



To: Duke University's Academic Council
From: Gabriel Rosenberg, Associate Professor of Gender, Sexuality & Feminist Studies and History,
Chair of APC, 2022-2023
Re: Academic Programs Committee (APC) 2022-2023
Date: April 7, 2023

I am pleased to provide the Academic Council with this summary of APC's activities during the 2022-2023 academic year. It has been a privilege to serve as Chair and to work with the Provost, Executive Vice Provost, Vice Provost, and faculty from across the university, as well as with APC's dedicated, kind, and professional support staff. Serving on APC is time consuming but vital work. My colleagues on APC are deeply dedicated to the academic mission of the university, and work on APC has been some of the most rewarding service I have done at Duke.

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

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

APC is fundamentally an advisory body to the Provost with a broad remit (see more just below). This year APC has had twenty voting members drawn from across the university, including two representatives from the Graduate and Professional Student Council. Seventeen *ex officio* non-voting members are invited to attend its deliberations. The Executive Committee of the Academic Council also appoints two non-voting members. (A membership roster for 2022-2023 appears at the end of this document.) APC meets as a full committee monthly. The voting members are also divided into two subcommittees, each of which meets monthly. Generally, the full committee meetings are used for discussion and advice to the Provost on major policy questions, while the subcommittees conduct reviews of external reviews of academic units, of newly created degree programs, and of joint doctoral programs between units, as well as consider proposals for new degree programs, and the creation, contraction, termination, or merger of major units.

PURPOSES

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

- 1) Consideration of external reviews of: units (departments and university institutes), newly adopted degree programs (a probationary review is required for new degree programs, typically after the first three years of operation), and joint doctoral programs between units. (APC does not review certificate programs, or the accreditation processes for professional schools).
- 2) Consideration of proposals for new degree programs or the creation, contraction, termination, or merger of major units (such as departments or university-wide institutes).
- 3) Consideration of major academic policy questions with salience for the entire campus.

ORGANIZATION

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

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

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

MODE OF OPERATION

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

When undertaking the first two of its functions, APC receives the full documentary record concerning either the external review or the new proposal. These materials include the prior evaluation by the Executive Committee of the Graduate Faculty (in the case of departments or joint doctoral programs), or by the Masters' Advisory Council (in the case of professional degree programs.) The APC Chair then appoints a "lead discussant." This faculty member reviews the materials especially closely and, in consultation with the APC Chair, frames discussion questions for the head of the unit/program under review, or for the lead faculty members on a new program proposal. These queries furnish a starting point for the brief presentation by unit/program heads at APC, and subsequent interaction between the presenters and the committee.

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

In the case of an external review, the Executive Vice Provost or the Provost provides APC's resolution to the unit/program concerned. The resolution also helps to inform any Memorandum of Understanding drafted by the Provost. In the case of a proposal for a new degree program or unit, the APC resolution, with the assent of the

Provost, goes forward to ECAC and then the full Academic Council, before final consideration by the Board of Trustees.

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

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

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

APC'S ACTIVITIES DURING 2022-2023

In the 2022-2023 academic year, APC's work was focused on updates from university officers and some important policy discussions. It was relatively light on external reviews, which are still backlogged as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic, meaning that much of APC's work was conducted in full committee meetings and APC's subcommittees only evaluated four external reviews and two unit change proposals.

A common theme in many of this year's discussions has been the university's financial footing, particularly as we emerge from the pandemic and the health system undergoes important structural and strategic shifts. Because budgeting seriously impacts all of the university's academic operations, and the budget of the School of Medicine is particularly impacted by the health system, we placed major emphasis on deepening APC's knowledge of the university's finances and its relationship to the health system. Provost Sally Kornbluth and Executive Vice Provost Jennifer Francis worked closely with APC through the end of the calendar year, after which Francis stepped into the role of Interim Provost and Vice Provost Ed Balleisen acted as the primary administrative liaison to APC. Both Francis and Balleisen provided excellent leadership in a period that might otherwise have been characterized by instability and uncertainty.

The emphasis on the university's finances began in our first full meeting in early September of 2022. After a short introduction of our new members, Daniel G. Ennis, Executive Vice President, and Rachel Satterfield, Vice President of Finance, provided APC with a full briefing on the university's current financial position. Ennis and Satterfield emphasized that the university's current balance sheet and finances were relatively stable and healthy, but that longer term budget projections suggested this stability might be short-lived. Chief among potential concerns is the School of Medicine's reliance on funds from the Duke University Health System (DUHS) to sustain its research operations. Even with the integration of the Private Diagnostic Clinic (PDC), DUHS's operating performance is increasingly challenged, which has serious downstream effects on both the School of Medicine and the university as a whole. Ennis and Satterfield emphasized the necessity of improving the operational efficiency for both the university and DUHS to slow cost growth as well as the need to reign in the physical growth of the university by revitalizing existing facilities.

Later, at a December meeting, the School of Medicine's Executive Vice Dean for Administration, Scott Gibson, provided additional context for the financial challenges posed by DUHS. Gibson noted that the School of Medicine has dramatically increased its research functions and sponsored research in the past decade, but that this

expansion was unmatched by the clinical expansion of DUHS. Because the School of Medicine is not able to fully recoup the cost of research operations through indirect costs charged to sponsored research, the clinical operations of DUHS help to make up the difference. In the longer run, integration of the PDC is likely to ease some of these revenue problems, but, in the immediate term, clinical expansion is likely to be a major strategic focus of DUHS, and this context is increasingly relevant to proposals from the School of Medicine that reach APC as well as the broader financial context. For example, in September, APC evaluated a proposal by Urology, then a Division within the Department of Surgery, to transition to the Department of Urology. The rationale for the proposed transition included boosting Urology's ability to recruit and retain the excellent faculty that would be needed to expand revenue and, thus, support Urology's clinical, research, and educational missions.

Although this context clarified some of the ongoing challenges the university faces, many updates received by APC over the course of the year outlined the exceptional work being done by our colleagues working within the existing budget footprint. In late September, APC received an update from Toddi Steelman, the Stanback Dean of the Nicholas School of the Environment, on the university's recently launched climate commitment. The climate commitment represents an ambitious university-wide effort to make Duke a global leader in devising sustainable and equitable solutions to the climate crisis, one that will crosscut the university's research, teaching, and public service functions. Members of APC posed important questions to Steelman. Members asked how the climate commitment can fully engage all the university's diverse constituencies, from humanists and artists to clinicians in the Schools of Medicine and Nursing. Members also inquired into how the climate commitment planned to measure contributions to environmental justice and how the commitment would be accountable to the communities negatively impacted by environmental racism.

Similar questions of how the university's research and teaching functions can be best aligned with its commitments to public service were raised during an update from Stelfanie Williams, Vice President of Community and Durham Affairs, and several members of her team. The Office of Community and Durham Affairs was created in 2018 and encompasses the university's community engagement programs and local municipal government affairs. The update focused primarily on two current initiatives within the office, the creation of a Center for Civic Engagement and the digital partnership program, that are intended to refine community outreach efforts and improve the community's ability, in turn, to access the university's scholarly expertise. Williams and her team outlined how these initiatives fit within the Strategic Community Implementation Plan created by a Board of Trustees' Task Force in 2021.

In addition, APC received an update from Suzanne Barbour, Dean of the Graduate School (TGS), on the current state of the graduate school and her vision for its future, all of which sparked a lively conversation. Barbour was joined by Elizabeth Washka from the university counsel's office to offer context on the university's response to efforts by graduate students to unionize. Although Barbour has regularly attended APC *ex officio* since joining the university in the fall, she took the opportunity to introduce herself more extensively to APC and to review the basic operations of TGS. In addition, she outlined what she regards as the primary challenges to graduate education at Duke, including providing adequate financial support for PhD students, meeting the financial and educational needs of the growing body of MA students, ensuring all graduate students receive consistent and excellent mentoring and career placement services, and addressing hierarchical, hostile, and unsupportive cultures too many students may still encounter at Duke. Barbour linked this final point specifically to the unionization campaign by noting that a failure to address cultural issues could breed discontent and could contribute to interest in unionization. Barbour reaffirmed the need for Duke to foster a culture of inclusion, respect, and collegiality for graduate students. Washka outlined the university's effort to challenge the right of the graduate students to unionize, citing differences between the financial arrangements of Duke's graduate students and those that prevailed in previous rulings by the National Labor Relations Board. APC members noted that challenging the right of the students to organize could carry serious external reputational risk for the university's graduate programs and could also compromise the credibility of the administration with the graduate community. APC members also questioned to what degree placing graduate students in private enterprise should be a major priority of the graduate school as well as how the graduate school measured and evaluated the excellence of its programs.

In January, APC received an update from Jenny Lodge, Vice President for Research and Innovation, on her office's work on ensuring research integrity and compliance as well as their efforts to enhance commercialization and IP management and to secure capital for Duke-affiliated researchers. The university has substantially increased its compliance efforts in the past five years and is, at once, working to ensure that compliance does not become overly burdensome for researchers. APC members asked whether the compliance programs were well-fitted to the various kinds of research conducted at the university or whether they were too narrowly defined by federally-funded STEM research. In addition, APC members inquired about the university's research misconduct procedures and, particularly, whether current procedures provided adequate public and community accountability and deterred future misconduct.

While this update has not yet occurred, APC is prepared to receive a report from the 2030 Strategy Team on April 26, our final meeting of the semester.

In addition to these updates, APC has taken on several important policy discussions this term. In October, Provost Kornbluth invited APC to discuss whether faculty holding MFAs should be tenure-eligible at the university, a question that had been the subject of a report by the Ad Hoc Committee on Tenure Pathways for Professors in the Creative Arts in May of 2022. William Johnson, Dean of the Humanities, Chaired the Ad Hoc Committee and was invited to join APC for the discussion. In general, APC was overwhelmingly supportive of the creation of a tenure option for faculty holding MFAs, reasoning that it would better facilitate the recruitment and retention of outstanding faculty, but APC members also emphasized the need for units to deliberate carefully on the implementation of such an option. Each unit, in collaboration with their divisional dean, should formulate its own appropriate standards for tenure, and, in addition, should decide on a procedure to adjudicate whether faculty previously hired as non-tenurable should now be given the opportunity to apply for and receive tenure. APC ultimately passed a resolution articulating this position, which, in turn, was the basis for a successful proposal before Academic Council.

On April 12, APC will discuss proposed revisions to the guidelines of external reviews for departments. Provost Kornbluth had requested a thorough study of the university guidelines on external reviews in 2022, and that effort is now being spearheaded by Vice Provosts Balleisen and Noor, who will also lead the discussion at APC. This is likely the first in a series of discussions before APC on the topic extending into the next academic year and resulting in a formal proposal for revision. The goal of these revisions is to streamline the external review process and to make it a more valuable source of information for departmental and university governance.

APC also received a proposal from the Margolis Center for Health Policy in February of 2023 that, if adopted, would convert the Center to an Institute. Because of the importance of such a conversion, the proposal was reserved for a full meeting of APC rather than delegated to a subcommittee, and the Center's Director and Deputy Director, Mark McClellan and Gillian Schmidler, fielded APC's questions. The proposal argued that conversion to institute status was warranted by the scope and success of Margolis's current operations and that it would allow Margolis to further bolster its fundraising and operations. APC probed the underlying financial implications of the proposal, its timing, and its impact on other units at the university. In particular, APC members wondered how Margolis's strategic plan articulated with the School of Medicine and the Duke Global Health Institute (DGHI), whether any of Margolis's operations would produce redundancy, and whether Margolis had adequately engaged other constituencies at the university, particularly faculty at Sanford and Trinity, with long term research interests in health inequality and the social determinants of health. As a result of that initial conversation, APC provided Margolis with follow-up questions, and the APC Chair held meetings with Mary Klotman, Dean of the School of Medicine, and Chris Beyrer, Director of DGHI, to better understand Margolis's relationships to those units. With feedback from APC and those stakeholders, Margolis has prepared a revised proposal that will return to APC on April 19 for further discussion.

In addition to the work of the full committee, APC's subcommittees evaluated the external reviews of four units (German Studies, University Program in Environmental Policy, Biology, and Evolutionary Anthropology) as well as the aforementioned proposal to convert Urology from a division to a department and a separate proposal by the Department of Immunology to be renamed the Department of Integrative Immunobiology. Subcommittee members conducted these evaluations with diligence and care. Although each external review encompassed distinct issues, one major theme emerged across multiple reviews: units often rely too heavily on charismatic leadership instead of institutionalizing governance procedures that are rooted in shared departmental values and deliberation. This problem appears to crosscut several often sensitive points of conflict, including hiring plans, DEI efforts, the mentoring of junior faculty, and the treatment of graduate students.

A comprehensive summary of activities is provided immediately below, as well as the membership roll.

External Reviews

- German Studies
- University Program in Environment Policy
- Biology
- Evolutionary Anthropology

Program Changes/ New Proposals

- Urology Division to Department Request
- Margolis Center for Health Policy – Center to Institute Status
- Department of Immunology Name Change Request

Policy Discussions

- Masters in Fine Arts (MFA)
- Review Process Implementation Plan

University Updates

- Overview of University Finances
- Update on Climate Initiative
- Overview of School of Medicine Finances
- Update on Research Misconduct and Compliance Questions
- Update from Office of Duke/Durham Relations
- Update from The Graduate School
- 2030 Update and Implementation

cc: Jennifer Francis, Interim Provost
Ed Balleisen, Vice Provost for Interdisciplinary Studies
Mohamed Noor, Interim Vice Provost for Academic Affairs

ACADEMIC PROGRAMS COMMITTEE

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

Term Ending August 31, 2023

Gabriel Rosenberg, Chair, Gender, Sexuality, and Feminist Studies
Amy Schmid, Biology

Term Ending August 31, 2024

David Goatley, Divinity School (left Duke 12/2022)
Marin Levy, Law School
Christine Payne, Pratt School of Engineering
Jay Pearson, Sanford School of Public Policy
Herman Pontzer, Evolutionary Anthropology
Deondra Rose, Sanford School of Public Policy
Rebecca Stein, Cultural Anthropology
John Supko, Music
Julie Thacker, School of Medicine

Term Ending August 31, 2025

Michael Boyce, Biochemistry
James Chappel, History
Campbell Harvey, Fuqua
Stacy Horner, School of Medicine
Deb Reisinger, Romance Studies
Karin Reuter-Rice, Nursing
Brittany Wilson, Divinity
Morgan Taylor, Graduate and Professional Student Council representative
Jax Nalley, Duke Student Government representative

Ex Officio

Mohamed Noor, Interim Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs
Gary Bennett, Dean, Trinity School of Arts & Sciences
Eve Duffy, Associate Vice Provost for Global Affairs
Jennifer Francis, Interim Provost
Erika Weinthal, Chair, Academic Council
Joseph Salem, University Librarian & Vice Provost for Library Affairs
William Johnson, Dean of the Humanities
John Klingensmith, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, Graduate School
Sally Kornbluth, Provost (left Duke 12/2022)
Kerry Haynie, Dean of Social Sciences
Deondra Rose - ECAC representative (subcommittee B)
Suzanne Barbour, Dean and Vice Provost of the Graduate School
Karin Reuter-Rice – ECAC representative (subcommittee A)
Jerry Reiter, Interim Dean, Natural Sciences
Martin Smith, Dean of Academic Affairs and Assistant Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education

