

Minutes of the Meeting of the Academic Council
Thursday, January 17, 2019

Don Taylor (Academic Council Chair / Sanford School of Public Policy): Hello, Happy New Year. Is it too late to say Happy New Year? Maybe today's the last day to do so. I hope everyone had some time to do something that was restorative over the break and that we are all ready to have big productivity in spring semester 2019. I'm just going to give a few quick overview announcements about what ECAC has planned for the spring semester, kind of the key things we think we need to focus on. There are two very consequential searches for the university that are underway. The Vice Provost and Vice President for Campus Life, the ad has been circulated some time ago. The committee is being chaired by Emily Bernhardt (Biology), has Council members Mark Anthony Neal (African and African American Studies), Steffen Bass (Physics), and Adrienne Stiff-Roberts (Electrical and Computer Engineering) as members. So the Council is well represented. Of course, Mark Anthony is a member of the Executive Committee. That search is a little further along than the next one, which is really just starting, which is for the Vice President for Institutional Equity and Chief Diversity Officer. That search is being chaired by Larry Zelenak (Law School), who is a Council member and a member of the Executive Committee. Other Council members who are on the committee include Tom Metzloff (Law School) and Laura Lieber (Religious Studies). And

there are other faculty on both of these committees as well. So, these are vitally important for Duke and the faculty are going to be well involved in those selections. There are a variety of issues related to both of those posts that are moving ahead. Things that we've talked about in the Council are going to be slowed until we pick these new folks so we can have a chance to engage with them. For example, we talked in the fall about trying to alter the faculty representation in adjudicating academic dishonesty cases. We have some concerns about the lack of breadth of the faculty who are now doing that. So, those are things that are being represented and will be discussed, but the next steps in those types of things are really filling these posts. And then those discussions will crank back up. Of course, any time you have a leadership change of these magnitudes, it's a good time to talk about new ways of doing things that might be needed. Following our October Academic Council meeting and the November 15 Academic Council meeting, we talked about faculty conduct, what we might do to try to improve our culture, talked about perhaps the faculty trying to own that task a little more directly. Yesterday, I presented a draft outline document on behalf of ECAC to the Academic Programs Committee that discussed what it might look like to adapt a faculty professionalism council for the campus side. The Medical School has one of these

and it's not a copying of what the Medical School has, it's an adaptation of the general idea. The point of such a council is to try to address what we might think of as sub-legal bad behavior, meaning something that is going to be judged by Duke as falling beneath some sort of legal definition of harassment, for example, but still something that we want to have less of. That conversation is going to be ongoing pretty much this entire semester. Claudia Gunsch (Civil and Environmental Engineering) has assumed the new post of Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement, working with Abbas Benmamoun (Vice Provost, Faculty Advancement). Because of that, Claudia resigned from the Executive Committee. But we're going to be working very closely with her on that. I just want to say really clearly: whatever we might come up with as a professionalism council, or whatever we decided to call it, will be something that would work in collaboration with an OIE process. It's not designed to be an alternative process or a workaround process. One of the key issues is triaging incidents to the correct place. I think the next steps are that ECAC is going to work very closely with Claudia, Abbas, and Ann Brown (Vice Dean for Faculty, School of Medicine). This will be an ongoing topic with the Provost and the President this semester. ECAC is hopeful that we will bring some sort of proposal in April for how we would go forward to comply with the two-meeting rule that we would then vote on in May. We're not sure what the proposal may look like. We don't need to rush this but also, if we have some clarity about what we want to do, we want to go ahead. I think, because of the nature of this discussion, we are planning to probably discuss this in March, even before the two-meeting discussion in April and May. That's just

going to be a big topic for us this spring. So those are just the announcements for what we're thinking. Of course, if Council members or any faculty have issues or things that you think we should be talking about, let us know. Send us an email. Actually, people don't usually have trouble sending me emails. [laughter] But that's part of the job, so that's fine.

APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 15 AND 29 ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

Taylor: Our next item is to approve the November 15 and the November 29 meeting minutes. We're approving two sets because those meetings are so quick, we just can't get them transcribed fast enough. Both sets of minutes were posted with the agenda. Are there any comments, additions, or changes to them?

[Minutes approved by voice vote without dissent]

REPORT FROM THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE FOR THE ELECTION OF THE NEXT CHAIR OF THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL

Taylor: Next, we are going to have a report from Gráinne Fitzsimons. She is the Chair of the Nominating Committee for the Election of the Next Chair of the Academic Council. She is going to report on her committee's work.

Gráinne Fitzsimons (Fuqua School of Business / Chair, Academic Council's Nominating Committee for the Election of the Next Chair): Thank you, Don. Happy New Year, everyone. According to the bylaws of Academic Council, any member of the university faculty is eligible to be considered for our Chair.

The bylaws indicate that the Executive Committee of Academic Council shall appoint a nominating committee to nominate two persons to run for Chair. In addition, additional nominations can be heard from the floor during this meeting. So we had our nominating committee. I was the Chair. The other members were Trina Jones (Law School), Ellen Davis (Divinity School), and Steffen Bass (Physics). I thank each of them for their service, thoughtfulness, and commitment to Duke. The committee began by reviewing the criteria and the duties of the Academic Council Chair with significant help from the wonderful Sandra Walton (Administrative Coordinator, Academic Council Office). This is a pretty intense job, it turns out, both in terms of workload and importance to the university. The Chair of the Academic Council, as you know, convenes and chairs these meetings. He or she also convenes and chairs the weekly meetings of the Executive Committee of the Academic Council. He or she also serves as an ex officio member on the University Priorities Committee, Global Priorities Committee, Academic Programs Committee, a Board of Trustees subcommittee, and a number of other committees. Twice a year, the Chair reports to the Board of Trustees on the activities of our Council. The Chair has regular contact and conversations with the President, Provost and Executive Vice President. The Chair also serves as the University Faculty Marshal, participating in undergraduate and graduate convocation, Founders' Day, baccalaureate and commencement ceremonies. The Chair also meets, and, as Don alluded to, corresponds frequently with members of the faculty, students, and members of administration who bring a wide range of topics to the Chair,

seeking faculty's perspective or guidance. I hope it's clear that the Chair is an important position for the faculty and the university, essentially acting as the faculty's voice. Given the importance of the role, our committee took its job very seriously in seeking what we felt were two very experienced and qualified candidates to run for Chair. We thought the ideal candidate would be a person with a history of active engagement in faculty and university affairs, some experience outside his or her own department, so that he or she understood the whole university, ideally, and also in faculty governance. We also believed the ideal candidate would show strong leadership skills, communication skills, and, importantly, empathy for all members of the Duke community. After agreeing on these criteria, we then created a list of possible candidates. My first reaction to this process, honestly, was just to feel grateful to our colleagues. We have a number of colleagues who have the kind of commitment and leadership experience at Duke that mean they could be more than qualified for this role. I felt really lucky to have the chance to be exposed to some of the work and accomplishments of our peers and just lucky to be part of this community. We were able to reach unanimous consensus on the two colleagues to run for Chair and, thankfully, both agreed. So, the two colleagues that the Nominating Committee presents to you today as candidates for our next Chair are Mark Anthony Neal and Kerry Haynie.

Mark Anthony Neal is Professor of African and African American Studies, Professor of English, and Chair of the Department of African and African American Studies. He earned his PhD from the University of Buffalo and has

been here at Duke since 2004. Professor Neal has extensive experience, having served on the Academic Programs Committee, the Duke University Press Advisory Board, the Trinity Diversity Advisory Committee, Provost's Review Committee, and President's Committee on Black Affairs. Professor Neal is co-convenor of the Black Faculty Caucus, co-director of the Duke Council of Race and Ethnicity, and founding director of the Center for Arts, Digital Culture, and Entrepreneurship. Professor Neal is a member of the Council and is currently serving on the Executive Committee of the Academic Council.

Kerry Haynie is Associate Professor of Political Science and African and African American Studies. Professor Haynie earned his PhD from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in Political Science and has been at Duke since 2003. Professor Haynie has served multiple terms on Academic Council and has also served on its Executive Committee. He has also served on a number of Presidential and Provostial committees and Council committees, such as the President's Working Group on Community and Dialogue, the Provost's Committee on Reimagining Doctoral Education, the Undergraduate Education Committee of the Board of Trustees, the Academic Council's Diversity Task Force, the Harassment Grievance Board, the Athletic Council, et cetera. Professor Haynie is co-convenor of the Black Faculty Caucus, President of the Executive Committee of the Black Faculty Caucus, and co-director of the Duke Council of Race and Ethnicity. Professor Haynie has served as Associate Chair of the Department of Political Science and as Director of Graduate Studies for both the Political Science Department and the

Department of African and African American Studies. I hope this brief and inadequate overview gives you just a little sense of the kind of commitment and service that both of these colleagues have shown to our faculty and to our broader community. Speaking for the Nominating Committee, we firmly believe that faculty governance at Duke will be in good hands, being led by someone with a strong voice, a wise mind, and a kind heart. Please join me in thanking Kerry and Mark Anthony, our colleagues, for agreeing to serve as candidates for Chair. [applause] At this time, the committee welcomes any nominations from the floor. Feel free to nominate yourself if you like the sound of all that work. [laughter] [pause] Hearing none, I think the work of the Nominating Committee is done. Don will now explain the process of our election and what happens going forward. Thank you. [applause]

Taylor: On behalf of ECAC, thank you to the Nominating Committee. ECAC is thrilled with the slate of candidates. I think the only thing we don't like is that both of them cannot be elected. Later this month, I think next Tuesday, members of the Council will receive an email that has a link to a Qualtrics survey. That's how you will vote for Chair of the Academic Council. Our bylaws say that the Chair for next year, who will assume the duties on July 1, must be elected before the February Academic Council meeting, so that's why we're going ahead and doing this. I think on the last Wednesday in January, people who haven't voted will get an email that says you haven't voted, you have one more day to vote. Also, later this month, after the election of the Chair is done, we will start the process of electing our Academic Council members for next year. All faculty who are eligible

to serve will get an email about that across the university. We have gone with an opt-out process. There is this debate about, do you do opt-out or opt-in? It's never completely clear which is the best way to do this. We're trying to get a breadth of folks to run. So everybody is, by default, opted in for the election. What that probably means, unfortunately, is, somebody is going to get elected to the Council and say, what are you talking about? I didn't run. [laughter] That happened a few times this last year, but we are erring on the side of trying to have a wide net. So we decided we're going to take those problems as opposed to the problem of folks saying, well it's always just the same folks that do this kind of stuff. I would just like to encourage everyone to talk this up with your colleagues. Duke has a pretty robust system of faculty governance and it's something that shouldn't be taken for granted. We need to participate as it's a big opportunity.

REPORT FROM THE CO-CHAIRS OF THE REIMAGINING DOCTORAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Taylor: Next, we have a good, long time for a very important discussion. We have Professor Susan Lozier of the Nicholas School of the Environment and a former Chair of the Academic Council and Ed Balleisen, who is the Vice Provost for Interdisciplinary Studies and Professor in the Sanford School and History. They are going to present the so-called RIDE report, Reimagining Doctoral Education report. They've been working on this for 18 months, maybe even longer than that. We have one item on the agenda after this, which will be conducted in executive session, so we have plenty of space and

time for them to present and then for us to have a discussion. Thank you.

Susan Lozier (Co-chair, Reimagining Doctoral Education Committee / Nicholas School of the Environment):

Thanks, Don. As Don mentioned, I am a former Chair of this Council so I do want to give a special congratulations to Kerry and Mark Anthony. Regardless of the outcome, I'm sure the Council will be in good hands.

So, we can trace the origin of this committee to the strategic plan that was approved by the Board of Trustees in May 2017. In fact, I stood before this Council on a number of occasions, maybe two or three times, talking about the formulation of that plan. Some of what I'm going to talk about in the beginning, you may have heard before. At the start of that strategic planning process, the committee realized that the past strategic plans had focused rather heavily on undergraduate education. Many of us who have been here at Duke for a number of years know that we talk about what the signature Duke undergraduate education is. Those past strategic plans had mentioned graduate education, but only in a sentence or two, and said we need to focus on attracting the best and brightest graduate students. So in the process of that strategic planning process, one of the recommendations to the Provost at the end was to take a hard look at doctoral education. The idea was saying, basically, are we educating our students to meet the challenges and opportunities of the 21st century? At that same time, Duke wasn't alone in making this call for a really hard look at doctoral education. Over the past decade, a number of disciplinary societies, foundations like Carnegie and Mellon, federal agencies, the national academies,

had really reached a general consensus that universities needed to look at doctoral training to make sure they were not educating doctoral students as if we were still living in the 1950s and 1960s. Together, with what we were talking about, we had the input at Duke, and then the national focal point, the committee recommended that the Provost charge a committee called Reimagining Doctoral Education. In large part, if I had to say what the goal of that was, it was really to pool together ideas from across the university and say, is there something that defines a Duke PhD? We think we understand what defines a Duke undergraduate degree, but in large part, our graduate education has been very focused on apprenticeship models. Students come to work for a certain faculty member. While that's still going to be true, we wanted to say, what is the added benefit of being at Duke for doctoral students? So, given that as an opportunity, we got the charge from the Provost, and we were charged, of course, with taking the university from a wide view. So this was looking at doctoral education in the Medical School, the Nursing School, Law School, completely across the campus. The Provost asked us to involve all stakeholders. And in particular, she called out that she wanted us to consider the complements to the disciplinary training. So as Ed and I get in to talking about this, we're going to talk about what we can do at the university level, and also what individual PhD programs are responsible for. And a big piece that she also called out was for us to consider what improvements we could make to advising and mentoring. The charge to the committee was to take a university view, then of course we had a large number of committee members from across the university. I think, from

my early survey, the only two members who are here are Kerry Haynie and John Klingensmith [Cell Biology / Associate Dean, Graduate School]. I don't know if there are any other members here. They are all listed here. [refers to slide] We also had four graduate students on the committee as well. I do want to have a special call out to both Dustin Benac and Carolyn Naughton, who were Office of the Provost fellows and interns. They did a large part of the background work for us. I'll talk about that in just a moment. I don't know if Carolyn Mackman is here, but Carolyn provided excellent staff support for us over these past 18 months.

We started this in the fall semester of 2017 and that semester and then into the spring, we really did a lot of homework. This was assisted by the Provost intern and Provost fellow. We wanted to know what was going on in the national landscapes. I mentioned some of those reports earlier like Carnegie and Mellon, that we looked at. In addition, you can go to almost any disciplinary society and find recommendations from those societies about doctoral education in the 21st century and what universities and programs need to do. We also looked at opportunities that are already in place here at Duke. One of the things that we did that we got a lot of input on is that we surveyed Duke faculty, we surveyed current Duke PhD students, and we surveyed PhD alumni. I would say we got a really, really strong – well, an adequate response from the first two groups – but a very strong response from the last group, PhD alumni. They had a lot of things to say about their Duke education. A lot of good things to say, but there was also considerable constructive criticism about their PhD education. We also looked into the funding structure and, importantly, I

want to give a call out to Paula [McClain, Dean of the Graduate School and Vice Provost for Graduate Education] because we engaged several points with Paula and the senior leadership team at the Graduate School and we worked in partnership with them as we went through our work. Again, I'll mention that John Klingensmith is a member of the committee. And we had focus groups. The next slide shows the timeline and we can look at that. I'll get to the focus groups then.

A number of people asked us along the way, is it even possible to think about PhD education across the university? Because we're all used to thinking about the disciplinary nature of our doctoral programs. So we understand that. In fact, one of our goals is really a charge to the individual programs to look very closely at their PhD programs. But as I mentioned before, we think that there is value to taking a university-wide look. We think all students should have the same expectations in terms of the level of mentoring and advising they receive. All students should come and expect that they also have equal opportunity to the programs that are offered by Duke, et cetera. We recognized the heterogeneity and appreciate the heterogeneity but we also think there is really considerable value in taking this university-wide look. I mentioned that we had graduate students on our committee. We also had a number of focus group discussions with graduate students during the work of the committee. We're also calling out for graduate students to continue to be involved when individual departments start looking at their programs. We were cognizant of the fact that faculty have a lot on their plate and some of the recommendations that we are making

might be more effort, more mentoring and advising graduate students. But we also think the biggest incentive for faculty to take up the recommendations that we have in this report is that we have a strong belief that if these recommendations are adopted, we will attract better and brighter graduate students. We think that, with these recommendations, maybe in some time, Duke will be an even more attractive place for graduate students to come and pursue their doctoral training.

I mentioned earlier about the national trends that we read a lot about what was happening. I will call out one of these, in particular, the mental health studies that are out there about the stresses that doctoral students are under due to financial considerations and also considerations due to lack of mentoring. This is the timeline of our work, just to give you an idea. [refers to slide] I mentioned the data collection and Carolyn and Dustin helped considerably with that. We met through last fall and the spring with many stakeholders. Many of you might not consider yourself stakeholders, but we met with faculty, many different committee groups. And these are the surveys we collected last spring. [refers to slide] Last spring we held many focus group meetings, which we had invitations that were open to graduate students, open to faculty. We also had some that were by invitation only. We met with the DGSAs, we met with DGSs, et cetera. We also met with some committees early on, like APC had input early on as well. Here are all our committee meetings that we had throughout this 18 month period. [refers to slide] This is after we had gathered all that data, both external and internal and looked through all the survey reports. Ed

and I, the great task fell to us to crystalize it and we wrote the report over the summer and that went back to the committee then in late August. We got feedback from the committee and then we basically went back out to the community. So you can see we met with APC, we met with ECGF, Trinity, Deans staff meetings, et cetera. After we got all the feedback in November, we revised the report and in late December, December 28, so we say we did it in 2018, we got unanimous approval from our committee. So we are going today to present that final report and inform you a little bit more about the recommendations therein.

Ed Balleisen (Co-chair, Reimagining Doctoral Education Committee / Vice Provost for Interdisciplinary Studies):

So just a little bit of a reprise of Susan's comments, what we found was quite consistent with what we see as a national consensus about many of the goals we should have moving forward for doctoral education. If you look at reports out at the American Historical Association or the Modern Languages Association, the Mellon Foundation, or the National Academy of Sciences...

Lozier: Or Oceanography!

Balleisen: The overlap in what people are calling for is really quite striking. There is a sense that only focusing on core research skills is no longer enough. If we want people to be prepared for the intellectual challenges of the century ahead of us, to be able to adapt to new kinds of questions, new kinds of methods, if we're going to have an institution that is actually taking full advantage of the talent out there in our society, if we're going to be preparing people to meet the obligations of institutions they end up in,

whether it was universities or elsewhere, if they're going to be able to engage appropriately with the wider society, then we cannot simply provide people with the training to do excellent research in a subfield. We absolutely have to do that in an amplified way that has a plus to it. That plus will look different, almost certainly, for the heterogeneous students that we have. We have very different types of programs. But there are certain key elements that we think are going to be emerging across many different types of programs. Some of those involve exposure to collaboration, a real focus on communication skills, and some attention to what it means to be an intellectual leader. These are things that are non-optional extras anymore. We have to find a way to provide that along with fantastic disciplinary training.

So, what were our findings out of the surveys that we did and the focus groups, about Duke in particular? We found really impressive strengths, and this was great to see. A perception among the faculty, perception among alumni, a perception among our current graduate students that we have fantastic faculty. Really serious intellectual firepower. Similarly, that's to be found in the cohorts of graduate students as well. That's an incredible strength. It's something that we should not lose sight of. At the same time, I think the vast majority of people that we talked to were quite impressed with the basic facilities that we provide, the core physical infrastructure. Some exceptions, especially lab facilities in the physical sciences that we heard quite a lot about. But incredible appreciation, for example, for our library, the building, the staff, the kind of support that people get there. And similarly, most faculty, most alumni, most graduate students really emphasized that

there was a great deal to Duke that they could tap outside their core program. A clear sense that that was in place. So, these are significant advantages that we have. The last one I think is particularly a comparative advantage and I think it's worth thinking about how we can take further advantage of it. So, strengths, but also concerns. One involves structural funding challenges. We've done better, in no small measure, due to the enormous efforts of Paula as a fundraiser, to address these funding challenges, especially improving our summer funding. But we're not where we would like to be. This is something that we have to think about. We have roughly 20% of our students in any given year not receiving summer funding in the first six years. So that's something that we're certainly aware of as a challenge.

Then, despite fantastic faculty, despite great infrastructure and many opportunities, we nonetheless found a really significant overarching theme of patchiness, unevenness. Unevenness about awareness of many of those opportunities, about how to actually access them in many cases, finding out about them too late in some cases. We found concerns about uneven progress on diversity and inclusion, a big theme that came through in both the surveys and the focus groups. And we found real unevenness with regard to mentoring. Fantastic mentoring and advising, also, too often, mediocre or negligent or even abusive advising. This seemed, to us to be something that we really needed to focus on, to think creatively about how to address. Some of the themes that came up with regard to this issue: some sense that graduate students often were finding faculty who were skeptical about going too far outside the core program, maybe

not even doing it at all in some cases. Concerns about a lack of awareness of health issues that many doctoral students have encountered at Duke. And also a theme of not seeing as much assistance as there might be for those students who wished to pursue a career trajectory outside of the university setting. Another really important finding, a place where I think we can do better, has to do with the possibilities for coordination across schools, whether that means finding the right way to offer courses that could better address students needs in a more efficient manner. But particularly, basically trying to improve the institutional gear meshing between all the different constituencies at Duke that have a role in doctoral education.

So, what are our recommendations? We started with our mission statement. We actually have a mission statement for doctoral education. And the pieces of the one that are the current mission statement are in the non-bolded text and the parts that the committee has proposed that we add are in the bolded text. [refers to slide] I think if you look at the difference between the two, you can see that what we're trying to highlight is not that we're giving up on any of the things that we've always held dear. Those are crucial. We have to have core research skills in disciplines at the center of doctoral training. But these other pieces are also really important and we can't lose sight of them. We've added those in explicitly as a guide to programs across the university.

Lozier: Let me just say one thing on that. One thing that drove our desire to change that mission statement – actually I think it was articulated by Emily Bernhardt, a member of our committee – she said that

we focused a lot on the production of scholarship, but we need to focus on the production of scholars more so. So we need to think about those doctoral students not just producing scholarship, since scholarship is critically important, but what are we doing to develop them as scholars, so that they are adaptable, they can communicate, work collaboratively, et cetera? So I think that was something that was interesting that guided our mission statement.

Balleisen: So that we produce people who are set up, not just to be effective the day they leave, but are set up well to evolve and grow and mature so that their full career is one that is going to represent us well as the institution that prepared them as a recipient of a PhD. So, the recommendations granularly fell into three main areas. The first, we titled "Make the Most at Duke." So, the idea here is that, mostly, what we need to do in terms of opportunities outside of programs, is to sustain them. I think there are some areas where we see a case for modest extensions. I think one of those examples is, the committee thinks we need a better framework for supporting internships for doctoral students. I want to stress here that our view is that the point of that is to strengthen their research skills. This will almost certainly not be something that's crucial for anything close to a majority of students, but I wouldn't be surprised if, for a fifth, maybe a third of students, the opportunity to go and do a really substantive internship that aligns with their research trajectory could be an incredibly beneficial experience. We know that we have doctoral students who are already finding that to be very beneficial so that's one area where we think we can employ some resources to

expand what's available. At the same time though, we need to focus much more intensively on ensuring that people know about all the opportunities that already exist. One idea there is to create a small cohort of doctoral-level analogs to our directors of academic engagement at the undergraduate level. So, these are people who really know the university and can provide a sounding board for doctoral students. Also, people who know the academic landscape and can be a safe place to raise questions about either what's going on in the department, or how to handle a difficult situation, which doesn't have the same kind of freighted dynamics when you have to reach out to your supervisor or a DGS or a chair, as important as those conduits to communication are. We really felt that it's important to call out diversity and inclusion as an arena in which we have to pull together to make faster progress, with respect to who we are as a university. We are doing a better job than we did ten years ago. I don't think any of us are happy with the speed with which we have made progress. So, this is something that we feel that we have to focus on collectively as a university. Finally, we need to make sure that we have a conducive environment for all of our graduate students in which to do their studies and research and learn how to become good teachers. There are different pieces to that. We have to have some attention to affordable housing, I think, in light of what's going on in Durham. We need to be thinking about how we're supporting doctoral students with the mental health and wellness structures that we have in place for them. And we need to think, where appropriate, about the ways we can make sure that we have a financial structure such that students don't have terrible anxiety about

how they're actually going to make ends meet. So those are going to take some tough choices on our parts, but that's also a key focus of the committee.

Lozier: The second goal, "Strengthening University Partnerships:" so the first part of this is really an articulation of fact that we can't rely on the Graduate School alone to raise money for graduate education. So, we call on the President and the Provost to both consistently articulate the centrality of excellent doctoral training towards the university's core missions and to work toward the provision of 12-month funding for five years for all graduate students. We feel as though an all-hands-on-deck approach is needed in order to move toward that fair and equitable arrangement for graduate students. I'm going to start by saying where this goal came from as well. In one of our focus groups, one of the graduate students articulated the fact that she felt as though there were two Dukes and she occupied both of those two Dukes. There was the broader Duke, which talked a lot about diversity and inclusion, which talked about the importance of training outside your discipline, which talked about perhaps the importance of internships, et cetera. And then there was the Duke that she experienced within her program. There was really not a meshing between those two. There wasn't discussion or even awareness of the importance of diversity and inclusion and other things. And also, when it came to non-academic careers, she felt as though that was voiced in the broader community but not within her individual PhD program. There were students in focus groups who said they wouldn't even tell their advisors that they came to discussions of our focus groups because the expectations on them that they were

supposed to be so focused on their research and not think about some of these broader issues. So as we went through this, we realized that, in order to really move forward and have excellent doctoral education, we have to have, not just the Graduate School focused on some aspects of it and then their departments focused on their curricular development and execution, but we really need a role for the Deans, we need a role for the President, we need a role for the Provost as well. We need to think about how all those leaders mesh together. One example of this, when it comes to accountability of faculty, is mentors and advisors. There really is very little accountability right now for people who are inadequate mentors and advisors, and there is insufficient accountability for those who are abusive mentors. We've certainly heard cases of that through the surveys and also in our focus groups. The university partnership is also what we really want to advance a team-based approach to mentoring and advising. We absolutely believe in maintaining that advisor-student relationship, that apprenticeship model should certainly not be abandoned. We just want to strengthen it. We talked to students and we surveyed them, many students. If I had to sum up two of the adjectives they used to describe their PhD education, was that they felt vulnerable and they felt isolated. We are not alone in calling for a network approach to both advising and mentoring. This is in all of the reports as well. Some students, I think it's in the department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, have already started a very active peer mentoring program, and Nursing as well. There are recommendations in there for these changes for how we advise and mentor our students.

Clearly, as Ed mentioned, we need to accelerate progress on diversity and inclusion. That also means that we have to work across the university to make that happen. The DGSs and DGSAs in particular, we feel as though they need to be drawn together as a community so they can learn from each other in terms of best practices. We're also calling for a heightened role of the DGSAs. The name they have, I think, doesn't clearly describe the role they perform. Because they're really more like program coordinators, more than being assistants to the Directors of Graduate Studies. They really work directly with the students and do a lot of that program coordination. We're calling on that particular aspect of their job to be more enhanced. These DGSAs are aware of the extra-departmental opportunities across the university.

The last one, then, this is where we've gone from all university, the different parts working together, and the last goal is called "Advance the PhD." Here is where we really want to call on all the creative ideas from the 54 different PhD programs we have across the university. So we are calling on every PhD program, the faculty in these programs and the graduate students in these programs, in the next four years, to conduct what we're calling a "Deep Dive." Within the next four years, we want all departments to revisit their mission, make sure that their curriculum is aligned with that mission, take a hard look at the advising and mentoring, evaluate that advising and mentoring, evaluate accountability for faculty members that don't meet the responsibilities of being a member of the graduate faculty. The Provost will put up funds for seed money for those programs that do this within the first two years. So we'd like for some programs that are

ready to go, to have a little added incentive to get going and take these deep dives. Also, what ideas come out of those deep dives, there will be funding available to provide seed money. If there are programs that departments want for increasing the diversity of their applicant pool and other ideas that come out of it, there would be money that would be available.

Balleisen: Just one additional point there. We also want to align what we're calling for with these deep dives with also external reviews of the programs, so that this would be another incentive for departments to get going on this, because they're going to have to then think through these issues and present analysis of them in the context of their next external review. So this is also a way that we would make sure that this kind of focus on mission and achievement of mission is going to be embedded in the process as we move forward, beyond the four years.

Lozier: I think we're ready to go to implementation, that's the third goal.

Balleisen: One last comment about incentives. We want to make sure that, as we think about improving funding, that we're providing students with the right incentives to go and get external grants, that we don't lose sight of that kind of issue. That we don't lose sight of providing faculty with incentives to get external grants in those fields where this is relevant, that actually help to fund doctoral training. We have to be mindful of all of those pieces if we're going to maintain, again, that healthy balance in terms of the finances.

Implementation: we'd like to get going this spring, if we can. Our proposal to the Provost is that we convene a committee to flesh out more granularly some of the things that we had in mind so that we can provide templates and structures for things like the departmental deep dives. So that we can also get clarity about what the seed grant frameworks will look like. We may need to define some things as well, like what we consider to be abusive advising, what exactly rises to that level. And then what kinds of appropriate processes we need, whether we have enough that's already in place or whether we need to build some additional pieces in to what we already have in place. This is going to be a big university lift. So, yes, we need a committee to help us get going, but the next step is going to be on any of these issues, pulling together faculty and graduate students and staff, along with senior leadership in the different schools and in the Provost's office, to figure out how we can begin making progress and get some momentum going behind this. Our intuition is that if we can do this collectively as a university, we're going to steal a march on the rest of the country. People have been talking about this for 25 years. The level of progress towards the type of goals that we've described has been relatively small. So, we are already leaders in key pieces of this. The Graduate School is a leader in provision of information about all kinds of issues having to do with doctoral training. We're a leader in the provision of teaching training through the Graduate School certificate program. There are many other places that we can build on that. If we do so, we're going to start attracting, as Susan suggested at the beginning, we're convinced, ever more compelling, intriguing, exciting graduate students who are coming here, not just to work

with a great faculty member, but to make the most out of our fantastic university.

Lozier: We'll be happy to answer questions.

Billy Pizer (Sanford School of Public Policy): I thought the report was great. I had skimmed it earlier so it's great to hear you give the overview of it because it emphasized slightly different things than when I skimmed it. One thing that I was looking for was what your view is on what else we should be doing in terms of the alternative career tracks that people might be going down, other than the traditional academic ones. It sounds like you mentioned some of the things that were happening campus wide, there was the question about whether that was being supported at the local level. But are there additional campus-wide things that we should be doing? Isn't that part of the puzzle, that there are so many students that are not able to go into academia, how are we preparing them for that?

Balleisen: My sense is that if we prepare people to be adaptable, excellent scholars, a lot of that will help with this other question. Although I would also suggest, I'm not sure that the word alternative, to me, is the best one to think about it now. In many fields, our PhDs have been going into non-academic careers for a very long time.

Lozier: Chemistry and Engineering are two.

Balleisen: In others, it's split. You're an economist, you know half the economists don't go into academia, and haven't for quite some time. The kinds of things that make people good teachers, excellent communication skills, the ability to get

across complex information in a way that is compelling to people who don't already know that area of knowledge. That's helpful in all kinds of other contexts too. Some awareness of the ability of leadership skills. That's very valuable in universities, actually. Departments run better if their faculty have some sense of that. Operating a really large class is much better if you have some sense of that, if you're the faculty member in charge of the 250-person class. So if we give attention to that, I think that will help immeasurably. We've already invested as a university in some of the other pieces. We now have much more heft in the Career Services Center, as one example. We have excellent people in the Graduate School, Melissa Bostrom, who's in charge of professional development there. A lot of it has to do with coordination and improving the information flow to make sure that people know what resources are out there and can take advantage of it. I do think this new position we have in mind, the analog to the undergraduate director of academic engagement, is going to be a piece of that puzzle too. We've had a National Endowment for the Humanities grant for the last two and a half years and the individual who has that kind of role through that grant has made a big difference.

Lozier: A lot of this has to be done locally. So, through our surveys, we asked students who graduated from Duke within the last ten years, we asked them if they still kept in touch with their department. Not surprisingly, those who were in academia replied yes, they do. And those who weren't in academia had very little connection with their department.

Balleisen: They were bitter about it.

Lozier: They were bitter about it. I think that's a good way to put it. The extent to which local programs value all career trajectories, we try not to say "alternative career paths," but the extent to which all those career pathways are valued really goes a long way toward showing the current students what is valued. The survey showed quite a bit of bitterness of students who didn't continue on an academia path.

Pizer: They didn't feel supported?

Lozier: They didn't feel supported or their work wasn't valued by the university.

Kathy Andolsek (School of Medicine): On an earlier slide you talked about opportunities around wellness, there's another word as well in there. But I'm just curious, as a next step, is there any prioritization around perhaps the mental health piece in this? And this is just totally ignorance, but I would imagine this cohort is a group that may have reproductive healthcare needs? Do they get paid their stipend if they take 12 weeks of family leave? Do they get support for that as an extension of their time here? I guess mainly the mental health piece.

Lozier: We didn't have this originally on our list, but I think we should have. We certainly heard it, not just from graduate students, I was amazed how many Directors of Graduate Studies talked about the wellness piece. So we call out for the President to assemble a group to evaluate what facilities Duke is providing, what support Duke is providing, so the wellness, and also the housing issues, and the affordability, all those issues go in together because it's very difficult for

students to focus on their intellectual development and their scholarship if they are dealing with mental health issues, if they can barely make ends meet, et cetera. We are just recognizing the problem, calling it out, and then recommending that Duke take a hard look at what resources are available to address these issues.

Balleisen: But we also want a focus on prevention. Obviously, we need to respond when people are encountering difficulties, but to make sure people are embedded in a strong community is a very good antidote to having feelings of isolation and anxiety.

Lozier: And that's where the mentoring and advising networks come in. That one-on-one relationship is one of the most amazing things for many graduate students and faculty members, but it also is a relationship that can really be very detrimental to some graduate students. I think with the recommendations that we're making, we hope they provide some preventative measures for some of these issues that students have dealing with anxiety of moving through graduate school. If we don't call on Steffen, he's going to come up and take the microphone. [laughter] Oh, do you have a question?

Steffen Bass (Physics): I want to circle back to the pursuit of non-academic careers for grad students. Duke has some good provisions in place. There are course numbers that grad students can enroll in if they want to take an internship somewhere in an industry. But the problem really is that the value system sits with the faculty. There are ample examples around of faculty who frown upon their students pursuing these kinds

of opportunities because it takes time out of the lab or time out of what the students will do for them. There are two things. Obviously, we have to work on that value system, but the question is whether you can help with that, whether you can incentivize in some way that the faculty feel that they don't have to have such a grip on what the student does and provide these opportunities to the students?

Lozier: We heard this all the time. So in graduate student meetings, students from the same department, one student would say, my advisor wants me to take advantage of these opportunities, I feel very supported, I'm able to do this and that, all the while these opportunities are not just for students who are looking for other careers. We're really talking about students who take advantage of opportunities that really increase the excellence in their scholarship. Students in the same program have a very different experience. That's the patchiness that we think is unfortunate and we think needs to be corrected at the programmatic level and I think Ed has something to add to this.

Balleisen: A couple points. One is just two illustrations. These are anecdotes, but I do think they speak to the issue. I can think of a current doctoral student at Duke who has been in communication with me recently, who actually has arranged already an internship to go to an international organization to take her research expertise and put it into conversation with people who, in an international organization, are going to have a new policy in this area on the basis of her scientific knowledge, so long as she can find funding for it. That's an open question at the moment. I had some ideas,

but there's no university mechanism for her to tap. I think that's a problem. A second example: I happen to know a really eminent chemist on our faculty who is standing in the corner of our room who happens to be the Dean of Arts and Sciences, who has told me that two internships that she held while she was a doctoral student were absolutely crucial in helping her make progress on her training as a chemist. I think there are actually many examples of that sort and so that is part of the equation. I would note, as well, on the financing side, the National Science Foundation has a very robust program that we could tap much more effectively that would solve some of this as well, at least in the sciences. We could do much better to help catalyze a university-wide effort to partner with them.

Bass: How do you bring the faculty on board who don't subscribe to that?

Lozier: That's where we get down to the accountability, where we get down to the individual programs, talking about what they value and what they don't value. We're talking for each program, every semester, to go through and talk about each graduate student, what's the progress in their scholarship, what opportunities they've been able to take advantage of, et cetera. We have a lot of closed shops when it comes to the PhD programs, either on an individual basis or a programmatic basis. I mentioned earlier that one graduate student talked about there being two Dukes. I would say in our experience, when it comes to graduate students at Duke, there are many Dukes for these graduate students, compared to the undergraduates, they might have a very common experience. There are many students who have absolutely fabulous

doctoral experiences here. They talked about it being intellectually enriching, supporting, and fun. But there are many students for whom it is a very difficult experience and a lot of that is not just because of that student; it has to do with the culture in a lab or in a group or in that department.

Kerry Haynie (Political Science / African and African American Studies):

I was a member of the committee and I fully endorse the report. Something I raised in our discussions and I raise here again is, that it's a little dangerous to have this report done in isolation of other things happening around the university. The faculty is increasingly shrinking in size and stretched in responsibilities. This report could be read as asking us to do more with fewer resources and less time to do those things. Somehow the discussion about taking care of the faculty and giving us equipment and compensation to do some of these things in this report needs to take place hand in hand, as opposed to looking at this in isolation of the larger current of the university.

Lozier: I agree.

Claire Ravenscroft (Doctoral Candidate, English): I spoke to the Academic Council at the November 29 meeting. I just wanted to express my gratitude to the committee for producing this report. It was actually a great pleasure to listen to you talking about all your findings and the research and thought that you put into it is very encouraging. In addition to the centrality of funding to these issues of mental health, to the flexibility that graduate students have to pursue internships and alternative academic

careers, I wanted to articulate something that Mark Anthony Neal said at the November meeting, which is that funding is absolutely essential to diversity and to fulfilling this university's diversity mission. So, I just wanted to make space for that again because I thought he put it incredibly well, to keep that in our minds and just to express gratitude for this.

Lozier: Thank you. We talk about both of those, but thank you for providing the linkage between the two, the funding and the diversity. Thank you.

Luke Bretherton (Divinity School): Just a broader invitation to reflection, given what's at stake and so much of the research that goes on here, and explored ramifications and the importance of asking questions of meaning and purpose in the research we're doing, is there a place for the word "wisdom" in the mission statement?

Lozier: Wisdom is always good. How can we argue against wisdom? [laughter] It's like arguing against the word "intellectual." We can take that under consideration. How's that?

Cam Harvey (Fuqua School of Business): I have two related questions. The first one is, how do we measure progress? We've been talking about this for a long time, 25 years, so it predates me. Is it possible that this "advance the PhD" could be more than a deep dive, but institutionalizing a data collection method so that we can measure progress? Things like placement, so what proportion of students are going to top schools? Things like the students that we admit. What is the next best place that they turn down? That's really critical information to figure out if we're making this progress. So I

would hope that this could be comprehensive. We collect the data, where, the next time we do this, probably in ten years, we'll have some data. And number two is kind of a related question. It's related to another question that was raised. Our program is large. We're the same size as Princeton and Yale, but they've got more than triple the endowment. I'm wondering if there was any conversation about the possibility of downsizing our PhD program so that it increases the chance that we could be unambiguously excellent?

Balleisen: We already have some of those metrics in place because the Graduate School has worked really hard to take a leadership position on this. Certainly, we have better data on where our students end up after they finish their degrees, three years out, than just about anybody in the country, except maybe Michigan. Some of the other data you're talking about, I think absolutely. There may be some things that we need to collect across the board and others where we should be expecting the programs as they are refining exactly what they are trying to achieve, to develop the metrics for how they'll know whether they're doing what they think they'd like to be doing.

Lozier: It would be really hard, across the university, to come up with a single set of metrics that people agree on. That is where we're relying on the individual programs and these deep dives, one of the things we called out is for them to set their metrics for how they would judge progress or if they are successfully educating these doctoral students.

Balleisen: One intuition around this whole effort is that if we're able to make progress in the ways that we've

described, we have fewer students who feel isolated, better advising as a matter of course, we should, I think, reduce time to degree and reduce attrition. We're always going to have some attrition and we're always going to have some students who take longer than the norm because life happens. That will enable us to invest more per student, either of those two things. That said, I also think that, if we can make progress here, we will find new revenue sources to support our doctoral education, whether that's through grants, or other means, or our students will be more competitive when they go out for the grant opportunities that already exist. That said, you're pointing at a potential tradeoff between quality and scale. I think every program is going to have to look at that. Understanding that some of our programs, which are on the smaller side, have thresholds, and there is a point at which you can't get smaller without really having serious threats to having a program at all. I think that's got to be part of the discussion.

Lozier: Personally, I agree with you. I think it would be far better for us to have students that are all funded, for twelve months, for five years, and they all have the same resources available to them, than simply having more students under our present system.

Lori Bennear (Nicholas School of the Environment): Related question on the size: one of the things you hear anecdotally is that, as faculty, we want PhD students because they help us do a variety of different things, but then for myriad reasons, there aren't academic jobs for them. So, they come in thinking they're going to be academics, they're working very hard for us, it's great for us, but then there are no opportunities for

them later, so then they end up pursuing some other career. Sometimes it works out great for them, other times they're unhappy. In all your discussions with the PhD alumni, did you get a sense that there were concerns about being used as a means of production without any real promise for an academic career at the end?

Lozier: I don't think it was phrased that way. [laughter] I think, for many students, again, this decision about not to go into a path, these are for the alumni, came late in their PhD careers. Even though it was a decision that, later, they were happy with, at the time, felt it wasn't valued. So what we're actually calling for is for these discussions to begin early on and for there to be transparency. This is why, when Ed mentioned that Duke is very transparent about their metrics, we also want the departments to be transparent and say, 80% of our students go on to academic positions, or maybe only 34% do. There is a faculty member in Biology, I think, who has a page where he says, if you're interested in my lab, please know that your chances of getting an academic position are one in ten. But if that doesn't scare you off, if you're interested in other careers, still come. I think the issue is that all the graduate students, it's just that all of the conversations come very late. We talked to the career center and they said that the number of students that come in in their fifth, sixth, seventh year, that suddenly realize that they aren't going to be able to get an academic position, and then are just now starting to think about what they need to do. That's really not where we want to be. We want to be exposing students to all career pathways early on, giving them the skills they need. The skills we're talking about are the skills that are important for those who

are going into academic as well as non-academic paths. There are some students who feel as though they spent hours in the lab and couldn't do anything else. That's certainly there. But by and large, I would think many of the students who didn't go on into academia feel as though that while they were at Duke, they weren't valued for the path they were taking, and certainly afterwards their career choice isn't valued.

Balleisen: Just one further comment. We found a lot of commentary about possibility for better assistance for graduating students who want to go into an intensive teaching program. So, the awareness among our research-focused faculty about how to prepare for that, even the nuts and bolts of how to put together the kind of job letter that works, the kind of presentation that works, we could do that better in many contexts, certainly.

Bruce Jentleson (Sanford School of Public Policy): What about the student who actually comes to get a PhD and actually really starts with the notion that they don't necessarily want to pursue an academic career? That comes back to some of the earlier conversations about our own organizational culture and what our expectations are. We often are talking about this and say, well, because there's no academic options, therefore they have to take this other route. If you think about the value we can provide in a PhD, of educating people to that level, we actually should want some of them to go in. I know from some of the programs we run that involve PhD students from all over the country, not through Duke, but through some other initiatives, we often run into this in my field, but in other areas. The other end is, if we count, how

would we weigh someone who got a PhD, say, in political science, and got a tenure track job somewhere, and someone else got a PhD in political science and went into a policy position? Or in art history, somebody who takes a tenure track or somebody who goes into a curatorship? It seems to me that we want to get to a point where we can value those equally, not only at the back end, but even at the front end. Most students probably wouldn't put that in the essay because they would be afraid to say I'll never get in, but can we create a culture where people can actually be honest about that from the outset?

Lozier: I agree. I think that's what we're after. Where we have that culture, where it's not just a default at the end.

Taylor: Just one more question.

Megan Mullin (Nicholas School of the Environment): I want to revisit something that Kerry said about capacity for implementation and just urge, as we go forward, these are a lot of great ideas, but we really need to be able to have the resources at the programmatic level to implement them. I loved what you said, Susan, about thinking of the DGSAs as program coordinators, and maybe even relabeling them, but the DGSAs I know are really stretched already, and I'm hearing more information load, more application deadlines, more resources that they're going to have to manage. I just urge the committee and the Graduate School going forward to making sure that the program coordinators are supported and are able to really implement these effectively.

Lozier: I agree. I appreciate that as well. I think this will be the work of the implementation committee, looking at the

resources that are necessary and making prioritization for these recommendations.

Balleisen: I also think that we can't lose sight of the potential for coordination in terms of best practices. I don't want to minimize your point, I think it's really important, but there's also a lot that we can do that isn't going to actually tax people more. It's actually going to help them in ways that will make more impact with less effort.

Lozier: More with less, somehow.
[laughter]

Balleisen: If we have a great idea in a given department for how to deal with an issue, and we can diffuse that across so that other people can pick up on it without discovering it themselves through a process of nine months of effort, that would be ideal.

Taylor: Thank you both. [applause] At the appropriate time we'll be back to this topic, no doubt here in the Council and outside of the Council.

[Executive session for the purpose of discussing the future of Central Campus]