

**Minutes of the Academic Council
Thursday, January 19, 2023**

Erika Weinthal (Chair, Academic Council / Nicholas School of the Environment): Hello everyone! Happy 2023! I hope everyone had a restful, restorative, enjoyable holiday break and that everyone is staying healthy as we return to the beginning of the spring semester. I would like to acknowledge that President Price has a new puppy that we just saw pictures of. Continuing with some other announcements: the annual election of the Academic Council, which will begin later this month for academic year 2023-24. All faculty who are eligible to serve will get an email from me with information about the process. I want to underscore a few important things. All eligible faculty are opted in with 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 primarily because of the large number of colleagues in the Clinical Sciences who are eligible, nearly 2,000. So, for those of you in the other schools and divisions, if you do not opt out you could then receive votes that would allow your name to proceed to the nomination ballot and subsequent election ballot. Please choose to stay in - to not opt out. Encourage your colleagues to not opt out and to consider serving on Academic Council.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE
DECEMBER 1 ACADEMIC COUNCIL
MEETING**

With that we will turn to the approval of the minutes from our last meeting, which was held on December 1st and posted with today's agenda. Are there any corrections to the minutes? May I have a motion to approve? Thank you. A second? Thank you. All in favor please say aye. Any opposed or abstentions?

[Minutes approved by voice vote without dissent]

As usual, you will see attendance sheets floating around the room. Please initial, and for those who are on Zoom we will note your attendance.

**PRESENTATION FROM PROFESSOR JOE
IZATT REGARDING THE NOMINEES FOR
THE NEXT CHAIR OF THE ACADEMIC
COUNCIL**

We will begin this Academic Council meeting with a presentation from Professor Joe Izatt, from the Pratt School of Engineering and who is also a member of the Council. He recently served as the chair of the nominating committee to secure the candidates to stand for election for the Chair of the Academic Council. My term ends June 30th, and the Academic Council bylaws state that the Chair of the Council is elected in February in the year that the current Chair rotates off. If you're wondering why we do it in February, it is so that the incoming Chair will have time to attend meetings of the Executive Committee of the Academic

Council in hopes of securing or ensuring a seamless transition.

Joe Izatt (Biomedical Engineering):

Thanks Erika and hi everybody! Welcome back 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 nominate two persons to run for chair. In addition, additional nominations can be heard from the floor during this meeting. Other members of the nominating committee were: Elizabeth Albright from the Nicholas School; Keisha Cutright, from Fuqua, and who is currently an ECAC member; Kerry Haynie, from Arts and Sciences; Don Taylor, from the Sanford School – they are the two previous chairs before Erika. I thank each of them for their service and tutoring me as a sort of newbie to this process as we went forward.

The committee began by reviewing the criteria and the duties of the Academic Council Chair with important help from Sandra Walton, who is the Executive Assistant in the Academic Council Office. I was very impressed to learn how demanding the job of Chair of the Academic Council really is. The Chair serves a two-year term. As you know, the Chair convenes and runs this meeting once a month during the academic term. However, this person also has other responsibilities. They chair the weekly meetings of the Executive Committee of the Academic Council, which we refer to as ECAC. They also serve as an ex-officio member on multiple university committees which include the University Priorities Committee, Global Priorities

Committee, Academic Programs Committee, Board of Trustees subcommittees, and some others. 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 the Executive Vice President. The Chair also serves as the University Marshal participating in undergraduate and graduate convocations, Founders Day, Baccalaureate and Commencement ceremonies. The Chair also meets and corresponds frequently with members of the faculty, students, and members of the administration who bring a wide range of topics seeking the 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 on a wide range of matters.

Given the importance of this role, our committee took its job very seriously in seeking what we felt were experienced and qualified candidates to run for Chair. We thought the ideal candidate would be a person with a history of active engagement of faculty and university affairs, including experience outside of their own department, with an understanding of the whole university, including our tradition of faculty governance. We also believe that the ideal candidate would show strong leadership skills, communication skills, empathy, and, above all, demonstrate the core Duke values of respect, trust, inclusion, discovery, and excellence.

After a review of these criteria we created a list of potential candidates. I was very impressed that we were able to quickly identify a number of colleagues who have the kind of commitment and leadership experience at Duke to be more than

qualified for this role. We also are incredibly lucky to live and work among such inspiring, accomplished, and dedicated colleagues. We were able to reach unanimous consensus on two colleagues to run for Chair and thankfully both agreed. Therefore the two colleagues that the nominating committee presents you today as candidates for our next Chair are Trina Jones and Manoj Mohanan.

Trina Jones, who's here, is a Jerome M. Culp distinguished professor of law at the Duke Law School, where she directs the Center on Law, Race, and Policy. Professor Jones received her JD from the University of Michigan, and has been here at Duke since 1995. Longer than me. *(laughter)* Professor Jones has extensive experience with university service and faculty governance. She has served multiple terms on the Academic Council, and has served on ECAC, the University Priorities Committee, the Academic Programs Committee, Trustee Centennial Celebration Task Force, Presidents Council on Black Affairs, Committees of the Board of Trustees: the Academic Affairs Committee and the Audit Risk and Compliance Committee; the Diversity Task Force Implementation Committee, and numerous other university committees. In 2014-15 she co-chaired the Academic Council Task Force on Diversity and she currently chairs our Faculty Hearing Committee.

Manoj Mohanan who is in Africa, and has joined us on Zoom. He is an Associate Professor at the Sanford School of Public Policy, with secondary appointments in the Department of Economics and the Duke Global Health Institute. Professor Mohanan received his PhD from Harvard in Health Policy, and has been at Duke since 2009. Professor Mohanan has been

an active member of the Academic Council also over multiple terms, including service on ECAC from 2020 to 2022, with the last year as Vice Chair. He has served on the Board of Trustee Strategic Task Force on Activating Global Network, as well as on the Board of Trustees Committees on Graduate and Professional Education, and Research Audit and Compliance. He currently serves on the Provost Search Committee, which is obviously ongoing, the Athletic Council, and the Campus-Based Research Privacy and Security Steering Committee. At Sanford, he has served on the School's Executive Committee for six years, chaired the Task Force on the undergraduate major, and has been recently elected to serve on the school's Ad Hoc Faculty Governance committee.

I hope this brief overview gives you a sense of the kind of commitment and service that both of these outstanding colleagues have shown to our faculty and the Duke community. You'll be able to learn more about them in their bios when the election begins. We, the committee, firmly believe that faculty governance by either of these outstanding colleagues at Duke will be in great hands. On behalf of the nominating committee, please join me in thanking Trina and Manoj, our colleagues, for agreeing to stand as candidates for Chair.

(Applause)

At this time the committee welcomes any nominations from the floor. Hearing none, the work of this committee is done. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

Weinthal: Thank you, Joe for agreeing to chair this committee, and thank you also to Kerry Haynie, Don Taylor, Keisha Cutright, and Betsy Albright for serving on this committee. The election for the next chair will take place later this month. Those eligible to vote are the current members of the Academic Council for this academic year, 2022-2023. It is not all faculty as often assumed. So, please, over the next month, pay attention to your email, because there will be a lot of emails coming through about the different elections.

Our next agenda item for today is to hear a proposal to grant tenure to some faculty in Duke's Visual and Performing Arts units. The supporting material for this proposal was included with the posting of today's agenda. I hope everyone had a chance to review the material. This item has been discussed with other groups over the last few months, most recently with the Academic Programs Committee, where it was approved. More significantly, the recommendation for this proposal flows directly from the Academic Council's Ad Hoc Committee on non-tenure track regular rank faculty. This report that was presented in April 2021 to the Council, and was a committee that was chaired by Sherryl Broverman [Biology/Global Health]. Interim Provost, Jennifer Francis, along with others who have been part of the various conversations surrounding this proposal for a change in tenure option in the Visual Performing Arts units, will lead us in a discussion today with other colleagues, and take questions. We will vote on this item at our February meeting.

PROPOSAL FOR A CHANGE IN TENURED OPTION IN THE VISUAL & PERFORMING ARTS UNITS

Jennifer Francis (Interim Provost): Thank you everyone. I think Erika has laid this out fairly well. In part, I think, one of the reasons we're bringing this forward from APC, our colleagues in the Visual and Performing Arts have prepared several reports on this topic, and we felt that they had prepared enough and that we were ready to consider this as a group. It's essentially for a change in the tenured option, where in the vast number of disciplines here at Duke the terminal degree is the PhD, in some areas, obviously law, it's a JD. This is a change for the Visual Performing Arts, where the PhD is less common, it's not that it is non-existent, but it is less common, and where the MFA serves as a terminal degree at so many of our peers. So, this has been brought up in a number of situations. The documents that have been prepared by our colleagues in the past - I want to especially give a shout out to William Johnson, who will be helpful in responding to questions here - have laid out a tremendous amount of detail concerning how they would be thinking about granting tenure in the situation where there was not a normal typical PhD terminal degree. We've actually asked them in some cases to wait a bit to define those until this group has made a decision on it, so that we're not sort of creating standards in the absence of that hypothetical, if you will. I think they've done an excellent job, though, in thinking about all of those details. So, with that said, let me introduce several people who have been involved in this. Gabe Rosenberg is our chair of APC this year and he was a part of the group that helped write this final recommendation. Ed Balleisen is our Vice Provost, our provostial admin support to the APC. I've already mentioned William Johnson, who has been working with many of the

colleagues in the fields that are represented here and you've seen their names around this. I think William is probably our major content expert today, and so I'll open up the floor to questions that the group may have, and then I will immediately defer to one of those people. *(laughter)*

Kathy Andolsek (Family Medicine and Community Health): I'm speaking as a member of a Departmental Promotion Committee in School Medicine, of which I'm a Co-Chair. One of the biggest challenges we have is when we're seeking external letter writers to support somebody getting tenure and the fact that so many institutions, particularly for some of these particular areas that our faculty may have their scholarship in, are institutions where tenure is no longer awarded. So, the requirement to have tenured faculty writing to support them is impossible or very challenging. And it raises a little concern with some of the structural inequities, and who nationally is even eligible for tenure given the institutions people are in or the disciplines they represent, and whether that's really a useful criteria for us. So, at any rate, I apologize I didn't read enough of the details to know how your process would work for external letter writers to know whether this might be an issue for you too. But, I'm hoping you've already solved this issue, and I can bring it back to my committee. *(laughter)*

Francis: I would say that there are tenured people at other schools. Now I'm not saying the population is huge, but William maybe you want to comment on that?

William Johnson (Dean of Humanities, Classical Studies): Yes, so the report that

was shared with you, which was the tenured pathways report that I had shared relies on two previous reports that we've all had an opportunity to read. One is the 2018 tenure standards committee report, which had a section on arts faculty. The other was the Riddell Report which was released in 2019. Those are really important for this question, because our committee did not go, and sort of do the huge investigation that the Riddell Report, in particular, did. We relied on professional associations, networking contacts, and then our own faculty from units to produce the draft tenure standards we have. But, those reports document what Jennifer Francis just said. That is that there are a lot of institutions that allow tenure in these fields, and some of them are very much our peer-plus institutions. The way I got into this conversation was around two particular targeted hires that we pursued. Both of those foundered not on Duke's reputation or the attractiveness of the institution, but on the fact that these two targets from both disciplines were unwilling to turn down tenure.

Stefanie Englestein (German Studies): I found the whole report extremely interesting and I learned a lot from it. One of the things that struck me as potentially concerning, but I can also imagine with which this concern would be laid to rest, is the absence of a double-blind peer review in these fields along the way. Obviously, letters could be solicited from people who are arm's length and there would be confidentiality in that case. But, in many of the fields, arm's length was the sort of most distant reviews could get when there were selection processes. And selection processes certainly sounded very selective. The problem that I would foresee with not having a double-

blind peer reviewed in a research field would be a circularity of the search for prestige. So, Duke hires somebody, Duke is already a very prestigious name associated with a person. Somebody submits anything, an article or a book or whatever, to a process because their name is known. It's known that they're at Duke. The group to which they've submitted it is also seeking prestige. It gives a huge boost to the applicant, to be coming from a place like Duke. Then we look at the prestige of a place that had selected that person because of our prestige. You have a circularity problem. So, the question is twofold – you've got two ways out of this - one was in the selection process that was written for creative writing, it was noted that a lot of the persons reputation would have to be established before they were hired. In other words, it wasn't at the tenure stage, but at the hiring stage that you would be looking for a candidate who already had done a vast amount. It sounded like that might be true in the other fields too, but hadn't been mentioned. So, if that were true, it would eliminate my concern here. The other way in which that concern might be eliminated would be if in these fields Duke isn't the kind of name that gives someone a boost. If, in fact, having a cushy job at an elite institution, seems like it's not a leg up for an artistic selection process, which is possible, I just don't know, then that would also alleviate my concern. There might also be other ways that I hadn't thought of. But, those were two.

Francis: The only thing I would say about the former is, I don't think we want to preclude hiring at an assistant professor level where there's the possibility of that growth. But, we still have our tenure

standards being there for the internal promotion.

Engelstein: Right. But, the question is how do you figure out at the tenure level whether merit was strong enough if there wasn't a double-blind peer review?

Johnson: Stefanie, you've raised a really interesting and wonderful question. This is also something that came out from the APC. What you raise is this idea that Visual and Performing Arts are about performance rather than contribution to knowledge. And I think that's part of issue.

Engelstein: I don't think so at all. I absolutely buy that this is a contribution of knowledge. The question is - and I feel this also a contribution to knowledge - when we write something we want the person judging it to be judging it on what kind of a contribution to knowledge it is, and not who we are.

Johnson: At the moment we're in the comfortable position that Duke is not particularly well known. *(laughter)* But I hope that will change. I think you're right to identify that as a problem. As the APC report mentions, there is a...I'll just put it different from your statement...there's a danger that we're leaning into prestige too much, and that's why I brought that up. Honestly, a contribution to knowledge is core to the idea of tenure in the creative arts. We want to see something that leads to new forms of production, and not simply a great performance.

Scott Lindroth (Music): I would say, partly to respond to Stefanie's question, that when we do hire, even at the assistant professor level, those candidates have to demonstrate substantial

accomplishment in the profession before we would even consider them. And that is not an impossible achievement. So, this could be, in my field, performances by major orchestras, major venues, or major presenters. That is something that we can expect, and that we would look for, quite honestly, before we would even take that candidate seriously. And that often goes hand in hand with the quality of the portfolio that would be submitted.

Johnson: May I ask a question - and Gabe, you might want to speak to this. Our committee's report includes a creative writing component which Stefanie just brought up. And it's just a draft of what tenure standards might be. That was the task that was put in front of us. And the APC report however, talks about in terms of Visual Performing Arts and does not include creative writing. Was that intentional?

Francis: No. It was just a way to not include the non-arts departments.

Weinthal: Thank you, Jennifer, William, Gabe, and Ed for being here and for the work of all the committees to bring this forward to Academic Council. As noted, at our next meeting we will vote on this proposal.

PRESENTATION FROM SUZANNE BARBOUR, DUKE'S NEW DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

For our last agenda item for today, I have the pleasure of welcoming to her first meeting of the Academic Council, Suzanne Barbour, our relatively new Dean to Duke's Graduate School. She began her term in September of last year. Dean Barbour comes to Duke from that other institution down the road (*laughter*)

where she served in a similar capacity. Clearly, I don't even need to say the name but it's a lighter shade of blue. She has also had an extremely illustrious distinguished career as an academic, as a scientist, where she previously served as a program director in the division of Molecular and Cellular Biosciences at the National Science Foundation. She was a professor of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology in the School of Medicine at the Virginia Commonwealth University. There she led the graduate program in Biochemistry and Molecular Biology. She directed research training at the Center on Health Disparities and held affiliate appointments in the departments of African-American Studies, Biology and Microbiology, and Immunology. Welcome Suzanne, we look forward to hearing from you and learning about your vision for the Graduate School.

Slides used in presentation.

Suzanne Barbour (Dean of the Graduate School): Thanks Erika, for a wonderful introduction, and thank you everybody for giving me the opportunity to chat with you today. I hope this is the first of many conversations and I look forward to working with you, learning from you, and hopefully doing some great things with you. And forgive me, I injured my foot, so I'm not walking too good today. Usually I walk a lot better than I'm walking right now.

So, Erika's already told you a bit about me, but let me just give you a little more context of who I am. I'm giving away my age there, but I'm a native of New Jersey and have a background in Chemistry and a PhD in Molecular Biology and Genetics from John Hopkins back in the 1990's. As Erika mentioned, mine's been a pretty

interesting career path, where I did spend more than 20 years on faculty. During that time, when I directed the graduate program I just got bit by the graduate education bug and that's actually what prompted me to move to NSF [National Science Foundation] where I was for about two years as program director and my goal there was to develop the administrative skills and the network I would need to get a Graduate Dean position. And I got really lucky in 2015, when I was recruited to the University of Georgia, where I spent four years as Graduate School Dean. Then moved to that *other place*. I was there for about three years during the pandemic, and now I'm really grateful to be here. The reason I show you all this, the career path, even though Erika has told you about it, is I think it's really important to note that I've been at very different institutions. My first Graduate Dean position was at a public flagship university, but it's a land grant. No medical school at the University of Georgia. Of course, I spent time at that other place that is just up the road. But again, public flagship institution, probably a little more similar to Duke in that it does have a very strong biomedical presence, but again very different than Duke. This is the first time I've been at a private university with the exception of my time in graduate school. So, I'm going to need your help to learn the ropes here and learn the culture. The short of it is when you've seen one graduate school you have seen one. (*laughter*) The challenges can be somewhat similar; the solutions are very different because the cultures are different. So, a lot of what I've been trying to do in these first four months is to learn your culture; meet some of you, get a sense of what the challenges, the opportunities, and ultimately the

potentially low hanging fruit and the high hanging fruit might be.

Just to give you a little more sense of who I am and what my priorities have been in the past - this is meant to capture some things I'm particularly proud of that I've done in my previous endeavors. They include not only developing emergency funding, but also tying that emergency fund to other things that would be helpful to students. For example, student needs. What else is going on in the student's life that requires them to need that loan? How do we ensure that they have what they need? Bridges to the Doctorate was a program that I developed. It was an off shoot of the LSAMP program at UGA. It was designed to help transition under represented students in STEM into a masters. Then I was really proud to hire the first director for Experiential Professional Development at UGA, and this was the first person in the Graduate School who was tasked with preparing students on academic careers and it persists to this day.

Then at UNC one of the things I'm most proud of is the mentor training that we set up. Where we basically provided faculty with best practices and graduate student mentoring. We'll talk about mentoring again later on, but the long and the short of it is there's a lot of concern about that with student mentoring across the country right now. We also developed a certificate in innovation, leadership, and management, which was designed to provide students with the skill sets for the working world and the master of applied professional studies at UNC is a new program. It opened for students just this month and it's modeled after GLS basically.

So, what is this list going to look like at Duke? I don't know. But, I hope by sharing my vision for the Graduate School I can give you a sense of where my head is right now. I'm still kind of at 30,000 feet trying to learn the ropes, so to speak. But, I hope this gives you a sense of where things might go.

If I had to take that 30,000-foot view and give you a sense of where I think things are going to go. I would summarize it, in this 90,000-foot slide, as holistic graduate education. But at the center of graduate education at any institution, if it's Duke, if it's UGA, is discipline-specific training, the kinds of things that you all do in the departments and the institutes. But, then what the Graduate School does is basically complement that, and in complementing it we develop the synergistic partnerships that allow us to provide the other things for what our students need to be successful. It's like the financial support that they clearly need in order to live well while they're in graduate school. We talked about mentoring a couple of minutes ago, that mentor training and preparing students to be good mentees is another thing we can help with in the Graduate School. Career development, obviously very important and I'll show you some data to give you a sense of how that is changing for us. Equity and inclusion is something that's been near and dear to my heart for a very long time, and clearly that's an important holistic piece of graduate education. There's evidence out there, I'm sure you all have seen it that graduate students are more than five times more likely than their peers to have anxiety or depression. So, this issue of graduate student wellness, preventing that anxiety or depression, becomes important.

What I want to do in the next couple of minutes is show you a couple of pieces of data. I'll give you a snapshot of what enrollment looks like now, and what our graduate student population looks like now. I'll give you a trend, so you can see how it's been trending over the last few years. I'll talk a little bit about where our students go after they finish graduate school, and then I'll try to take this down from 100,000 feet to maybe 5,000 feet.

I'll start by showing you two slides about applications, and on this first one I'm capturing PhD and Masters programs. So, PhD is in blue, Masters is in yellow. What you're looking at on the far left is percentage of total enrollment, in the middle is percentage of new enrollment, and on the far side is the number of applications. The reason I'm showing you this, is the trend is very interesting. The PhD line is coming down and the Masters lines is going up. In fact, if you look at new enrollment, they're almost 50-50. They're almost comparable now, and what that suggests to me is the kind of student we have on campus is changing. Whether we want that change to happen - we have to have that conversation, but it does suggest that we may need to rethink some of the things we do in the Graduate School which tend to be very much PhD centric. We'll talk a little more about that later on. The application data that you see over here on the far side, you can see that there's a trend up in PhD applications which is really exciting. But clearly, we have to have money to support those PhD students. We also have to ensure that when we admit them we're ultimately admitting students who will be able to get out into the job market and get a job in whatever the career path of their choice is. These are all conversations I think we're going to have to have.

If we look at applications and enrollment through a demographic lens, that's this slide, in this case the blue is going to be female students, in orange it's going to be international students, and the red is going to be under represented minorities. We have PhD enrollment on far left, Masters in the middle, and over here on the far right these are applications. There are a couple of really interesting trends here. One of them is the percentage of our students, whether they're PhD or Masters who are international is climbing. And I think we probably all agree there are probably more things we need to do to support our international students and ensure they have a seamless transition. It's also really nice to see an uptick in the percentage of our students who are coming from under-represented groups. I think we probably all agree this line is not where we want it to be. What I find really interesting, though, is if you look at the percentage of PhD enrollment and compare that to percentage of applications, they're pretty much dead on top of each other. What that tells me is if we're going to move this line, and I think we agree as a community we want that, we're going to do it at the application level. We've got to get more students interested in looking at Duke. So, that's a snapshot of current enrollment.

Let's talk about career outcomes. By the way, all this data is available on the Graduate School website. These are our PhD career outcomes from fall 2005 to fall 2022. There's a lot of stuff going on here, but I think the thing you really want to look at is this sort of light blue bar. That light blue bar is representing students who went into academia or higher education. The gold, those students who are doing something

beyond academia. What I'm really trying to show you is the relative percentage of students who are in the blue or in gold. And you can see that varies from discipline to discipline, but in all of our disciplines we have a significant percentage of students who are choosing non-academia. In fact, if you sum up all this data on the right-hand side, business and industry about 31%, higher education close to 40%. They're pretty comparable. What that tells me, is that we need to make certain that we're preparing students for the career path of their choice. I think that's a place where the Graduate School can help, and I look forward to having those conversations.

So, let's go back to the 100,000-foot view, and see if I can fill in the blanks a little bit. Here are the things I think we need to do very early on to accomplish my vision for the Graduate School in the near term. Currently we need to broaden our base of endowed PhD fellowships. I should say, before I get started on all this, I'm going to be highlighting the little slices of pie in this holistic education wheel to indicate the connection to whatever it is I'm talking about on the left-hand side. You're going to see in every one of these that synergistic partnerships slice is going to be highlighted. That's because I view the partnership between the Graduate School and the faculty who are training the students as being absolutely central to everything we do. We need to be a good faithful partner to you, else we cannot accomplish any of this. Clearly, we need to broaden the basic PhD fellowships. That clearly falls into the financial support piece of the pie, but it also has to do with student wellness. Students are going to be in better shape if they feel that they have a sustained and stable financial support. It also has to do with equity and inclusion,

part of our challenge in recruiting underrepresented minorities. I also think it's going to be critical for us to build on community for underrepresented students. Remember, the percentage of our international students is going up, the percentage of our underrepresented minority students is ticking up as well. And so clearly, there's a need for us to ensure that they feel comfortable, that they feel supported, that they have community. Again, that lights up several sectors of this wheel, again, dependent on the partnership between the graduates and the college and schools.

Another critical piece is cultivating a culture of excellence in PhD mentoring. This is something we took on at UNC Chapel Hill. It's one of the things I'm really proud of. I think it's an essential component of what we do. Many faculty want to be the best mentor they can possibly be. But how can they do that if they don't know what the best practices are? I think we can be helpful in that.

I also think it's important for us to broaden professional development opportunities. Again, this goes back to the fact that our students are choosing a variety of career paths now. We need to make certain that our students not only know what the potential career paths are out there that are open to them, but that they also have the tools they need to make the right decisions. And that pertains not just to career development and mentoring, but also some of that anxiety and depression that we see in graduate students is not just related to maybe not the greatest mentor or not having strong financial support. I think some of it is career angst and not knowing what they're going to do.

Speaking of professional development, I think it's also critical for us to ensure that DGs and DGAs have the professional development they need to be the best possible partners with their graduate students and with the Graduate School. I think we need to do more to ensure that they are up to speed on the best practices in graduate education, and that they have the resources they need to put those into play in their programs.

Then I talked about master students. The trends are that we're having more and more master students on campus. But, the way we're organized as a Graduate School is very much PhD centric. It may be time for us to rethink this and look into enhancing support for master students. I think that's going to light up the pie for master students across the board.

Finally, I think we need to look inward in the Graduate School and streamline some of our administrative processes. We're talking paperless processes. We're talking about looking at workflows. The long and short of it is, if we can accomplish that we're going to provide everything that happens around this wheel, including your discipline specific training. I think we're going to make that easy. Ultimately do our job in terms of streamlining the processes.

When I think about the blue-sky ideas, the things that will take time, take money, and take a lot of effort. I just want to throw three things out that have jumped out of me so far. The University's Center of Exemplary Mentoring, some of you may be aware of this, and it's supported by a Sloan Foundation grant right now. It supports underrepresented students in the physical sciences and engineering, and basically builds that community and

provides some mentoring support for them. I would love to blow that up and translate that across the entire institution. I'd love to do that in a way that would address all disciplines. Students from not just underrepresented minority groups, but other students on campus as well, and I'd love to think that we could flush this out in a way that would not only impact students, but ultimately allow Duke to emerge as a center for exemplary mentoring, as a center for not just the practice of mentoring but the study of mentoring as well. Big dream, take a lot of money, but something that I'd like to think about.

I also think we need to enhance the climate for our students. Not just within the Graduate School, but within the programs. We have been taking a look at the Climate Survey data. I have to admit there's a ton of data, we haven't gotten very far into them. But the long and the short of it is, we definitely have work to do as a community. This is going to be an important part of what you and I, together, do as we go forward. We need to identify pockets of excellency and lift them up. But, I think we also have to identify places where our students are struggling and find ways to address those cultural issues. Speaking of culture, I imagine a lot of you are probably aware of the wave of student organizing and unionization that's happening across the country. In fact, we have a card signing campaign going on here right now. You can attribute some of that to financial support for students, but a lot of it actually has to do with the climate and the culture that students find themselves in. They want to be part of the system. They want to have a seat at the table. I think those are conversations we're going to have to have going forward as well. By the

way, we don't know what the outcome of the card signing campaign is just yet.

And finally, I know this sounds like kind of a crazy idea, but I would love to have a rotation system where faculty who are interested come into the Graduate School, bring their expertise and have an opportunity to enrich the kinds of things we do. I spent time at NSF. NSF has a rotation system. They bring in folks from academia. It's a wonderful resource for NSF. At the University of North Carolina, we had an endowed term professorship that allowed us to bring faculty into the Graduate School for short periods of time to work on special projects. I'd love to try and replicate something like that here. I think it'd be a great way for us to compliment the expertise we have in the Graduate School, and also be a great opportunity for faculty who are interested in administration, and maybe get a taste of it and see whether it's for them.

I hope that gives you a snapshot of who I am, what I'm thinking, and where I think things may be going. Please remember I've only been here for four months. I am very much on a learning curve. You might think this would be easier the third time around, but it's actually in some ways more challenging because you assume that you know how things work since you've done them before but it doesn't always work out that way. I look forward to working with and learning from you, and I will be happy to answer any questions that I can. Thank you.

(Applause)

Kerry Haynie (Political Science, African and African American Studies): I was intrigued by the data you show with

the Master's program and the PhD students with that line across it. Some of us who've been on this Council for some period of time, remember conversations where we were concerned with the large number of masters programs that were being proposed to this Council for approval and what that might do to the quality of PhD programs and then to the quality of the mentoring and advising that the masters students would get. And, at the same time, our faculty, while not necessarily declining, certainly wasn't growing as we introduced more of these students to Duke. So, I would suggest as something to look at and you sort of alluded to this, how are those masters students doing and the climate for those students to train in and mentoring for those students?

Barbour: That's a great question. And our wonderful colleagues in the Office of Institutional Research have broken up the Climate Survey data for us by Masters versus PhD across the disciplines. So, we've got access to all those data but we haven't combed through it, but can get that.

Anne West (Neurobiology): I'm part of the group that's over in the Medical School with all the big, you know, graduate training programs that are over there. This might be more of a comment than a question. But you know, for years basically we have our own system over there, right? We have our own office that takes care of most of the needs that the graduate training programs have, run by Beth Sullivan. My question is, how much do you see those programs, maybe, running on their own versus really running within the Graduate School? Because you cover so many disciplines. And I also think that there's a real

important thing not to reduplicate efforts that have already been done. So, for instance, we have to all undergo mentor training because NIH requires it for programs that are NIH funded. So, we already have to do that and please don't make us do another one. *(laughter)* Also, there's much you might be able to learn from the National Mentor Training Network that's running over there, which has a lot of good things. Then, when you talk about forming this new network for underrepresented students, I think of the [IDEALS office](#), and what Johnna Frierson is already doing, and she's amazing. I feel like over the years I've been here, we've set up some of our own things to manage the problems and the needs that our students have. And I just don't know how much you've gotten into this.

Barbour: Yeah, I have that biomedical background. So, I know the medical school kind of sits on its own bottom. That's something I've seen before. I still think there's an opportunity for us with the synergistic partnerships that we talked about before. I think there's an opportunity for you to learn from us, but I also think there's an opportunity for us to learn from you, and ultimately figure out what's best done at the local level and what's best done at the Graduate School level. I would argue there's merit in students from the Medical School, for example, having the opportunity to interact with students from Engineering and students from the Nicholas School, and those are the kinds of things that we can make happen in the Graduate School.

West: Yeah, it just hasn't happened a lot in the past. I always thought there should be more of it.

Barbour: Fair enough. I put the synergistic partnerships – it took me awhile to come up with a good word. And I ended up using synergism, and there are people who don't like the word synergism. But, in my discipline, bio chemistry, synergism means the combination is actually greater than sum, and so I think together that's what we need to aspire to.

Tom Rankin (Art, History & Visual Studies): I direct one of those MFA programs we were talking about. *(laughter)* I guess I'm going to try to connect the last two agenda items, your presentation and what we were just talking about, because I think if we rethink master's education and the Graduate School in general we've got two relatively young MFA programs that are not MA programs, and they're not PhD programs, but their terminal degrees. And we're graduating students from those that are getting tenure at our peer institutions while we are figuring out what to do about tenure. And I think there's a real opportunity to improve our young MFA programs, and some of it does come to something you were talking about, inclusion and equity. We lose a lot of our best admits to peer institutions that have more fellowship money for MFAs, because we here at Duke see the MFA, more like an MA without a lot of fellowship money. We've made progress in the last 10 years. But I think that's something that we really need to do, and I think it is also connected to this idea back on the tenure side, of building a faculty in the Arts. I think, speaking of synergisms, there's a lot of connection there. We have graduates now that have tenure around the country, and yet they couldn't have gotten tenure here. We're also missing some really good students, particularly

some of our more diverse admits, to peer institutions. So, I look forward to trying to figure that out. It's not going to be solved quickly. It's not a one-shot thing, but I think that as the Arts evolved and as graduate education, the practice of art, evolve we really have an opportunity.

Barbour: I agree, and there may be a unique solution for Duke that isn't already out there. The other advantage I think I have as a Graduate School Dean is I'm connected to a network of Graduate School Deans across the country. So, there are opportunities for benchmarking, opportunities for site visits, opportunities to bring folks in to take a look at what we're doing and provide us with advice. But, that's just advice. How that advice gets tailored down to meet the needs of Duke is another question. And again, that's something I think we have to work on.

Cam Harvey (Fuqua): My question is about how you think about measuring success? So, for example, you have shown us some statistics, and it would be nice to see other analyses. For example, it would be useful to know not just the number of people that go to an academic job, but how many go to top 10 schools or top 20 schools? And if we see a trend, a positive trend, maybe that's a measure of success. So, I'm just wondering what you're thinking is in terms of actually measuring how the initiatives that you do make Duke more attractive and effective?

Barbour: That's a great question. I think the number one metric of success is whether students come here and actually leave here with the degree. That's number one. The second one, I say, is do they leave here with a degree and do they in the process finish that degree in a timely

matter? Did they leave here without a mountain of debt that ultimately sets them back so that they start their working life in the hole? I would probably put, what is the specific career path after that? In part because that's really student-specific. I take your point. A prestigious place like Duke - and again it's my first time at an elite private institution - the index is not just how many graduate but how many folks find their way into research one jobs? Those are the kinds of things I need to learn from you, quite frankly, because in the past I have prioritized my methods a little bit differently.

Terry Oas (Biochemistry): I would just comment on that. What we're hearing from many of our graduate student applicants are questions for exactly that kind of information. And I know the Graduate School does collect and make available to potential applicants a lot of information. But some of the fine grain details like, where do your students go? What portion of your students end up in academia? What portion end up in industry? What portion end up in other fields? I got that exact question this morning.

Barbour: Well that level of granularity actually is on the Graduate School website. In terms of the specific places where students are placed, I don't know that we capture those data yet. John [Klingensmith] would know better than I do. But, we certainly don't make that public. Again, those are the kinds of conversations I need to have so I know what this community needs and we can figure out in the Graduate School how to get the data that you need.

Oas: I have a second question. In lieu of the likely outcome of the Supreme Court decision this coming year, what is your thinking about our strategy for maintaining the kind of diversity that we've been shooting for now for many years and want to keep?

Barbour: It's a great question. I've been in a couple of town halls recently talking about that. The advice we've been given is don't think anything yet, because we obviously don't know what the Supreme Court is going to decide. But start thinking about how we can couch our goals in ways that ultimately are of educational benefit. So, I think what we need to be thinking about are the arguments we would make to document that paying attention to things like race and ethnicity makes a difference in terms of the educational experience our students have here on campus, and ultimately how they apply that educational experience to go out into the workforce and do the things that are necessary for our country to be successful. We've been cautioned that there are a lot of ways this decision could go. They could uphold it, probably unlikely, but they could. There could be a complete erasure of any mention of race to the point where you wouldn't even collect that kind of information on an application, or it could land some place in between. Those are all unknowns. But the one thing we do know is that whatever happens, we're going to have to couch our efforts to diversify our graduate programs in terms of race and ethnicity. So, that's what we need to be thinking about. And as we get closer and closer to the day, we in the Graduate School, will be having some conversations to help folks start thinking about these things. If it happens, or when it happens, the likelihood is the decision will come out in June. The big

ones usually do, but it's going to apply immediately. So, the folks who are applying in fall 2023 is where we're going to have to be ready to hit the ground running and again, casting some things in the context of educational background.

Thank you very much. I appreciate the time.

(Applause)

Weinthal: This concludes the meeting of the Academic Council today. So, you get an extra 30 minutes, and we will see everyone on February 16th.

