

**NEH Next Generation PhD Planning Grant
White Paper – Grant Number ZA-250633-16**

Title of Project: *Cohorts, Courses, Qualifications, and Careers: Reconceptualizing the Humanities PhD at Washington University*

Project Director: Jean Allman, the J.H. Hexter Professor in the Humanities, Professor of History, and Director of the Center for the Humanities

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY IN ST. LOUIS - CENTER FOR THE HUMANITIES

June 22, 2017

Over the course of the past ten months, our NEH Next Generation PhD planning committee and its four affiliate working groups agreed on five central objectives to guide the planning and implementation processes involved in reimagining humanities PhD training at Washington University for multiple career outcomes. In our final formulation, the objectives were to:

1. **Affirm** the value of non-academic and alternative-academic outcomes for the humanities PhD.
2. **Augment** the capacities and skillsets associated with traditional PhD training in the humanities.
3. **Clarify and emphasize** the ways in which capacities gained in pursuing a humanities PhD can apply beyond the professoriate.
4. **Extend** the institutional networks (both internally and externally) in which humanities PhDs circulate.
5. **Assist** humanities PhD students in determining what career choices, within and beyond academia, are most appropriate for their own aptitudes and interests.

The challenge animating our Next Gen PhD planning process was finding ways to realize those objectives in ways that made sense for our institution.

What Happened

August-October: Setup and Data Gathering

Before our grant formally started, we set up a preliminary meeting in mid-August with the faculty and staff who had helped conceptualize the project. Because our work was to be structured through a planning committee of twelve and then four working groups of seven to eight members, we needed to brainstorm potential participants. In addition to faculty in the humanities, we wanted our planning committee and working groups to include graduate students, alt-ac staff, and WUSTL humanities PhDs who are working in non-university jobs in the community. We identified core participants from faculty, staff, current graduate students, and alumni and were delighted that almost everyone we asked agreed to participate. We began our grant with thirty-one working group members, with a thirty-second slot left open for a future associate dean for graduate career development that our Graduate School was seeking to hire (*see appendix for a full list of grant participants*). We also hired a master's student from our classics department as a research assistant.

Our early meetings in September and October were enthusiastic, and we quickly coalesced around shared goals, but we realized that we needed a much clearer sense of what kinds of training were happening on our own campus, as well as more information on the national conversation. Working Group #1, which was focused on the small size of incoming PhD cohorts, joined together with Working Group #2, which was looking at PhD coursework and curriculum design, to put together a five-page overview of all our humanities PhD- and graduate-certificate-granting curricular requirements by the end of October. Working Group #3, which was exploring ABD training and professionalization, crowd-sourced a list of internship opportunities that recent WU PhDs had experienced, mostly in the St. Louis area. Working Group #4, which was examining career advising, put together lists of career advising programs and resources that existed around campus: within departments and programs, within graduate student organizations, in the Teaching Center, in the Career Center, in the Graduate School. They also held a focus group of PhD students to assess how useful our current resources were, tried to identify best practices for career advising across these disparate venues, and began to target industries/businesses for placing humanities PhD graduates.

Members from all four working groups also needed more and better placement data from the Graduate School, and through a series of additional meetings, we were able to access some of their anonymized results in PDF and even spreadsheet form. On the national level, we took advantage of the Council on Graduate Schools' webinar programs to familiarize ourselves with some new initiatives and tools. We also seized on opportunities throughout the year to send our planning committee members to relevant academic conference sessions (National Humanities Conference, Modern Language Association, etc.) and asked them to report back on these organizations' programming and their discussions around transforming the humanities PhD. Our ongoing monthly meetings in both the planning committee and the working groups were increasingly well-informed, and by the end of the fall semester, most of our groups were beginning to be comfortable recommending potential action items — some minor, some massive, most somewhere in between — that they thought might help us realize our objectives and improve training for the humanities PhD at Washington University.

November-February: Visitor Input and Initial Recommendations

In order to precipitate wider discussion and get external feedback on our nascent ideas, we invited four speakers from other universities to our campus as part of our Next Gen PhD initiative. Our first visitor arrived the week after Thanksgiving. Russell Berman, the Walter A. Haas Professor in the Humanities at Stanford University, met with select individuals and groups including not only our planning committee members but also our humanities department chairs and directors of graduate studies, talking frankly about his own experiences with PhD reform at Stanford and in the MLA, and offering us an early opportunity to broaden our conversations outside our working groups. Using Stanford's literature programs as an example, our discussions began to be more concrete. Some elements that worked there simply wouldn't work at our university, while others seemed promising. Berman's stature as a respected senior administrator also allowed him to meet with our campus leadership; our Graduate School dean, our dean of Arts & Sciences, and our provost all took time out of their schedules to discuss the Next Gen PhD project with him. In a final debriefing at the end of his visit, Berman told us that

he was impressed by how supportive our leadership was, and he gave us some insights into their priorities as well. We repeated some of these techniques with each campus visitor.

Our other fall-semester visitor was Amy Pszczolkowski, assistant dean for professional development at Princeton University and a longtime leader in PhD career advising. Her invitation was generated by Working Group #4, the career-advising group. Pszczolkowski arrived in December, just after the end of fall-semester classes and before the beginning of final exams, and her itinerary was targeted somewhat differently from Berman's. She did meet with senior university leadership and with Working Group #4 (plus anyone else from the planning committee who wanted to join in), but she also spent time with the Graduate School's data analysts and with the leadership of the Career Center. As our only non-faculty visitor, Pszczolkowski was able to speak to a different range of campus stakeholders and to assure them that staff, too, were part of the Next Gen PhD conversation. She also provided a great deal of useful knowledge, both from her experiences at Princeton — working initially in Career Services and then moving more recently to a Graduate School position engaging with departments — and from her leadership role in the Graduate Career Consortium. Within a few months of Pszczolkowski's visit, both our Graduate School and our Career Center hired new full-time administrators in charge of graduate (and especially PhD) career advising.

Sidonie Smith, the Mary Fair Croushore Professor of Humanities at the University of Michigan, opened our first major Next Gen public event in early February when she addressed our annual Faculty Book Celebration as its featured speaker. Smith's 2015 *Manifesto for the Humanities* was one of our early inspirations for our Next Gen PhD project, and we shared the book widely around campus in hopes of priming a larger discussion with faculty. In addition to her public lecture, Smith met with our planning committee, our leadership, and — most importantly — with our Arts & Sciences humanities faculty at an open forum. At this event, we were delighted to see a number of colleagues, especially more junior people, who had heard about the Next Gen PhD project from someone else (since the faculty representatives in our initial committee and working groups had been heavily tilted toward department chairs and program directors). The discussion delved into some issues we hadn't initially viewed as part of our planning process, including the tensions between home departments and area studies programs, the different needs of international students and students of color, and the use of digital and other alternative-format scholarly projects in tenure and promotion. Smith emphasized the importance of faculty leadership here, since, as she pointed out, "faculty in the humanities have far more agency than they're willing to claim."

Our final visitor was Teresa Mangum, the Director of the Obermann Center for Advanced Studies at the University of Iowa, who helped us continue our outreach to faculty and staff but also incorporate graduate students outside of the handful who had already been included in our planning committee and working groups. Mangum met separately with a group of our humanities PhD students and asked, as a campus outsider, for their honest views. She then met with our planning committee and with Working Group #1 to share some of what she had learned. In addition, Mangum provided valuable feedback on our working groups' initial recommendations (boiled down to a three-page document) and urged us to consider our end goals and what kinds of changes would accomplish them. She recommended that we give more

attention to the engagement of humanities disciplines with the public, as some of our programs and departments had already begun to do, and discussed different models of collaborative work and how those could fit into an already packed faculty schedule.

Late February featured one additional event. Building on suggestions from as early as Berman's visit, we sponsored a meeting of directors of graduate studies (DGS) in the humanities and humanistic social sciences, led by a key member of one of our working groups who was also the director of graduate studies for history. Although the Graduate School occasionally convened meetings in which directors of graduate studies were informed of new policies, we discovered that these (mostly associate-level) faculty greatly appreciated having an unofficial forum in which to discuss their mutual concerns around recruiting, informing, and mentoring PhD students and learn from their colleagues. We gained valuable insights into their work and promptly added regular faculty-sponsored DGS meetings to our recommendations.

March-May: Public Conversations and Action Plans

By the beginning of March, we had synthesized our working groups' initial recommendations and our colleagues' and visitors' best advice into a three-page draft action plan, distinguishing between actions at the departmental, divisional, and Graduate School/Career Center level. We had also acquired two new planning committee members with the Career Center's new assistant director and the Graduate School's new assistant dean. Our project for the remainder of the spring semester was to get feedback on the draft plan from as many constituencies as possible. The senior faculty on our planning committee signed up to present our action plan at faculty meetings in the relevant departments and programs; our PI presented the plan at meetings of the Dean's Academic Planning Committee, the Humanities Chairs and Directors, the Arts & Sciences National Council, and at a meeting of the Graduate School Council. Meanwhile, our new planning committee members helped us present the plans to additional staff colleagues at the Career Center, the Teaching Center, and the Graduate School.

We gained new insights from each meeting: some departments had very different disciplinary conventions around public scholarship, some were concerned about their graduates' placement records, while others felt confident they were already exceeding national averages, and some were simply much more interested in working with us than others. Most of our prior meetings had been self-selecting. As we moved into the spring semester, we tried to engage some of the faculty and departments who had effectively opted out of our earlier planning process, and in some cases we realized we needed more incentives. We revised our action plan yet again and began planning to implement some of the more straightforward items in the coming fall semester.

What Worked and What Didn't?

Our principal accomplishment to date has been the formulation and dissemination of a detailed action plan for transforming the humanities PhD at Washington University. We were fortunate to have enthusiastic support from our campus leadership and meaningful collaboration from groups inside and outside Arts & Sciences, where the humanities PhD is based. Our process simply would not have worked without expertise from our Graduate School and our Career

Center, as well as participation from key players in the Teaching Center, Writing Center, and Skandalaris Center for Interdisciplinary Innovation and Entrepreneurship. We were also able to take advantage of alumni connections to local art museums, private high schools, and even software developers. And, of course, we relied on the years of experience and varying institutional backgrounds represented by our humanities faculty, including current and former department chairs, program directors, directors of graduate studies, and placement advisors.

The decision to administer the grant from the Center for the Humanities allowed for strong collaboration across departments and programs in the humanities and humanistic social sciences. It also allowed for an important degree of independence from individual departments and from the infrastructure of the Graduate School. The Center for the Humanities also came with a built-in administrative staff whose expertise in grant coordination, event planning, and communications proved tremendously helpful throughout our planning process. Additionally, the center's leadership allowed for synergy between existing campus events such as the annual Faculty Book Celebration and our one-year Next Generation PhD events.

We benefited especially from learning about best practices and innovations that had already been implemented at our institution at the departmental level. Several of our humanities departments had already introduced PhD tracks or programs aimed at creating more versatile PhDs, and we were able to learn from their experiences. Similarly, some of our graduate certificates offered potential models for enriching existing PhD programs and seemed to improve PhD outcomes. One department had a thriving internship program; another had devoted years to rethinking its placement advising; and several departments had experimented with substituting quantitative or digital skills for language requirements and peer-reviewed papers for qualifying exams. We also learned from less successful efforts: why did PhD students in one department show no interest in a seemingly well thought out administrative internship option? What was the value of emphasizing public scholarship if, in some disciplines, it added few jobs to the more traditional academic track? Why did some advisors discourage graduate student interest in an alternative-format dissertation? Our colleagues' willingness to share their past failures and course changes saved us from many possible dead ends.

If we were to begin our process again, however, we would make some changes. First — and unavoidably, given the timing — we spent about half of our grant period with two new but open positions, one in the Graduate School and one in the Career Center, that were directly related to graduate career development and so to our grant (indeed, our Next Gen PhD planning work came up prominently in the recruitment efforts for both positions). Once the positions were filled, those individuals became integral parts of our Next Gen team, and we were able to accomplish and delegate a great deal more with them on board. We are looking forward to including both new colleagues on a permanent committee to share data about humanities PhD training and outcomes beginning next year.

Because of the timing of the grant award notification, it was difficult to schedule and then undertake the kind of groundwork that would have opened up discussions to a wider public earlier on. For example, we tried to recruit planning committee and working group participants from a range of humanities disciplines, but inevitably some were left out, while others were overrepresented due to an abundance of highly engaged faculty members. Once we finally

started the project of systematically meeting with each department, we discovered some unexpected allies, some equally unexpected opponents, and some discipline-specific questions we needed to take into account. We also discovered that despite nice stories in various university publications back in August, important stakeholders across our university simply did not realize what the Next Generation PhD grant entailed.

A related challenge was the difficulty of bringing guests to campus early enough in the grant period to make an impact. Our grant proposal called for inviting six outside experts to campus, and we could invite only four, with the earliest arriving at the end of November. This was in large part the result of a very short turnaround between when the grant was awarded (early August) and when it began (September 1). If that timeline continues to be followed in future iterations of the Next Gen PhD planning grant, we would urge applicants to generate a robust list of potential visitors while they are waiting to hear back about their proposal and perhaps even to invite one or two people for the early fall if backup funding is available from another campus source. It is extremely difficult to bring any visitor — especially a senior scholar with administrative responsibilities — for a campus visit in the fall semester when they cannot be invited until August.

Finally, we could have included the perspectives of more current PhD students earlier and more centrally in our process. Although we had one PhD candidate on our central planning committee and at least one additional PhD student in each working group, this added up to a relatively small proportion of our grant participants. In retrospect, we think we should have invited graduate students to attend at least one session with each of our external visitors. Although it made sense that we relied on the expertise and availability of faculty, staff, and alumni in our planning process, a closer working relationship with our Graduate Student Council and with graduate student leaders in each department and program might have saved us time and effort. We hope to partly remedy this omission by asking for feedback from current PhD students in many of the trial programs we are proposing to implement starting in the 2017–18 academic year.

What Does It All Mean?

Although ours was a planning grant, with most of the implementation still to come, our Next Gen PhD planning process has already impacted our production of humanities PhDs. We helped to facilitate the hires of new full-time administrators in the Graduate School and the Career Center with portfolios dedicated to career development for graduate students. We inspired a range of department-level activities, including an alt-ac panel in art history that we plan to recreate again next fall for a wider audience. We talked our way into faculty meetings, even in departments where PhD reform had never been put on the table. We presented the same proposals to graduate students that we did to faculty and took their suggestions just as seriously. We engaged many PhD alumni by calling on them for their experience and advice. Our grant got the attention of our university's senior administrators, who reaffirmed their commitment to offering vibrant and versatile humanities PhD training. Our events and presentations brought humanities PhD reform out of the handful of departments and programs where it had been under discussion and into an interdisciplinary, university-wide conversation that is still ongoing.

Most importantly, we have built new, productive relationships between individuals and units on our campus where they had not previously existed. The permanent committee on the humanities PhD we will constitute next year will include representatives from not only the Next Gen planning committee but also the Graduate School, the Career Center, and the departmental directors of graduate studies. Meanwhile, the directors of graduate studies in the humanities and humanistic social sciences want to continue to meet together, and the Center for the Humanities intends to host those meetings. The Career Center and the Graduate School are working together more closely than ever; the Skandalaris Center for Interdisciplinary Innovation and Entrepreneurship is planning a brand-new initiative together with the Center for the Humanities. The classics department is exploring with their colleagues in education and the St. Louis Public Schools the possibility of training classics PhDs more explicitly for teaching Latin at the secondary level. None of these initiatives are fully in place yet, but none of them were on anyone's radar last August. We expect that the connections formed over the past ten months will continue to bear fruit well after the end of our grant period.

When we began the Next Gen PhD planning process, we were not certain what to expect. We knew that it would be challenging to get faculty buy-in, especially given our decentralized and deregulated humanities PhD infrastructure. Some of our participants worried that we would lead a premature rush into change for its own sake; others complained that we were wasting time rehashing ideas and techniques that had already been discussed exhaustively by the AHA, the MLA, and many of our peer institutions. But we all agreed that we needed to come up with meaningful interventions in order to improve humanities PhD experiences and outcomes at Washington University.

We were pleasantly surprised by how enthusiastic many of our faculty colleagues became about engaging with issues around career development and capacity building that could easily have been left to other campus units (Career Center, Teaching Center, etc.). We were also surprised at how much our staff (many of whom hold their own PhDs) and our alumni had to offer, since their career trajectories were significantly more diverse than those of our faculty and their experiences generally more recent than those of our senior faculty. We were pleased, but not surprised, to discover that the graduate student representatives on our planning committee and working groups had distinct and valuable perspectives they were willing to share. Our views of the problems facing doctoral education in the humanities across the country did not change substantially as a result of the Next Gen PhD grant; what changed was our views of who and what could begin to solve those problems.

What's Next?

As our Next Gen PhD planning process winds down, we are still busy formulating initiatives for academic year 2017–18 and beyond. We will continue to disseminate the results of our planning process by creating an easily circulated bullet-point document, based on this white paper and highlighting our goals and plans for the coming year, which we will distribute to humanities faculty and graduate students in the fall. We will also act promptly to create a permanent committee for inventorying and sharing data about humanities PhD students, their outcomes, and their placement, as well as shifts in curriculum and other requirements. This committee, which continues some of the work done by our Next Gen planning committee, will

include representatives from the Career Center, the Graduate School, and the departmental directors of graduate studies.

We are committed to making an array of new and reformulated resources available to our humanities PhD students starting in 2017–18, including:

- new self-assessment options for humanities PhDs in our Career Center, piloting the use of Imagine PhD;
- new courses and certification for the recently approved (2016) graduate certificate in Data Science in the Humanities (DASH);
- a new drop-in series of ten brown-bag workshops focused on acquiring and improving a range of skills and capacities essential for success in careers beyond academia, sponsored by entities around campus including the Center for the Humanities, the Graduate School, the Teaching Center, the Career Center, the Humanities Digital Workshop, and the Library;
- a new Graduate Careers website co-sponsored by the Career Center and the Graduate School;
- a spring-semester career fair with special resources aimed specifically at humanities PhDs and ABDs;
- opportunities to participate in the new Innovation in the Humanities initiative being planned jointly by the Center for the Humanities and the Skandalaris Center for Interdisciplinary Innovation and Entrepreneurship; and
- a panel during the fall semester, open to both graduate students and their faculty mentors, that features four “Amazing Alt-Ac” (AAA) stories from different humanities disciplines. Humanities PhDs (both Washington University alumni and others) who have created impressive careers outside of the university classroom will speak about their experiences and then answer questions from the audience. (This event could be repeated annually or biennially with different participants.)

In addition to the AAA panel, humanities faculty will also be invited to attend a workshop in the spring semester, modeled loosely after our institution’s successful efforts some years back to create more writing-intensive courses at the undergraduate level (“Writing Across the Curriculum”). This workshop (to be repeated in subsequent semesters, given enough interest) will focus on providing tools to help faculty enhance core transferable skills in their graduate seminars; our Spring 2018 pilot iteration will probably focus on collaborative research/writing and public presentation. On the administrative side, we hope to enhance our existing data on placement and career trajectories through participation in the Council of Graduate Schools’ Understanding PhD Career Pathways initiative, for which our Graduate School colleagues submitted an application last month.

We also have ideas that stretch beyond 2017–18 and require significant new funding commitments from our own institution, external partners, or both. We would like to see the creation of some or all of the following:

- a serious and coordinated program to bring our humanities PhD alumni to campus in order to advise and train current students, including as part of an interdisciplinary lecture series;
- sustained training programs for humanities faculty (perhaps an annual 2-3 day retreat) on the best pedagogical practices for infusing key capacities such as oral presentation, writing for multiple audiences, and digital and quantitative literacy into their respective graduate curricula;
- curricular innovation grants for humanities faculty to further incentivize the development of more collaborative, skill-oriented graduate seminars over the summer, especially as they might bring the humanities into conversation with the science disciplines and professional schools elsewhere on our campus;
- competitive funding for faculty to purchase course releases and use that time to enroll in one or two courses in a discipline outside their own in order to improve faculty capacity to “cross-train” graduate students in areas outside traditional disciplinary training that might enhance the students’ success both within and beyond academia;
- a new faculty hire in network analysis in the humanities to support the DASH curriculum;
- an annual institute or training workshop in media relations for both faculty and graduate students;
- subsidies for humanities PhD students to embark on year-long, non-academic internships, including in academic administration, as part of their doctoral training;
- subsidies and curricular infrastructure for a new program in which humanities PhD students have the option of earning a master of arts in teaching degree as part of their doctoral training;
- support and student subsidies for a PhD-oriented “Road Show” event in which our Career Center helps students prepare resumes targeted at a specific career interest area and then leads them on a 1–2 day trip in order to learn more about that area and meet with major employers in a nearby city;
- the creation of a multimedia library on professional training for the humanities via videography of our workshops, alumni events, etc.; and
- support for a potential lab community for humanities research that would offer both a new physical site and significant institutional investment (scholars-in-residence, postdoctoral fellows, etc.) in applied and collaborative interdisciplinary humanities teaching and research around selected yearlong or multi-year themes.

This admittedly ambitious list is not an exhaustive catalogue of ways to transform the humanities PhD experience and accomplish our central goals at Washington University — indeed, we hope and expect that the conversations sparked by our Next Gen PhD planning grant will continue for years to come. In the meantime, however, we are prepared to move forward in a range of concrete ways, including by seeking further internal and external support for some of our more transformative initiatives.

Appendix: Grant Participants

All affiliations and titles are based at Washington University in St. Louis unless otherwise specified.

Principal Investigator:

Jean Allman, the J.H. Hexter Professor in the Humanities, Professor of History, and Director of the Center for the Humanities

Other Members of the Central Planning Committee:

Wendy Love Anderson, Academic Coordinator, Center for the Humanities

Jim Beirne, Director of External Relations, Career Center

Elizabeth Childs, the Etta and Mark Steinberg Professor of Art History and Chair, Department of Art History and Archaeology

Aaron Coleman, PhD candidate in Comparative Literature and Chancellor's Fellow

Joseph Loewenstein, Professor of English, Director of the Interdisciplinary Project in the Humanities and the Humanities Digital Workshop

Laurie Maffly-Kipp, the Archer Alexander Distinguished Professor and Director of the Religious Studies Program

Diana Mitchell, Associate Dean for Policy and Program Analysis, Graduate School of Arts & Sciences

Timothy Moore, the John and Penelope Biggs Distinguished Professor of Classics and Chair, Department of Classics

Thi Nguyen, Associate Dean for Graduate Career and Professional Development, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences (beginning March 2017)

Michelle Repice, Assistant Director of Academic Services, Teaching Center and subsequently Assistant Director of Graduate Career Development, Career Center (beginning March 2017)

Michael Sherberg, Professor of Italian and Chair, Department of Romance Languages and Literatures

Mark Smith, Director of the Career Center and Associate Vice Chancellor for Students

Lynne Tatlock, the Hortense and Tobias Lewin Distinguished Professor in the Humanities, Professor of Germanic Languages and Literatures and Director of the Program in Comparative Literature

Other Working Group Members:

Roshaunda Cade, Writing Center Program Manager, Western Governors University

Eleanor Des Prez, English Department Chair, John Burroughs School

Mary Druyvesteyn, Director of Development, University Libraries

Mary Ann Dzuback, Associate Professor in Education and Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies, Chair, Department of Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies

Julie Flory, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Campus Communications, Office of Public Affairs

Kenyon Gradert, PhD candidate in English Literature

John Ladd, PhD candidate in English Literature

Judith Mann, Curator of Early European Art, Saint Louis Art Museum

Sean McWilliams, Assistant Dean and Director for Academic Success, College of Arts and Sciences

Vernon Mitchell, Curator of Popular American Arts, University Libraries

Kate Moran, Assistant Professor of American Studies, Saint Louis University

Grizelda McClelland, Assistant Dean in the College of Arts and Sciences and Lecturer in Classics

Adrian Ossi, Software Engineer, Bullhorn Inc.

Robert Patterson, Professor of Practice and Director of the Writing Center

Nancy Reynolds, Associate Professor in History and Jewish, Islamic and Near Eastern Languages and Cultures, and Director of Graduate Studies in History

Jessica Stanko, Campus Services Coordinator, Skandalaris Center for Interdisciplinary Innovation and Entrepreneurship

Gaylyn Studlar, the David May Distinguished Professor in the Humanities and Director, Film and Media Studies Program

Elisabeth Windle, Lecturer in English

Orin Zahra, PhD candidate in Art History and Archaeology

Invited Visitors:

Russell Berman, the Walter A. Haas Professor in the Humanities and Chair of Graduate Studies in German Studies, Stanford University

Teresa Mangum, Professor of Gender, Women's and Sexuality Studies and Director, Obermann Center for Advanced Studies, University of Iowa

Amy Pszczolkowski, Assistant Dean for Professional Development, Graduate School, Princeton University

Sidonie Smith, the Mary Fair Croushore Professor of the Humanities and Director, Institute for the Humanities, University of Michigan

Ex Officio Participants:

Barbara Schaal, the Mary-Dell Chilton Distinguished Professor and Dean of the Faculty of Arts & Sciences

William Tate, the Edward Mallinckrodt Distinguished Professor in Arts & Sciences, Dean of the Graduate School and Vice Provost for Graduate Education

Holden Thorp, the Rita Levy-Montalcini Distinguished Professor, Provost, and Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs