



To: Duke University's Academic Council
From: Douglas Campbell, Professor of New Testament and Chair of the Academic Programs Committee, 2018-19
Re: Academic Programs Committee (APC) 2018-19 update
Date: April 10, 2019

I am pleased to provide the Academic Council with this summary of APC's activities during the 2018-19 academic year. It has been a privilege to serve as chair and to work with faculty from across the university, and with the delightfully efficient support staff. If the Provost ever taps you on the shoulder and invites you to become a member of APC, I encourage you to give it your full consideration as it has been an interesting experience.

Following a brief introduction to the committee's function, a description of the topics covered this year is provided. The report concludes with a more thorough explanation of the committee's purposes, organizational structure, and mode of operation, which is a standard inclusion.

Thank you for the opportunity to share with you this overview of the committee's work. I can assure you that the committee members take their charge seriously, devote considerable attention to the topics that come before them, engage in thoughtful conversation, and reach decisions and make recommendations that they believe are in the best interests of the university.

APC is fundamentally an advisory body to the Provost with a broad remit (see more just below). This year APC has had twenty-four voting members drawn from across the university, including two representatives from the Graduate and Professional Student Council. Seventeen *ex officio* non-voting members are invited to attend its deliberations. The Executive Committee of the Academic Council also appoints two non-voting members. (A membership roster for 2018-19 appears at the end of this document.) APC meets as a full committee monthly. The voting members are also divided into two subcommittees, each of which meets monthly. Generally, the full committee meetings are used for discussion and advice to the Provost on major policy questions, while the subcommittees conduct reviews of external reviews of academic units, of newly created degree programs, and of joint doctoral programs between units, as well as consider proposals for new degree programs, and the creation, contraction, termination, or merger of major units.

APC'S ACTIVITIES DURING 2018-19

This year's considerations had a different emphasis from those of previous years. A larger number of external reviews than usual had to be considered counter-balanced by fewer proposals

to create new degrees, units, or programs. Three degree programs at Duke Kunshan University (DKU) were reviewed, all by the same subcommittee to allow the development of a degree of familiarity with the complex dynamics in play at DKU.

External reviews:

- DKU Medical Physics Master's degree program
- DKU Master of Management Studies degree program
- DKU Global Health Master's degree program
- Department of Classical Studies external review
- Department of Economics external review
- Department of Neurobiology external review (scheduled for late April)
- Department of Physics external review
- Department of Sociology external review
- Master of Environmental Management degree review

New proposals:

- Proposal from the Department of Community and Family Medicine to change its name to the Department of Family Medicine and Community Health
- Proposal to convert the Head and Neck Surgery & Communication Sciences Division to a Department

Policy discussions: Considerations of

- An update from the Tenure Standards Committee
- Faculty culture
- Duke's culture and environment for international students
- The regulation of Undergraduate and Graduate Certificate programs
- The Reimagining Doctoral Education Committee report
- University Institutes and Centers review report
- Graduate student financing (scheduled for May)

Broader issues identified in APC deliberations:

1. *Respect.* APC has encountered repeatedly, both in full committee when discussing particular incidents that have received campus-wide attention, and in subcommittee when discussing the health of programs under external review, the damage caused by disrespectful actions and postures, especially on the part of particular faculty. Intra-faculty, faculty-student, and faculty-staff relations have all clearly been periodically harmed by behavior that is fundamentally disrespectful to alternative research modes, to different cultures, and to differentials in terms of race and gender. The damage is significant, while the incidents themselves have frequently seemed to be egregious and unnecessary. It is increasingly apparent that the university needs to put robust systems in place that can not only address incidents of unacceptable behavior but also, equally if not

more importantly, promote positively a culture of respectful and constructive behavior. (The ancient philosophers would have recognized and spoken at this moment of the inculcation of a virtue ethic.)

2. *Diversity.* APC has repeatedly had to challenge units to increase their diversity in both their student cohorts and their faculty. Units sometimes fail to appreciate that this is a critical institutional goal in addition to the achievement of academic excellence as measured by (not entirely reliable) metrics such as national and international rankings, while those that do are often not proactive enough in their efforts to rectify quite shocking statistical disparities. Having said this, it is clear that rectifying said disparities is a very difficult challenge, with chronic pipeline constrictions, and the sheer discomfort URM face flourishing within overwhelmingly white and male faculty and student populations.
3. *Complexity.* APC has also learned that the two aforementioned dynamics interact in ways that are complex, and not at all obvious or intuitive. They do not, that is, always align neatly, with harmful behavior mapping onto basic axes of historical discrimination. Sometimes they do, and sometimes they do not. So helpful responses to harm and to a lack of diversity have to identify, to understand, and then to navigate quite particular local situations very carefully, pressing ahead on both issues, and trying to manage their interactions constructively.
4. *Sustainability.* Given the current financial stresses on Duke, units that do not have a sustainable underlying business model do need to face the possibility of either radical reformulation or a sunset. Healthy programs need ultimately to be tapping a pool of potential students who recognize the nature and value of the program on offer and are prepared and able to pay for it, and thereby generate sufficient enrollments and income to sustain that program's infrastructure. In like manner, programs like doctoral education need to consider carefully a shifting and increasingly challenging financial and employment environment, and adapt accordingly, bearing in mind that challenges can result in highly creative and constructive responses.

The following detailed description of APC's purposes, organization, and mode of operation, has been reproduced (lightly edited) from the annual reports by previous APC Chairs to the Academic Council.

PURPOSES

The Academic Programs Committee (APC) has three basic functions, each of which involves the provision of advice to the Provost on pivotal matters relating to Duke's core academic mission:

- 1) Consideration of external reviews of: units (departments and university institutes), newly adopted degree programs (a probationary review is required for new degree programs,

typically after the first three years of operation), and joint doctoral programs between units. (APC does not review certificate programs, or the accreditation processes for professional schools).

- 2) Consideration of proposals for new degree programs or the creation, contraction, termination, or merger of major units (such as departments or university-wide institutes).
- 3) Consideration of major academic policy questions with salience for the entire campus.

ORGANIZATION

To ensure that APC's deliberations incorporate faculty perspectives from across the university, the Provost and the Executive Committee of Academic Council (ECAC) collaborate in the selection of members from each of the professional schools, as well as a range of departments in each division of Arts & Sciences. The Graduate and Professional Student Council also has representation on APC. There are several *ex officio*, non-voting members from Duke's senior academic leadership who receive the meeting materials and are invited to all meetings.

Since 2014-15 APC has been composed of two subcommittees within the full committee. Each subcommittee is structured to achieve the widest possible representation of schools and divisions, and each has one appointed graduate student representative. Each subcommittee meets once per month and has the authority to act on behalf of APC as a whole. The full committee also meets once a month. By this mechanism, APC convenes three times a month during most months of the academic year, although faculty members, aside from the Chair and Vice-Chair, still only have two meetings per month. The APC Chair has the responsibility of ensuring comparable standards of evaluation across the two subcommittees.

The Provost typically appoints faculty members of APC to serve for three-year terms, with the Chair coming from the third-year cohort. When selecting the Chair, the Provost again works with ECAC, and typically rotates the choice between the broad divisions of intellectual inquiry within the university.

MODE OF OPERATION

Typically, the two APC subcommittees handle external reviews or new degree/unit proposals, while the full committee discusses broader policy questions. On occasion, however, scheduling difficulties have resulted in a subcommittee discussing a policy issue. The Provost also retains the discretion to ask the full committee to consider an external review or proposal for a new degree program or unit.

When undertaking the first two of its functions, APC receives the full documentary record concerning either the external review or the new proposal. These materials include the prior evaluation by the Executive Committee of the Graduate Faculty (in the case of departments or joint doctoral programs), or by the Masters' Advisory Council (in the case of professional degree programs.) The APC chair then appoints a "lead discussant." This faculty member reviews the materials especially closely and, in consultation with the APC chair, frames discussion questions

for the head of the unit/program under review, or for the lead faculty members on a new program proposal. These queries furnish a starting point for the brief presentation by unit/program heads at APC, and subsequent interaction between the presenters and the committee.

During an APC meeting considering an external review or new proposal, the lead discussant is responsible for ensuring the questions from the subcommittee are addressed. The lead discussant then drafts the committee resolution – a document that summarizes the discussion that APC had on the topic and provides concrete recommendations to the unit/program heads and the Provost on how to proceed regarding the proposal or review at hand. The resolution is reviewed by the APC Chair and the Executive Vice Provost before being shared with the subcommittee for a vote or additional comments. This process usually takes place electronically, although if several subcommittee members ask for an additional face-to-face discussion, the Chair will delay the vote until the next meeting of the subcommittee.

In the case of an external review, the Executive Vice Provost or the Provost provides APC's resolution to the unit/program concerned. The resolution also helps to inform any Memorandum of Understanding drafted by the Provost. In the case of a proposal for a new degree program or unit, the APC resolution, with the assent of the Provost, goes forward to ECAC and then the full Academic Council, before final consideration by the Board of Trustees.

Before moving to generate a resolution, APC may ask for additional information from unit heads/lead proposers. In the case of new proposals, APC may also ask for minor revisions to the formal proposal, or send the proposal back for more substantive reconsideration and reframing.

APC also receives visitors to frame its policy meetings of the full committee. The Provost, Executive Vice Provost and the APC Chair work together to set the broad agenda for these discussions. The Chair then works with the invited members of the university community to identify appropriate background reading materials and structure brief presentations to set up discussion. Typically, the Chair takes notes on these meetings, and where appropriate, solicits additional feedback from committee members. After the meeting, the Chair often submits a memorandum to the Provost and the heads of relevant university units/programs, summarizing the views expressed and the suggestions furnished by APC members and offering additional commentary, where appropriate.

Over the course of its deliberations and discussions, APC often identifies broader issues and concerns that transcend individual proposals and routinely brings these to the attention of the Provost.

cc: Jennifer Francis, Executive Vice Provost
Sally Kornbluth, Provost
Neil Siegel, David W. Ichel Professor of Law and Political Science and incoming APC
Chair

ACADEMIC PROGRAMS COMMITTEE

The APC is an advisory body to the Provost. The charge to the APC is a broad one in terms of advising the Provost on university-wide academic issues as well as providing advice on the creation, termination, or contraction of academic units. The full Committee meets once a month. Members serve on one of two subcommittees which meet every three weeks. The membership of the APC is comprised of senior faculty members from schools with undergraduate bodies and the professional schools, including two from the Executive Committee of the Academic Council. Ex officio members include the Provost, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Chair of the Academic Council, and the Executive Vice Provost, among others. Term: three years.

Term Ending August 31, 2019

Douglas Campbell, Divinity School - Chair
William Gerhard, Graduate and Professional Student Council representative
Michèle Longino, Romance Studies (will not serve spring, 2019)
Paul Magwene, Biology
Joyce Zhang, Graduate and Professional Student Council representative

Term Ending August 31, 2020

Deb Brandon, School of Nursing
Keisha Cutright, Fuqua School of Business
William Darity, Sanford School of Public Policy
Thomas Ferraro, English
Benjamin Lee, Pratt School of Engineering
Fan Li, Statistical Science
Cary Moskovitz, Thompson Writing Program
Kate Scholberg, Physics
Neil Siegel, School of Law

Term Ending August 31, 2021

Ray Barfield, Divinity and School of Medicine
Jasmine Cobb, African and African American Studies
Stephen Craig, Chemistry
John De Figueiredo, School of Law
Sara Galletti, Art, Art History & Visual Studies
Christina Gibson-Davis, Sanford School of Public Policy
Negar Mottahedeh, Program in Literature
Susan Murphy, School of Medicine
Beth Sullivan, School of Medicine
Charlotte Sussman, English

Ex Officio

Valerie Sheares Ashby, Dean, Arts & Sciences
Gary Bennett, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education
Lawrence Carin, Vice Provost for Research
Kirsten Corazzini, Chair, Global Priorities Committee
Eve Duffy, Associate Vice Provost for Global Affairs
Jennifer Francis, Executive Vice Provost
Daniel Kiehart, Dean, Natural Sciences
John Klingensmith, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, Graduate School
Sally Kornbluth, Provost
Rachel Kranton, Dean of Social Sciences
Paula McClain, Dean of the Graduate School and Vice Provost
Mark Anthony Neal, African and African American Studies – ECAC representative
Arlie Petters, Dean of Academic Affairs and Associate Vice Provost for Undergraduate
Education
Richard Riddell, Vice President and University Secretary
Victoria Szabo, Art, Art History & Visual Studies – ECAC representative
Don Taylor, Chair, Academic Council
Gennifer Weisenfeld, Dean of the Humanities