

**Minutes of the Meeting of the Academic Council held via Zoom
Thursday, April 15, 2021**

Kerry Haynie (Chair, Academic Council / Political Science / African & African American Studies): Good afternoon, everyone. Welcome to our April meeting of the Academic Council. Before we begin, I would just like to say that I hope everyone has had their vaccine or are on the list to get it. I encourage you all to take advantage of the opportunity to get vaccinated. It's easy as pie; Duke is running a very smooth operation. So, please do get your vaccinations.

A few announcements before we get to our agenda. This spring, our normal process for awarding the Faculty Scholars Award resumed. As you might recall, last year, our process was interrupted because of the pandemic. Undergraduates in their third year are eligible for consideration for this award, which is the only faculty-endowed award at Duke. The award was established by some of our faculty colleagues in 1974. This year, twenty-eight nominations were received from various departments. The Council's Faculty Scholars Committee reviewed all the nominations and selected six finalists for interviews. From those six, three were selected to receive the award. I'm pleased today to share the names of the Faculty Scholar Award winners from the class of 2022. They are:

Katherine Gan, a Global Gender Studies Major;

Logan Glasstetter, a Chemistry Major;
And Xinyu (Norah) Tan, a Computer Science and Mathematics major.

All three intend to pursue a PhD in their respective fields of study. Please join me in congratulating these students and extending best wishes for their future academic endeavors.

Let me also thank our colleagues who served on the selection committee. They did double duty this year, because of the interruptions we had last year with the pandemic. Thank you, committee members.

Now, I want to say a word about the earned degree approvals that will take place at our May 6 meeting. Each year, the Academic Council has the high honor and the distinct responsibility of approving the earned degrees of all students seeking to graduate from Duke. The Council will do this again this year at our May 6 meeting. If you have been reading your emails and Duke Today carefully, you would know that the university will be holding the commencement ceremony on Sunday, May 2. Even in this crazy world of the pandemic, two comes before six. So, the candidates for earned degrees will commence with pomp and circumstance on May 2, but on May 6 the Council will receive the names of the candidates for the degrees from the Deans of our ten

schools and will approve those degrees at that meeting. I know we'll approve them, because I get to count the votes. So, we're a little off schedule this year, because of the pandemic and moving commencement up earlier in the month. So, students will commence on May 2 and we will receive and approve the candidates for degrees at our May 6 Academic Council meeting. The degrees will be conferred and the candidates will graduate on or shortly after May 7, assuming the Board of Trustees will approve and accept our approval. I don't count those votes; I can't guarantee that. I assume they will approve our recommendations. Like always, no candidate for degree will be awarded their degree before the faculty approves it. Please attend the May 6 meeting so that we can undertake our most important responsibility as faculty.

My last announcement is about the election of ECAC members. As you know, the election is underway. Those eligible to vote are Council members for the next academic year, 2021-22. So, if your term ends in May, you should not have received a ballot for the election. Standing for the three openings are:

Betty Tong (Clinical Sciences / School of Medicine);
Warren Grill (Pratt School of Engineering);
Scott Huettel (Psychology and Neuroscience / Social Sciences Division);
Thea Portier-Young (Divinity School);
Sam Buell (Law School); and
Keisha Cutright (Fuqua School of Business).

ECAC is grateful that these six colleagues agreed to stand for election and that they are committed to putting in the time this

position requires, should they be elected. I'll announce the results of the election at the May 6 meeting.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE MARCH 18 ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING

Haynie: Next, we'll move to the approval of the minutes from the March 18 meeting. The minutes, as usual, were posted on our website. Are there any corrections or edits to the minutes?

(Minutes approved by vote without dissent)

DRAFT REPORT FROM THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL'S AD HOC COMMITTEE ON NTT-RR FACULTY DESIGNATIONS

Haynie: Now, we'll move to our agenda. Our first presentation is from Sherryl Broverman, my colleague from ECAC and a faculty member from Biology and Global Health. Sherryl served as chair of the committee to examine various faculty titles used throughout the university for non-tenure track, regular rank faculty. Some of you may recall that in October 2016, Professor Judith Kelley from the Sanford School and Kevin Moore, Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs in Trinity College, presented to this Council some proposed revisions to the Faculty Handbook concerning regular rank, non-tenure track faculty. Those proposals dealt exclusively with the process and procedures for reviewing and reappointing non-tenure track, regular rank faculty. What it did not do was address the issue of the variation in how non-tenure track, regular rank faculty titles are used across the university. After several discussions with ECAC, I appointed a committee to examine this

issue. A draft report from the committee's work over the past eighteen or so months was posted with your agenda. Sherryl will now talk more about their findings and answer any questions you may have. Before giving the floor to Sherryl, let me say a few words about what will happen with this report. I've spoken with Provost Kornbluth, to whom this report will be transmitted, after we get feedback from you. The plan is for Sally to discuss the report with the Deans and put in on an Academic Programs Committee agenda sometime next academic year. After an APC discussion, the report will come back to ECAC, perhaps with some amendments and additional recommendations. ECAC will then decide whether to bring it back to Academic Council with any specific proposals that Council should vote on. Today's presentation and discussion is limited to the matter of the variation in how these faculty titles are used across the university.

Sherryl Broverman (Biology / Global Health / Member of ECAC): Thank you, Kerry. I'm happy to be here. I was really delighted to work on this project with some wonderful faculty from across campus. If you look at who participated in this, we have Kathy Bradley representing Law, Beth Hauser, who is in Biostatistics and Bioinformatics in the Medical Center, Joe Izatt from Pratt, and then we have Mark Anthony Neal [African & African American Studies], Ranji Khanna [Literature] and Victoria Szabo [Art, Art History and Visual Studies] providing some good distribution across Trinity, and then Ken Rogerson in Sanford. So, a really stellar group to talk about our charge, which is on this slide.

We were given a specific charge to assess how the titles of professor of the practice,

research professor, lecturer, and senior lecturer are currently used by schools, departments and institutes across the university – I think it's important to note that this excludes the Schools of Medicine and Nursing, which have a very different faculty structure and have their own processes – in order to ascertain if there was consistency in the classifications with regard to teaching, research, and service expectations. In addition, the committee was asked to assess what distinguishes or should distinguish each of these ranks from the other, determine if new regular rank, non-tenure track designations are warranted, or whether we should consolidate existing designations, particularly given the context of higher education in general and at Duke in particular, and define pathways for promotion in each rank and suggest recommendations for what those pathways should be, and recommend procedures for evaluation of regular rank, non-tenure track faculty that will help ensure consistency in evaluations across units and departments. In sum, the committee was charged to look for consistency within a title, clarity between the titles, and some equity in those definitions across campus. As Kerry said, we had a very specific charge. We were not charged to examine the number of regular rank, non-tenure track faculty on campus or the philosophy of the inclusion of these faculty within the academy, all worth discussing, but not within this committee.

Here was our process: we started out getting a sense of the landscape on campus. We looked at the bylaws from seventeen departments in Trinity College, representing all three divisions. We looked at the five different schools – again, not Nursing or Medicine – but

Fuqua, Law, Sanford, Pratt, and Nicholas. For comparison, we looked at eight peer schools to see how they framed their bylaws to deal with regular rank, non-tenure track faculty. What we found, looking at Duke, is that regular rank, non-tenure track faculty are critical members of the professoriate at Duke. They are deeply integrated into every school and division. There are some parts of the university that cannot function without them. The Program in Education, International Comparative Studies, and the institutes and centers only hire regular rank, non-tenure track faculty.

This is data provided by David Jamieson-Drake's [Assistant Vice Provost and Director, Institutional Research] office, looking at the percentage across campus. [refers to slide] Note here that the institutes and centers are 100 percent non-tenure track faculty. Trinity is about twenty-eight percent compared to that 100 percent. In the schools, where you might imagine bringing in more non-academic professionals, or people in non-academic careers, you see the Law School is at forty-one percent, and particularly Sanford, at almost fifty percent non-regular rank, again, perhaps looking at bringing in non-academic professionals to enrich their programs.

Duke is different from all of the peer schools we analyzed, except Harvard. Stanford, Brown, Penn and Cornell only had short-term, visiting, non-academic professionals, those without a terminal degree in academia. They were expected to continue their professional work outside of academia while affiliated, and expected to return to that non-academic work when the affiliation ended. So, not considered people as permanent parts of the academy. Princeton only used a

lecturing instructor for educators teaching faculty. Hopkins only had POPs in the business school, again, bringing in people from their professional lives. University of Chicago had POPs in the law school. Harvard was the one that was most similar to Duke in bringing in nationally-recognized scholars with terminal degrees in academia that were expected to have leadership on campus and in governance, and maintain a long-term affiliation with the university.

If you look at the gender distribution on campus, you find that regular rank, non-tenure track faculty are highly female, using traditional gender binary, compared to thirty percent across campus. [refers to slide] That actually does include the Medical School and the Nursing School for women. Nicholas, Law, and Trinity have women much more heavily represented. There could be some interesting discussions about spousal hiring over time, the different ways women get brought onto campus, worth, perhaps, a deeper dive later on. I was also on the Faculty Compensation Committee two years ago, looking at salary equity. I pulled some data, and some of the biggest inequities on campus were in the non-tenure track divisions. Overall, tenure track faculty are above ninety percent gender equity ratio, often most of them near 100, and the report concluded that the POPs – they did not look at research professors or lecturers in that data analysis – were one of the places that had the highest gender inequity, despite the fact of having the greatest number of women in that designation.

We found that faculty with the same title and rank can have very different job descriptions and evaluation criteria for promotion. Some of our major findings:

there was a wide range, particularly for research professors and POPs, with little consistency or clarity within each designation. Many units had job descriptions for research professors and POPs that were identical, despite the different titles. Many units had job expectations for POPs that differed little from tenure track faculty expectations. Non-tenure track faculty in the Natural Sciences are often expected to do nationally or internationally-recognized research without being provided access to laboratories, start-up funds, or graduate students. Honestly, the word “practice” had very little meaning on campus right now, given the wide range of people that hold that title, ranging from artists to chemists to social scientists.

If I walk you through some of the findings, starting with research professors, each line in this chart is from a different bylaw from a different unit on campus. [refers to slide] You can see, starting out with research, some research professors are expected to do only independent research, be fully funded by external grants, others are expected to work in the laboratory of a tenure track faculty member, some are expected to have publication records comparable to that of tenure track, others are supposed to include teaching, administrative work, or have teaching loads equivalent to tenure track faculty. Some are expected to do no teaching. We got the data on the origins of salary and it ranged from 100 percent salary from Duke to 100 percent external funding. So, very little clarity or consistency on what a research professor should be doing at Duke.

Same thing for looking at the POPs. Starting out looking at research, many people think of POPs as teaching faculty.

Some bylaws said “some research,” others said, “peer reviewed nationally and internationally recognized scholarship, innovation that leads to recognition at the national level.” Again, POPs are very diverse. Some are expected to have performance experience but not scholarship. Some were expected to continue their professional lives outside of academia. Going down to teaching, it could be just saying “teaching,” to “teaching load equal to tenure track,” to “teaching load higher than tenure track.” So, again, very different expectations as far as research and teaching, and little clarity amongst the definitions of POPs across campus.

For lecturer, it was a little bit tighter with less spread, but I would have thought a lecturer on campus just strictly taught and was involved in the pedagogical mission. But, again, they went from no research to some research, to teaching and research, to teaching and advising, to fundraising. So, again, a lecturer is not a lecturer across campus.

We had a series of recommendations that came out of doing this analysis. The first is to recognize that lecturers are part of the professoriate and deserve to be recognized with a teaching professor title. That would be used for those with a primary expectation of teaching. We thought we should restrict the research professor to faculty whose primary expectation is independent scholarship, functioning as independent researchers compared to working in a laboratory, assisting tenure track faculty, and the title research scientist should be used for that. This would create two parallel faculty designations, clearly defining one with primary research and one with primary teaching.

The POPs were a little harder because of the complexity of how they have been brought in and their expectations across campus. We spent quite a bit of time on this and decided, for clarity, that we proposed three different titles for POPs. The first would be professor of the arts, recognizing and highlighting the value of the arts on campus and elevating this position. Professor of the practice should perhaps be used predominately for those who are a professional outside of academia, for example, a World Bank economist who might come and affiliate with the university, perhaps for a long time, but their training is as a non-academic. And then use career track, which is modeled on what happened over in the Medical School with their analysis of titles, for academically-based, academically-structured POPs, people with PhDs who come here to do research, scholarship, and teaching. They would be assistant, associate, or full, without tenure, again, modeling the titles in the Medical Center.

We also think it's important to clearly delineate how POPs differ from tenure track, given that they are expected to perform in all three areas. We accept it as a given, though this could perhaps be revisited, that POPs should demonstrate teaching excellence, but we recommend that promotion to full should use some examples currently used on campus, in saying that you need national recognition, scholarship or service to the field. So, someone who was in their disciplinary societies and helping to develop new curricula on diversity, DEI curricula that is nationally recognized, might be worthy of promotion as much as their traditional academic scholarship.

We also recommend some kind of process for the oversight of the weighting of scholarship, teaching and service within each unit to promote fairness. Trinity naturally has a structure that lends itself to this in that, while the chairs in departments create the different expectations, the divisional deans can look for equity across those departments and across their divisions. In Pratt, multiple departments could be creating definitions and expectations and weighting of scholarship, teaching, and service. There is only a single person, but the dean could be responsible for that equity. Unfortunately, in the institutes, Sanford, and Nicholas, there is not an obvious oversight structure for ensuring that there is equity in how these titles are applied and evaluated.

It was felt pretty strongly by the committee that, in rare but appropriate cases, non-tenure track faculty should be allowed to convert their position to tenure track or tenured in a no-risk manner, that is, not lose their POP or research professor category if they were denied that tenure. It was acknowledged by some in some departments that some of the most high-profile or most productive faculty were POPs or research professors and that, in appropriate cases, we could create a pathway for that transition to recognize what they're currently contributing to Duke.

Number seven is to regularize the contract lengths and provide longer contracts for faculty with a track record of excellence. Right now, three-, four-, five- and ten-year contracts are used for different people. There are people who have been on campus for years who are still doing four-year contracts, which means every three years they have to put

together an evaluation committee and a proposal, and we find that that is perhaps not the best use of departmental and faculty time when people have established track records of excellence.

This is slightly outside the purview of this committee, but it came up multiple times and we felt we should share it: to recognize that the MFA is the terminal degree in the arts, equivalent to an MD or a JD, and to consider allowing faculty in those positions to apply for tenure track positions at Duke. We hope that will lead to a rich conversation about how Duke retains some of the most excellent artists in the country.

Finally, since many non-tenure track faculty are judged on having and producing nationally and internationally recognized scholarship, they should have access to academic leave in order to advance it. Currently, Trinity offers a Dean's Leave policy that has varied widely under different deans, from fifty percent of applicants being approved, to almost none. It is not guaranteed like sabbatical, it is something that is competitively applied for, but faculty in other units on campus, the non-tenure track faculty in the institutes are not eligible for any form of leave, even though they are assessed and evaluated for promotion based on their scholarship.

So, quite a wide range of recommendations. We did find that regular rank, non-tenure track faculty are critical members of the professoriate at Duke. They are deeply integrated. They are critical for many units on campus, for the strategic growth of teaching and research, and we hope this report stimulates conversation that leads to

greater equity for our colleagues. I'll stop there and take any questions.

Haynie: Thank you, Sherryl, for that very comprehensive report. Thank you to the committee for all the hard work they put in. Any questions for Sherryl or the committee?

Cary Moskovitz (Thompson Writing Program): Sherryl, thank you and your committee for this really important contribution. Great job. I have two practical questions. One is, the recommendation for POPs having a national reputation in two areas, one of which would be teaching: it's not clear to me what a national reputation in teaching would consist of that wouldn't be scholarship of teaching and learning or other things that would fall under "service" or "scholarship."

Broverman: That was lack of clarity on my part. Maybe it's a little clearer in the report. One of the two, being research or service. We expect good teaching as evaluated internally by Duke, and then national recognition in either research or service in the field.

Moskovitz: I read the report and the report mentions "national recognition in two areas," and my point is, there is a difference between excellence in teaching and national recognition of excellence in teaching, and it's the latter that I'm having a hard time understanding what a portfolio would have that would demonstrate that.

Broverman: We weren't asking for that, but teaching would be an internal evaluation for the quality of teaching, and then you would have national... oh, excuse me, you're right. We need to change the

title. We need to have “national recognition in research or service.” You’re absolutely right, we need to modify that language. Sorry for the lack of clarity. You would do research or service, on top of teaching, in terms of our recommendations.

Moskovitz: The second is, the option to convert from POP to tenure line, I’m assuming that POPs who would have the portfolio to do that would probably not be assistant POPs, so what happens, for instance, to an associate or full POP, do they then become assistant professor? How does the rank thing work?

Broverman: We did not operationalize that. That would obviously require more work with the Provost’s office. This was looking at people who were currently full POPs, and the assumption that they would transfer to tenure, not tenure-track, and the question would be whether that would be associate or full, is something that would have to be operationalized. Is it a drop-down in rank, is it a one-to-one transfer across? It’s a great question that needs a little more time to dig in with the Provost’s office of how to operationalize.

Jana Schaich Borg (Social Science Research Institute): Thanks for the great presentation and all your hard work. This is a follow-up question on Cary’s great questions. Your answer might be that it was not part of your purview. Some of the institutes have world-renown research professors and POPs who only have one appointment, and it is in those institutes. I was curious if you have thought about what a move to tenure track might look like for POPs and research professors in the institutes?

Broverman: Obviously, the only people

who can grant tenure right now are departments, so that faculty member would have to develop an affiliation with a department, unless there is a policy change to allow tenure to be given within institutes and centers, which, currently I believe is not the case. We do recognize the work done in the institutes and centers and the challenges those faculty face in not having access to resources through Trinity, even though they might be teaching heavily in the undergraduate curriculum. That would have to be an affiliation with a department, which then brings up, what does the department get for that line? It is a trickier conversation.

David Malone (Program in Education): I want to thank the Provost and Sherryl and the committee for all their work on this. I’m in my thirty-fifth year here at Duke as a POP, and there has been a long-standing need for clarity to be brought to the expectations and responsibilities and the career pathways of POPs. Thanks to Sally and Sherryl for giving attention to this.

Broverman: Kerry started the committee. I think he’s going to yell at me if I don’t give him credit. Thank you.

Haynie: Thank you, David. Again, thank you, Sherryl. The process will be that this will be a continuing discussion with Provost Kornbluth. She will then discuss it with the deans and APC. Sally, do you want to say anything?

Sally Kornbluth (Provost): I think it was a really excellent report. Sherryl, thanks for your work and the work of the committee. I think the process will be good. I will make a comment about this conversion from non-tenure track to tenure track. Just looking historically, it’s

not unprecedented at Duke, but the instances that I'm aware of, and people can correct me if I'm wrong, at least it's most frequent in that rarity that it's been a full to a full conversion. In other words, looking over the career of an individual, their career clearly merits tenure at full. That doesn't preclude, though, us looking at the other options that you mentioned, Sherryl. I think this should be part of the discussion with the deans and with APC. I will say that I still think it's going to be a somewhat rare event. In other words, it's not that we will routinely bring people in on a non-tenure track and then funnel into tenure track. There's a whole lot of reasons for that, including the clock and what's expected for progression. Again, that's quite different from Medicine, where there are tracks where they can come in less differentiated and move to tenure. But, obviously, the options for clinical practice are different than on the campus side. It will require more discussion, but I think there's a core of some really good recommendations in the report.

Haynie: Thanks, Sally. I want to highlight something that Sherryl highlighted in the report, which is the issue of equity. It's important that we pay attention to how titles are used with regards to equity. Again, thank you, Sherryl, and the committee for an excellent report.

PRESENTATION FROM THE SANFORD SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY FOR AN EXECUTIVE MASTER'S DEGREE IN NATIONAL SECURITY POLICY

Haynie: Our next agenda item is a proposal for a new Executive Master's degree from the Sanford School of Public Policy. Dean Judith Kelley and her colleagues will outline their rationale and

plan for this proposed degree and take questions. The various supporting materials were posted on our website. You should note that this proposal has gone through our regular committee structure for consideration. As per our bylaws, we will vote on the proposal at our May 6 meeting. Should you have questions between now and then, please send them to me via our Academic Council email address and I will give those to Dean Kelley and you'll get answers either before the meeting or at the meeting on May 6.

Judith Kelley (Dean, Sanford School of Public Policy): Thank you very much, Kerry. If I may, I would love for the people who are presenting the proposal with me to quickly introduce themselves.

Mark Hart (Director, Digital Learning, Sanford School of Public Policy): My name is Mark Hart and I am the Director of Digital Learning at the Sanford School.

Kelley: Mark comes to us from a position at Florida University, where he was the director of an extensive suite of online programs that he built. We're really appreciative of his experience.

Tim Nichols (Executive Director, Counterterrorism and Public Policy Fellowship Program): Hello, colleagues, my name is Tim Nichols. I teach counterterrorism policy and policy analysis in the Sanford School. I've been at Duke for fourteen years and I also run a number of executive programs, not only short-term executive education programs, dealing with the military and the national security apparatus, but a year-long program through which we bring national security professionals to be at Duke for a year. We don't award them a degree, but

just a certificate and acknowledge their professional development, and then send them back to their respective agencies. I'm very excited to have the opportunity to speak with you today.

Kelley: Thank you so much. First of all, I want to thank the Academic Council for all the hard work that you do. You're the backbone of our university and it's not a lot of folks who appreciate just how much work goes into being part of the Council. Our proposal that we sent to you today is display number one on that, because it's very extensive reading material. I appreciate the time you put into orienting yourself on that proposal and helping us make it as good as we can.

This proposal is the result of a three-year process that started with our strategic priorities planning, where we set one of our strategic goals to be broadening our professional offerings. At that point, we created an Academic Programs Task Force that was headed by Bruce Jentleson [Sanford School of Public Policy]. We set three criteria at that time for how we would want our professional programs, like what the criteria would be for whether a new idea would have legs for us. Those three criteria were that it had to be mission-enhancing, we have to have the capacity to be excellent when we launch such a program, and it had to be revenue-positive. Those were the three criteria. Based on those three criteria, a number of recommendations came out from the Academic Programs Task Force. One of them was the creation of a hybrid, mid-career program. We didn't want to replicate and compete with what so many other leading schools are doing in this space. We thought that we would be better off finding a niche where we could start out in something that we thought

would be our strength and we could differentiate ourselves from the market. That's what led to our focus on a national security program. I want to make clear that we are defining national security as it intersects with so many important issues today: climate, health, cyber, international development and so forth. This is a broad program, the aim of which is to take folks who had a rather narrow experience working in national security and broaden their perspective on all the policy implications and edges that there are to the national security field. The focus and the planned curriculum that we are proposing has also been shaped by extensive consultation, not just with faculty, but with private and public sector national security experts. We've had many interviews and consultations with them, local and regional military personnel as well, and our own extensive alumni that we have and students that we've had at Sanford, both in our concentration that we have in our existing program, as well as the counterterrorism fellows program we've had for a long time and the executive education cohort we've had. Now, I want to turn it over to Tim, who will talk a little bit about why we think this program has the capacity to be excellent for us.

Nichols: Thank you. Just as a quick snapshot of what we're looking at. You can see that we are being selective. [refers to slide] Judith mentioned that we're going to be broad, but it's going to be broad within national security. We're going to ask for a slightly more experienced cohort. Some of the programs we have, you can go from undergraduate right into it, and we're trying to dissuade people from this, because our baseline is going to be a little bit more sophisticated. We're asking for

people who have worked in the national security area for seven to ten years. There is a broad acceptance of NGOs who are helping, people who are working in biotechnology. As long as it relates to national security issues, we're willing to consider them. You can see that we're offering two options, and this is based on numerous consultations in and outside of Sanford. One is what I would consider the twelve-month, rigorous program that will most definitely leave a mark on the people who undergo it. The second one is twenty-month, which will be the same content, just stretched over a longer period of time, for those who know going in that they will not be able to keep up with the rigor of the twelve-month program. And then our cost for either is \$45,000. The quantity of educational components is the same, but we've developed them in such a way that those who might not be able to keep up with the twelve-month can go to the twenty-month program.

One of the things that we wanted to do, and we've had numerous conversations, is try to figure out a competitive advantage. We have a number that we think we've teased out. The first one is, our Master's degree is less expensive than a two-year MPP in residence in Durham, and it's less expensive than a two- or three-year program elsewhere. So, the price point is attractive. We're going to keep the first cohort small and make it scalable. We think that we will keep it small for the first few years, just to make sure that the admissions standards are kept at a very high level, that we have the feel of a Duke University education. We're not trying to make a factory or a mill here. And then we have some pretty tremendous staff members and faculty members within the Sanford School that

can manage and help this program at its beginning. We're not planning on bringing a huge amount of extra folks on board to help us.

The final piece is, right now our target audience is six hours' driving distance from Durham. Why? Because, throughout the academic year, there are going to be moments of immersion, three-day periods during the semester, five-day periods during the summer, where we're going to ask the cohort to come to Duke and we're going to take them all day long, have networking events, classes, orientation, all sorts of activities so that there is a personal feel to it. We definitely don't want to be seen as an online course. We want to build relationships by having in-person events. In order to do that, we have to have a feasible commuting distance, and right now with the pandemic and folks being uncomfortable with plane travel, we think that we can target our cohort within six hours. That doesn't mean it's exclusive, but that covers Washington, D.C., the 660,000 US military service members who are stationed within a six-hour distance of Duke, and rotate every three years, and it covers a number of the consulting and government employees in the D.C. and Maryland area. That's why we think we can appeal to an audience to attend Duke, come to Duke occasionally, and get an Executive Master's. Over to you, Judith.

Kelley: It's very important for us to make sure that we have an excellent program. We don't want a run-of-the-mill program. That's why we're keeping it a certain size. We are planning to do this by building on our already strong national security faculty at Sanford, and there are some at other places as well across the university who also had influence into the creation

of this program. We want to try to diversify this faculty by bringing practice faculty to it as well. We want it to be a very strong professional program. We envision a model where the program is led by the practice faculty, but where we have rotations, exchanges with the tenure line faculty into the program. Given that it's a hybrid program, there are lots of ways we can do this, not just people owning certain courses, but making sure that when we have a lecture on a topic that Peter Feaver [Political Science] is an expert on or Bruce Jentleson is an expert on, those folks can come in and help with that. But also, when we have these weekend on-campus experiences, we can integrate some of our Master's students who are here on campus and some of the faculty here on campus, and that way, we think that this is not going to be some siloed program where there is a special faculty that is hired just to do that. It really needs to be a Duke experience and that's very important for us. It's a wonderful opportunity for us to bring more diversity, both in the types of experiences we have, but also the types of demographics we have in our faculty. We think that's really important.

Finally, we also have very good connections, not just Sanford, but Duke as a whole, to the national security community. We think that there are experts, even if they're not part of our faculty, that we can bring into our classes, that would take it up to an outstanding level for our students to have that level of interactions. I'm going to turn it over to you, Mark, if you would talk a little bit about recruiting and admissions.

Hart: Something that we're cognizant about is building these cohorts and having really high standards for that. We

feel like there's a need for this within this regional area and beyond. Obviously, we want to do things the standardized way that Duke does, so we're going to be using the general admissions systems. We don't want to put the cart in front of the horse, but with the timeline, we've been working in Sanford, we have a really great communications team and we just hired a new marketing specialist with some time carved out for this, so we're working on a lot of ideas on how we can mix traditional, online, social media, and progressive ways to market this program. Any time you have a new program, one of the first things you have to do is get the word out. Of course, I think Duke's reputation and Sanford's reputation and Tim and his group, their reputation, will do a lot of work for us in that regard. We're looking at traditional ways of marketing, obviously a whole infrastructure, their website and social media presence, going into analytics and Google and such. Those are all ways we need to utilize and get the word out and get the particulars across and make people aware that we exist and what's special about our program for ourselves and in relation to our competitors. Beyond that, just like with everything else we do at Sanford, that's just the way you get your foot in the door to talk to people. Once that occurs, then we will switch gears to a very personal approach. I think with an executive program, it's really important that as these people are working and have jobs, you really have to show them how this fits in with their life and their goals. We're going to work with every single person individually through phone calls and emails and hopefully campus visits down the road, to show them how this is going to fit with them moving forward. I know everyone likes a marketing plan and all this market

research, but I think I would go back to what Judith said, and I know Tim is a pretty humble guy, but I think there has been a real desire for something like this in the area and I think a lot of people approached Tim and other faculty, saying, when are you guys going to do something like this? Tim has a really detailed plan, as we've talked about this, like a regional approach of getting out there on these bases and getting out there with these organizations. I think there is going to be a really high demand once the switch is turned on. We're not just going to lean on that. We're also going to get out there and work to have a recruiting mindset that we want to help people, of course they want to join us, but we also want to get the right people and get a diverse group in here as well. Also, part of that is, talking about organizations or military bases, it would be great, too, if we could create some kind of long-term connections with these groups and then maybe some of these organizations can send a few people to us year over year, and then that would allow us, even with our work, curriculum, and projects, to start creating some long-standing things that we can do with these organizations.

Kelley: Thanks so much, Mark. Tim is going to talk a little bit about the curriculum and then Mark is going to talk about the online pedagogies we're going to be adopting, and then I'll close it out and then we'll open it up for questions, so you know what we've got left. Tim, over to you.

Nichols: We spent significant time querying what topics should be covered in an Executive Master's of National Security. We had the Duke faculty perspective, I queried the military, I queried the consulting world, and there

were some general themes that came out, and we feel like we've captured those. We had to decide how much latitude we wanted to give the students, and the answer was, there are too many basic things that we need to shore up to give them a lot of latitude. It's an executive program, focused on sharpening the understanding of the US national security process and how strategy is affected. You can see here, the courses, budgeting, ethics, leadership, strategic design, all of those apply across the board to the applicants that Judith mentioned earlier. [refers to slide] We're going to give them one elective within a ten-course Master's degree, to be taken in the spring, and the idea behind that is to give them a chance to step out and maybe highlight a faculty member that they've been watching or reading about and take a course. The key will be that those electives, we have plenty in Sanford, but that elective will have to be something that they can either attend remotely, take online, take remotely in the evening, or else they'll have to fall back to a number of the online courses that we built in Sanford. But nine of the courses are pre-programmed and they will be taught in a hybrid format, meaning they'll have some flipped classrooms each week, some interaction with the professors each week, and then some immersion. So, the idea is to give them the hybrid aspects of all three of those exposures.

We have two team-based learning courses, one in the fall and one in the spring, where they'll have projects. Right now, we're developing a way to reach out to their employers, whether it's the government or the consulting industry, and try to have some kind of client relationship where the students can take on something that's important to their

employers. Don't think of it as a consulting project where we would be billing hours, think of it more as an exposure to a real-world national security issue that the government or the government contracting world is looking at rigorously.

The last part I'll mention is we wanted to look at accreditation and make sure that the hours and the equivalents of time are appropriate, it supports the accreditation pathway, and we're over in terms of the number of hours spent per class with the immersion experience, with the weekly online classes, and with the flipped classroom, the pre-recorded fifteen to twenty-minute lectures that will form the foundation of the classes. We think we have thought through this. We vetted it with the industry and we vetted it with the Duke academic folks, so we think we have a pretty good way forward.

Hart: Any new program sometimes has a ramp-up, but I think for a lot of reasons, and with our infrastructure – we just built a new recording studio in-house – and with so much practice that our faculty has gotten this past year with COVID, I think we're going to be able to hit the ground running with an exceptional product from an online standpoint. My degree is in educational technology curriculum and instruction, so it's going to be grounded in educational theory, including the new potential educational theory, which is connectivism, which is where we want to connect our students with experts in the field. Even though some of this is online, we want to allow our students to be able to network within a hybrid program. We're going to use curriculum mapping. It's not going to be ten individual courses. What we want to do is think thematically and how the ten courses are puzzle pieces

that work together and how we can work towards bigger projects and then, as Tim talked about, how these courses connect to people's professional practice. Again, a blend of synchronous and asynchronous materials, and a lot of students talked about how they liked being able to watch videos and such before coming to class, which allows them to be more prepared, but also, as online learning goes, people do like the advantage of being able to do things on their time and at their pace as well. We've created, as I said, a professional-grade recording studio inside Sanford. We actually built a light board from just going to Home Depot and getting a product, but what we've built since then is even further. One of the things that I think has been talked about, you have one course, the traditional way is having one instructor. What we're looking at is taking each course and breaking it down into modules and who is the best person to teach that module. This is another way that we can weave in our faculty together and give them more exposure and more collaboration. We're also not going to shy away from the students doing collaborative work as well. With Zoom and some of the other tools, it used to be that online learning was something that was more individual-based or interfacing with the instructor, so we wanted to do as much as we can to have these students work with one another and apply the material.

We're also really cognizant of the fact that one of the things that online learning misses sometimes is that informal learning: people talking before class or after class, or getting together. So, we really need to find ways that we can build online learning communities for these students and ways outside of the classroom for them to interact and to

process and network or just talk about a movie that they saw. So, we want to find ways that we could do that as well. I think Tim also did a really good job of describing how this curriculum has been vetted in a way where, not only is it foundations that people need, skill building, but every cohort that goes through it is going to be different because we've also created the topics modeled off of real world events, and then everything will be different for each student within the cohort because they are then connecting to the professional practice. A lot has gone into trying to decide not only what we're delivering, but how we're delivering.

Kelley: Thanks, Mark. I just want to end by noting that we're not isolating this program here at Sanford, certainly we're not isolating it from Sanford, we're also looking at ways to integrate it with the on-campus experience, on-campus programs we have, which are our concentration and our Master's program, our fellows program, as well as the executive education program. But also, with American Grand Strategy, a campus-wide program that Sanford is very involved with. And, we imagine there will be some events on the weekends that the students are here that can coincide with that. Also, with the Center for Law, Ethics and National Security at the Law School. So, we think that there are many assets at Duke that we want to plug into.

As a closing note, I just want to say that we're really excited about this new program. We think it will be a great first step for Sanford into the digital program space. Aside from the collective COVID adventure we've all been on, this will be a first step for us. We're excited about it. We have a new Office for Digital Learning

under Mark that we think can handle this transition to this new program and we feel like we're ready for it. Most importantly, though, I think we can bring value to the lives of the students who come into the program. That's what we want to do. We want to bring value to people engaged in the national security sector. Many of them are public servants and it's our mission at Sanford to help educate the leaders of public policy and to address the nation's most pressing challenges, and this program serves to enhance that mission. Next year, the Sanford School is going to be celebrating fifty years of public policy at Duke University. Part of the original vision in the letters that went back and forth from Terry Sanford [Former President] and Joel Fleishman [Sanford School of Public Policy] when they were thinking about what this new entity would do, was to create a mid-career program. Although we were started in 1971, it took until 1987 before we created our first, and so far, only, mid-career program, which is our Master's in International Development Policy. We think now is the time for this next step for us to create this mid-career program, which we hope will be one of two new programs that we are launching in the near future. For us, this program directly addresses one of our strategic priorities, which is to broaden and diversify our professional offerings, and we're really excited to get started. We're happy to take your questions.

Haynie: Thanks to the team from Sanford. Are there any questions? I have one that was submitted to me via email and it's similar to a question that came up in our ECAC discussion. The question is, it seems to me, after having read the proposal, that it's possible to receive a Master's degree that's being proposed

having taken a minority of the classes from Duke faculty. Is that accurate, and if so, is that a good thing?

Kelley: I think that depends on how one defines “Duke faculty.”

Haynie: The question that came up in ECAC was that you’re relying on quite a few adjuncts who are coming in course by course and it may differ from year to year. They may not know one another in any given year.

Kelley: I think that, in the very beginning, as we start up, that may be true as we’re bringing folks on. We may bring them on more in the adjunct capacity for the first year, as we’re making sure they’re going to be good teachers and this is going to work out. Certainly, we are planning next year to hire a regular-rank Duke professor to help spearhead this. We imagine Tim will be involved in the program, and several of our tenure line faculty who have been involved in the program. What will the actual number of courses taught by folks who are not regular rank be? I think, in the beginning, it may be that that’s a fifty-fifty balance. But I think as we go into year two and three, we’ll start to have a majority of classes taught by people whom we define as Duke faculty. At the Sanford School, professors of the practice are very much part of our conception of our Duke faculty.

Harvey Cohen (School of Medicine): Thank you. Very interesting-sounding program. Could you clarify two related things: one – what are the characteristics of the students that you would be looking for to bring into this program? Related to that, when they finish, what is it you are thinking they will be doing, following this

program, in terms of their career development?

Nichols: I’m happy to answer both those questions. The first one, the characteristics would be: step one: you’ve spent seven to ten years in the profession of national security. That’s a broad interpretation. You may work at the State Department, you may work at Booz Allen, you may be a serving military member, you may work at an NGO. What you’re doing has something to do with US foreign policy and national security. That’s who we’re looking for. This also excludes certain groups of people: undergraduate students who have recently graduated or people who are deciding that they want to enter the national security sector. Those would not be ideal candidates because there’s a baseline. There’s an expected level of contribution of the students that we’re pursuing based on their work experiences. What we hope to do, when I spoke to the military and the consulting world and the cabinet agencies, this is what they said: this investment is about preparing people for higher levels of contribution. Higher levels of responsibility, leadership, or, perhaps, higher levels of staff quality. I’m not trying to prepare people to bump to a different job or to leave their agency and find a job in a different agency. I’m hoping that they will be able to produce higher-quality results at their level and at the next-higher level within the organizations. As a matter of fact, one of the things that I heard very clearly from one consulting firm was, we will not send somebody to Durham for years, because if they do that, they’re no longer relevant. But if they can stay in our consulting firm, we’ll subsidize their education and the expectation is they give back for a period

of time. So, we're going to require them to sign on for a few years and contribute at a higher level when they finish. So that's our idea. It's not a career change, it's a career investment. The idea that they're going to get a bump for their future contributions. Does that answer your question?

Cohen: Yes, pretty much. Just one quick follow-on: how many are you thinking of starting with the first year?

Nichols: We think we'll get somewhere in the neighborhood of eighty to 100 applications and we're really focused on about twenty. We think twenty is a good first cohort. We'll learn from the cohort, they'll learn, the dynamics will be good, everyone will know each other's names, and the faculty will have time to nurture it. Then, I think, after a year or two, we'll reassess if we want to go up. I'm not a big fan of large programs. I like the small, intimate programs, but I think the faculty will have to review how it's going and adjust based on what's best for Duke and ensuring the high quality for students.

Kelley: Thank you for that question.

Cam Harvey (Fuqua School of Business): Thank you for your presentation. I have one question in terms of the offerings. When I was looking at the alternative offerings, one thing that jumped at me was that American University has a course that is devoted to cyber security, whereas cyber plays a minor role, it seems, in the Duke offering. It's grouped into the threats and opportunities amongst about nine different threats. Given that this is increasingly important, I worry that students that want to get something leading-edge might not be interested in

Duke, which might be geared towards a more traditional, not even giving cyber a full course.

Kelley: Cam, thanks for that question. I don't know whether you know, but we've actually been making some tremendous investments in cyber security over at the Sanford School with the hire of David Hoffman, who came to us from Intel. He is doing fantastic work at the undergraduate level and is now also helping lead, together with others, our concentration in tech policy within the MPP program, which has the ability for students to focus on cyber. It's true that this program is not for folks who want to come and become cyber security experts, exclusively. It is aimed at a different demographic. That doesn't mean that we, at the Sanford School, don't have the capacity to teach to that, or that they couldn't connect with folks in that area or access programming in that area, but that is not a dominantly cyber program. From a curriculum perspective, Tim, do you want to add anything to that?

Nichols: What I would say in response to that is, number one: we have two team classes, and if, in fact, you're right, Cam, that there is a huge demand for cyber, then the projects can have a heavy cyber piece. My issue is that cyber may be a sliver that goes deep, but I'm concerned about the broader piece. We're going to have people from the intelligence community. We're going to have people from the military, none of whom necessarily have a deep cyber understanding, so we're going to expose it, it's going to be present in a number of components. If they choose to go deep on cyber, they have three opportunities to do so: two in the team learning projects, and one in the elective. For where we stand

now, not being confident that we're going to have a deep, thick, cyber vein, I think we've set it up to provide that flexibility without committing ourselves to being an intense, cyber-focused education. I hope that answers your question.

Harvey: Thank you, it does. The question was mainly for the positioning of the program. You might want to make it very clear in the marketing that you do have deep resources that are available, not just at Sanford, but in other parts of the university, that your students can draw upon.

Nichols: That's a great recommendation, thank you.

Moskovitz: My question is about the lack of prerequisites for students who are dealing with ten years or longer since they've been in an academic environment. There could be some real challenges for basic academic skills, maybe with writing, especially with math. I can understand why you might want to set up online courses, but I could also see that students who might be well-situated to take advantage of your program might need some longer refreshing of basic algebra, even. Maybe I'm misunderstanding the kind of students you're expecting to get. I can imagine that in some lines of work, it might have been ten or fifteen years since some of these students did any algebra at all, for instance. How are you thinking about the timing and whether students would do some work before they came versus doing that when they're here during a very obviously loaded schedule?

Kelley: That's a great point, and also one that we have been learning from over the years, as Tim can attest to for our counterterrorism fellows program, where

we get people who have way more than seven to ten years of experience. They really have been away from academia, and believe me, Cary, sometimes I've had those folks in a class and told them to write a paper, and they have turned it in, and I have said, "let me introduce you to the concept of a paragraph!" There is definitely re-acculturation for some of those folks going back into academia. We are actually quite familiar with dealing with that. Tim, do you want to talk to how we're planning to tackle that?

Nichols: Cary, you strike a nerve with me, because I would say the same thing applies to all grad students that aren't coming directly from undergraduate. In that first summer, we have a number of boot camp-type approaches to try to reorient folks to academic writing and to research. We do it now with our counterterrorism fellows. David Schanzer, in the Sanford School, does a fantastic job of reorienting people who are working as practitioners to what it means to really research, organize your thoughts, and make a compelling argument. We plan to take part of that and overlay it on this program, because we already understand the deficiencies. We have years of these people showing up at Duke, having these deficiencies - not because they're not smart, they're very smart - it's because their jobs don't demand that type of approach. That first summer is going to be heavily invested to helping them practice and reacquaint themselves to research and writing for a policy community with an academic undertone. Does that answer your question, Cary?

Moskovitz: It does, I guess. And you all may have plenty of experience and success doing that, just having a sense for how long that re-acculturation and

baseline might take. I don't know if, for instance, there are so many good MOOCs [Massive Open Online Courses] available, if students might have an opportunity to do some of that work prep on their own before they show up, so that they're not overloaded. But that's obviously for you all to figure out.

Nichols: That's a brilliant suggestion. We'll take that on board. I know you, Cary, personally, have helped us with some of our fellows in the early days of writing and forming the questions and stuff. I get where you're going. Bringing practitioners back to the academy always has this problem. Addressing it early in their time at Duke is the right approach. That has been emphasized by a number of the faculty members.

Haynie: Thank you all. That will have to be our last question for the time being. As I stated earlier, we vote at our next meeting, the May 6 meeting. You can submit questions in the interim to me via the Academic Council email address. We'll have time for questions before we vote at the May meeting.

Kelley: Kerry, thank you for the opportunity to share our program.

Haynie: Thank you, Judith, and your team.

***EXECUTIVE SESSION: CANDIDATES
PROPOSED FOR HONORARY DEGREES
FOR DUKE COMMENCEMENT 2022***

Haynie: Now, we'll move into executive session for our last agenda item. If you're not a member of the Duke faculty, we'll have to ask you to please excuse yourself from the meeting at this point. Only Duke faculty can remain.

[Remainder of the meeting conducted in executive session to discuss candidates proposed for honorary degrees for Duke Commencement 2022]