them here on campus for on average 5.7 or 6 years. They not only contribute to the research mission by following directions, but ultimately, they take ownership of their projects, and they develop new knowledge based on their own curiosity and their own intentions. So, we see them in a very different space than a master student who's here for just 18 months to two years, who might do a very small research project that ends up being a figure in a paper but doesn't take on something independent and has a very different contribution to the research mission than a PhD student. You invest in your PhD students in those first two years. In the last three years they're giving back to you by way of the things they do in the research mission and teaching mission in other places on campus. Again, this is not just a Duke way of looking at master's versus PhD students. This is the way that master's and PhD programs are run in general at research universities like ours. In a perfect world, believe me, I wish the tree outside my window grew money, and I would love to fully support every master's student on campus, certainly all the students in the Graduate School. Obviously, we can't do that.

Dalia Patino-Echeverri (Nicholas School of the Environment): On this question of on how to use the data to craft a long strategy when considering master's program, I think it's very important to recognize that there is a lot happening in the schools and divisions that is not captured by data. It may be worth considering a survey of the faculty in a professional school. Like the Nicholas School, there has been always, at least for the last 17 years, a big tension between the faculty that is mostly oriented to the master's program and the faculty who have oriented to the master's program, but feel that we are, in a way, not providing 100% to the doctoral or undergraduate students. So, in our school, there is a small proportion of faculty that teach undergraduate students, a small proportion of faculty that advise those students. You always wonder, would you have more PhD students if you had more time to write grants to support those PhD students, if you were not advising 12 master's students under master's programs and under master's projects, for example? There is definitely a change in the way the divisions that are heavily dependent on the income that comes from the masters. The way they make those decisions, it will not show in the data. I think there would be value in trying to gather data in some other way.

Barbour: Really appreciate that. You're illustrating why the graduate school doesn't make those kinds of decisions. Those are local decisions, because it's really important for a faculty to sit down and talk about their division, talk about their department, talk about their school, where they want to go, how they want to get there, and the right mix of programs and students that's going to get them there. I really appreciate that. That's the reason why graduate education is distributed and not just run by a central entity.

Victoria Szabo (Art, Art History & Visual Studies): I'm curious about whether there is a larger interest in formulations like 4+1 or online education, and whether that's something we're going to systematically look at as an institution or if that's more localized?

Barbour: Yeah, it's a great question. I would love to look at those kinds of

mechanisms, if for no other reason than because I think they open up access to Duke graduate education to more individuals. The other thing we really ought to be thinking about are, some of the stackable credential certificates, for example. Think about it, you all provide Duke undergraduates with an amazing undergraduate experience. They walk out of here with a degree in, say, 2024, but a skill set that's likely to get rusty over time. Having a rusty skill set and reskilling, upskilling doesn't necessarily mean you have to come back and do it to a degree. So, I think the idea of compartmentalizing training so that outstanding alums can come back and kind of fill in the gaps. Upskill or reskill is a fabulous idea in the online space, is a great way to do that. With that said, we don't want to be Grand Canyon University either, right? But I think we can accomplish that because we all know the culture that we want to sustain here at Duke. In the graduate space, there's some really cool places where we may be able to do some things in the online space that would be incredibly impactful and wouldn't change our culture on campus at all. And I hope that we'll be able to do that.

Noor: I'm going to add to Suzanne's answer there. Excellent. I agree with everything you said. The Academic Programs Committee last year actually took up this question, so thank you for asking that. We actually generate a series of guidelines for 4+1 master's programs because we wanted to make sure there would be some guardrails around that. They wouldn't be willy nilly. For example, that the only ones that can do it are programs that already have an admitting master's program, the ones that already have an undergraduate major. There's a three-page handout that has all the various guardrails around. Just to make sure that we're careful with this process and we don't go crazy. But yeah, definitely interest in that. Thank you for asking the question.

Oas: To get back to Cam's question and listening to Mohamed's addressing his question, would it be fair to come away from this, concluding that if in fact, our teaching resources are keeping pace with our obviously increasing student population, just total students, and yet our tenure track faculty level is flat, then is it true that all of this increase in students are being compensated by non-tenure track faculty?

Barbour: It's a good question. I don't have the answer to that. Do any of my colleagues have some insights?

Noor: I don't have the answer for sure, but I think you actually addressed this earlier on. One of the issues we have is, again, the cost for tenure track faculty has accelerated at a huge pace, not just the start-ups. In fact, that we have so much salary compression illustrates as we're hiring more people, like they're coming in at much higher salaries. Essentially it helped us try to keep pace with that. But, it has not been sufficient to completely counteract those other forces, which is basically the increasing costs associated with it. That's my impression, but I don't actually have an analysis that lays that out.

Oas: So that answer addresses cost.

Noor: Yeah.

Oas: But it doesn't address the teaching faculty to student ratio, right? That was what my question was about. What's the faculty to student ratio? Is that keeping pace? And if it is and if we conclude that that's not due to tenure track faculty, then the obvious conclusion is all of the increase in master's

programs is concomitant with an increase in adjunct faculty, non-regular rank faculty.

Noor: To quote my colleagues, correlation does not equal causation. But yes, I agree.

Asheley Skinner (Population Health Sciences): Just a quick comment in regard to the tenure track and the adjuncts. Certainly, in the School of Medicine, there's a substantial number of regular rank faculty who are not tenure track, but are treated otherwise very much like tenure track faculty, so it's not necessarily being covered by adjuncts.

Harvey: This is my last question, definitely. Just to throw some data out. Tenure track growth over the last 15 years is -4.2%. Non-tenure track regular rank is up 112%. That's just a fact. What I'm more interested in is the non-regular rank, so nobody that's here. What would be very interesting to know is who are the teachers of these students? And, is it the case that the students are getting the best quality education by certain programs loading up adjunct professors? Some of them are good, maybe some of them aren't. My question is really about the potential risk to the Duke brand. I am also privy given my role at the APC to some of these master's reviews, and I notice a very large disparity in selectivity. It is dramatic sometimes. I am wondering, is there any oversight of that? Again, if you are accepting 70% of the people that apply, I worry about the Duke brand and I also worry that we are not doing the students a favor in terms of admitting them. This is a tension. Yes. The students brings in tuition revenue. Yes, it helps fund PhD students and faculty salaries. But in the big picture, we need to be very careful about protecting our brand.

Barbour: Your point is incredibly well taken. I will say there's a nuance to that percentage admissions, the selectivity. For some programs, students apply to work with a specific faculty member and they're only admitted if indeed they're going to work with that faculty member. That's not the case for all the programs. But in many cases, there's almost a 1 to 1 correlation. I think probably the more telling data, to be honest, are the attrition data, which we don't systematically collect. Again, we're going to make that happen. Thank you.

Jones: Thank you so much, Suzanne. (applause) We really owe Suzanne and her team a debt of gratitude, for collecting this information. Some of it was already existing, but then pulling together more over the last couple of months. Thank you so much. As I think the conversation shows, this is an incredibly complicated area, and it always helps to have appropriate information as we think about some of the issues that you've been raising today. We have ten minutes. I could give it back to you, or we could engage in a little bit of open conversation. Periodically we have some extra time to hear back from Council about what's on your mind, what would you like for ECAC to tee up for conversation in the future, or just any general issues involving higher education that you'd like to put on the floor. So, go for it, if you have anything in mind. Any burning issues that you'd like us to tee up for conversation over the next semester?

Jessilyn Dunn (Pratt School of Engineering): A challenge that has come to my attention kind of recently is staff members and especially those on grants and maternity leave. It's a very specific challenge, but I've noticed that it actually causes problems with hiring biases. The challenge is that when we have staff members who are paid on grants, if they go on maternity leave or some sort of medical

leave, the funding for that comes off the grant. I do believe that there should be a broader school wide support for these, such that if faculty are looking to hire people to work on grants, there's not a bias that somebody is likely to go on to leave and therefore they would decide not to hire them. In the early stages of kind of understanding NIH and NSF policies around this, but my understanding is that the default policy at Duke continues to pay the person from your grant for up to 90 days, at least for the NIH. That's a big hit. It's just something that I wanted to bring to the attention of others and then maybe pursue further. But if anybody knows anything more about this, I would love to learn more.

Jones: We can certainly ask a question and get back with you with some information. That's very important. Anything else?

Jennifer Cohen (School of Medicine): Somewhat related topic to what was just mentioned, but a little bit different. The Tenure Clock Relief policy is to my understanding, one year per child. The Tenure Clock Relief policy is the same if you have multiple children at one time. To me, two children at once is more work than one child at once. Anyone can come ask me if they want to have more personal experience. (laughter) I think it affects a small number, probably, of individuals. It's at no cost to the institution to give two years for two children, even if they are birthed at the same time, because I do think in terms of productivity, academically, two children is two children, whether they're birthed at the same time or at different times.

Jones: Okay. Thank you. It's really important to open up the floor because we are thinking about our athletics, changing the landscape of athletics and support for research from NSF, NIH and NEA over the next administration. It's really interesting to hear what's on your minds as well. Where's the next hand, Betsy?

Betsy Albright (Nicholas School of the Environment): On the other side of the coin, as someone who has no children, I'd love to have a discussion about Duke's benefits, particularly in terms of college education.

Jones: Tuition assistance benefit?

Albright: Yeah, tuition assistance benefits and thinking about benefits more broadly, the number of invitations I've had to adopt colleagues' children is not insignificant. (laughter) So, I would just think a holistic analysis of what that benefit looks like and how that plays across different family structures.

Jones: As another person with no biological children, I have often been asked that as well!

Ginsburg: Thank you for both comments. I would like to put them in a broader context, and that is how Duke thinks of the life cycle of its faculty in general, because it's not only having kids, but it's also taking care of aging parents. Perhaps it's time to think about the life cycle in general rather than addressing particular events individually.

Jones: Any final comments?

Harvey Cohen (Clinical Sciences -- School of Medicine): My question was the same. I'll just extend that a little bit. I wanted to specifically raise, and I should know the answer, but I don't. What the policies are about family care for tenure track extension? Increasingly we see people needing to get involved in the care of aging parents, ill parents, ill spouses. There are all kinds of

these things. I think that was the point of this last comment, which I would echo. It's something we should look very seriously at.

Jones: I'm hearing a theme here, in terms of support for leaves, support for family care and thinking about how a healthy family is defined, right? Maybe thinking about that a bit more broadly. Just benefits in this area in general.

Ginsburg: Not just benefits. Many faculty spend their entire life cycle here, rather than think about events within that life cycle, think about developing a strategy to support faculty throughout the life cycle as a whole from marriage, if the case is, through retirement and everything in between.

Jones: Okay. All right. Adriane, last comment.

Adriane Lentz-Smith (History): I was actually just raising my hand to second what you said. The things that you listed are already on ECAC's mind, right? I think that the narrowing landscape for funding and how we then think about our expectations of each other is important. I also have gotten to the point where I think we have to stop thinking of our students in the revenue sports as being students. I had a basketball player tell me last year that the idea of a scholar athlete is a myth, like there is no scholar part but like I have a job, right? So, I think we need to talk about that. What do we do about the fact that the world is pushing us to treat our big athlete students like they are athletes with an attachment to a Duke brand. That's disturbing. Then when you add in betting, as you mentioned last year, I'm still freaked out by it. I think that we really need to go into that.

This is just a rant because I hated Scholarly so much when I had to do the annual faculty report, but I think that there is some version of a conversation about hiring outside service providers who seem to have no clue about how academics talk about productivity or do things, ask us to talk about ourselves, which I would really love to open up, because I increasingly feel like I'm pulled into conversations with folks who have no clue about what I do, but assume that I'm not doing it well. (laughter)

Jones: Okay. Thank you for that, Adriane. I'm glad that Abbas and Sherilynn are here, because I think that some of what's being raised here provides an opportunity for Faculty Advancement, HR, OIE and the Council to partner. As we stated today, there will be a new Chair. I'm not sure that we will be able to get to this during this semester, but certainly we can start teeing up programs and information for next year. I want to thank you for the input and also for the humor.

I want to remind you that next month we will hear from our special guest, Holden Thorp, about challenges facing higher education. Dr. Thorp is a highly esteemed scholar and the former Chancellor at UNC-Chapel Hill, a current Professor of Chemistry at George Washington University, and the Editor-in-Chief of the Science Family of Journals. He's been very generous with his time. He will be here to talk to the Council about a constellation of issues facing higher education. A reception will follow the meeting, so please mark your calendars and plan to attend. Academic Council meetings are open to all faculty, so bring your colleagues as well. This concludes our meeting for today. Have a good evening. Thank you for your time. (applause)