White Paper

Report ID: 2880577

Application Number: ZA-250742-16

Project Director: John Majewski

Institution: University of California, Santa Barbara

Reporting Period: 8/1/2016-7/31/2017

Report Due: 10/31/2017

Date Submitted: 7/3/2017

NEH Next Generation Humanities PhD Planning Grant

UC Santa Barbara White Paper

June 2017

What Happened?

The goal of our initiative was to spark an intensive discussion within our fourteen humanities departments about how we might train graduate students for diverse career pathways. We had a two-part structure, consisting of a "Core Committee" and a cohort of department representatives. The Core Committee of graduate students, alumni, faculty, and administrators organized all workshops and events. Carol Genetti, the Dean of Graduate Division, and John Majewski, the Dean of Humanities and Fine Arts, co-chaired the Core Committee and served as co-directors for the project, but participation among the thirteen members was broad and deep (a list of the Core Committee participants is listed in the appendix). The second, larger group of participants consisted of a graduate student representative and a faculty representative for each department. We left it to the chair of each department to select the departmental representatives, who each received a stipend for participating. The department representatives and the Core Committee participated in a series of workshops and events. Each of these meetings was organized by a smaller subcommittee of the Core Committee, and the Core Committee met after each workshop to debrief and consider about the results.

Workshop #1: November 2016, "The Next Generation Ph.D. Retreat."

Our inaugural workshop featured two guest speakers, both of whom have expertise in non-academic career paths for PhDs. Paula Chambers founded *Versatile PhD*, a web-based career resource for doctoral students and new PhDs interested in careers beyond academia.

Harry Boyte, an architect of the Center for Democracy and Citizenship's public work approach to civic engagement, works broadly with non-profit foundations, educational, and national and international citizen organizations that are concerned with community development, citizenship education, and civic renewal. The guests' presentations were followed by a group discussion of current trends in employment for PhDs, the various skills acquired by PhDs that are highly prized by non-academic employers, and the attitudes of faculty and doctoral students toward preparing students for careers beyond the Academy.

Workshop #2: January 2017, "Understanding Graduate Aspirations."

In preparation for the second workshop, committee members surveyed graduate students throughout HFA to gauge their expectations and beliefs about a variety of issues related to their training and career prospects. The workshop featured a rich and informative discussion of the survey results, which provided important insights into graduate students' thinking about their education and potential career trajectories. The findings also underscored the need for departments to foster a culture that recognizes the need to prepare doctoral students for jobs outside the Academy. Concrete suggestions for aiding graduate students included broadening training, promoting graduate student career fairs, and helping students to develop and nurture networks that will benefit them beyond graduation.

Workshop #3: March 2017, "Placing with Partners."

The third workshop featured a panel made up of graduates of various HFA doctoral programs who have achieved career success outside of academia. The panelists offered insights into a range of issues, foremost of which was the need to recognize that many skills learned in

graduate school are highly desirable and applicable to a wide array of careers. The panel presentation was followed by smaller group discussions, in which participants probed such issues as how faculty can use their connections and networks to benefit their students' career exploration; how graduate students might more actively participate in exploring various career options; and how the university can assist students in preparing for non-teaching jobs.

Workshop #4: April 2017, "Revising the Curriculum and Learning Outcomes."

The fourth workshop featured discussion of various issues related to community-engaged work. After hearing from a panel of graduate students who have incorporated community-engaged work into their doctoral training and projects, all participants met in smaller groups for discussion. The discussions focused on a number of specific issues, including how HFA departments engage with communities and diverse publics as part of graduate training. Participants discussed potential changes and/or additions to graduate training, challenges that they expected to encounter in instituting changes, and the role that advisors might play in supporting publicly-engaged work. All participants were given homework, which consisted of querying faculty and graduate students in their home departments about publicly-engaged work as it relates to their discipline.

Workshop #5: May 2017, "Public Humanities and Different Career Pathways."

The final workshop was originally slated to cover alternative dissertation formats; the shift in the workshop topic clearly indicated the direction of the previous workshops' discussions. The discussion focused to a large degree on what we want to achieve with respect to training graduate students for a broad range of careers, including publicly-engaged humanities

(particularly as such work develops communication and collaborative skills and facilitates professional networking). The workshop also included a report on the department surveys conducted after the previous workshop. There was a discussion of possible models of broadening graduate students' training, including internships, an interdisciplinary doctoral emphasis, a possible certificate program, workshops, and theory courses. Finally, workshop participants considered which of the models might work best for our campus, setting priorities, and possible concerns related to the proposed changes.

What Worked and What Didn't

We viewed the initiative as highly successful in stimulating open and honest dialogue among the Committee and the departmental representatives. The partnership between the Division of Humanities and Fine Arts and the Graduate Division allowed us to tap into different realms of expertise and insured that the effort would have a high profile on campus. A co-authored formal invitation from Deans Genetti and Majewski, for example, led all departments to appoint faculty and graduate student representatives. The Core Committee (and its various sub-committees charged with planning individual workshops) created well-structured workshops that ensured lively conversations that included a mix of Q&A periods with speakers and panelists, small-group discussions, and large-group discussions. The conversation was stimulating, honest, and enlightening, and participants expressed a variety of viewpoints. Assigned seating led to the integration of students, faculty, administrators, and staff at all events. The success of the workshops reflected the excellent chemistry of the Core Committee; all meetings were well attended and participants eagerly volunteered to work on organizing specific sessions as part of

the sub-committees. Extensive notes taken at each Core Committee meeting and distributed among the members meant that important threads could be followed throughout the year.

While we were gratified with the many successes of the grant, it was clear that our initial goal of having discussions take place at the departmental level was unrealistic. Part of the problem was logistical—departments dealing with faculty recruiting, curriculum planning, academic personnel, and other business simply did not have the capacity to engage in a far-reaching discussion about new ways of training graduate students. We also learned that faculty members were divided on training for diverse career pathways. Some faculty members—especially those with recent experience in the rigors of the academic job market—eagerly endorsed different kinds of graduate training. Yet even some of the faculty who attended the workshops as department representatives expressed skepticism. Many worried that faculty members did not have adequate expertise outside their academic discipline; others voiced concerns that emphasizing broad-based career training would inevitably deflect attention from the core academic enterprise. While many faculty recognize that the job market is highly competitive, at the same time our departments are successful in placing graduate students in academic jobs. We sensed that many departments did not believe that there was real urgency to undertake a potentially dramatic transformation of graduate training.

It was also surprising to us that many graduate students were lukewarm or even opposed to reorienting graduate education toward training for multiple careers. In our survey of graduate students, many indicated that they wanted to pursue primarily academic careers and therefore had little interest in training for other types of careers. Other graduate students expressed concern that they would not have the time to pursue this type of training given the difficulties of fitting in additional courses to schedules that are filled with seminars, teaching, and dissertation

research and writing. Some also worried that pursing different types of career training would endanger funding opportunities because they believed that advisors and departments would give more attention and funding to those students dedicated to an academic track.

As our conversations progressed and it became clear that our original model was unrealistic, the Core Committee increasingly began to embrace the notion of publicly-engaged humanities as a path to diverse careers. Others have made this link as well. Suzanne Ortega, the President of the Council of Graduate Schools, is among many observers to link public humanities outreach—making the humanities more known to the wider public—to changes in how graduate students are trained. According to Ortega, "We will need to build bridges between humanities scholarship and public life if we want to benefit from the powerful lessons of history, philosophy, foreign languages, literature, and art." Ortega's vision is self-consciously political; she sees the publicly-engaged humanities as a way of building a type of nationalism on a foundation of shared humanistic values. Yet it is clear from our conversations that other models of public humanities have a somewhat different emphasis, and are more oriented toward forging stronger connections between campuses and local communities, frequently to advance social justice. By the end of the year, our collective thinking moved to how we might devise programs that link different visions of the public humanities to different types of graduate training. The Core Committee revised our final workshop with departmental representatives to focus on practical ways to link public humanities programs with new types of graduate training.

We view our shift in focus as part of what worked best in our initiative. Our work was dialogic: we absorbed differences and learned about uneven sites of interest through honest and authentic interaction among campus representatives. In this regard, our advice to future participants is straightforward: Allow your plans to change to reflect the direction of the

conversation; allow progress in conversation; bring faculty and graduate students along. For us, all participants are in a new place compared with where we started. That is perhaps the best indicator of a successful conversation.

What Does It All Mean?

At the end of the process, the Committee felt that the momentum was moving towards starting an initiative on publicly-engaged humanities, to be based in our Interdisciplinary Humanities Center (IHC). The program that we envision would include both a certificate program for graduate students and a funding mechanism that would support publicly-engaged research for both faculty and students. The initiative would include a foundational course on the history and theory of the public humanities, as well as a strong professional development component that would prepare students for careers across a broad professional spectrum, in partnership with the Graduate Student Resource Center. Practical courses on website design and financial management, offered by UCSB Extension. Lynda.com (with which UCSB contracts) or other entities could be included in the curriculum. We would strive to offer many of the courses and training in the summer, with appropriate levels of financial support, so that graduate students could more easily incorporate the certificate program without slowing down their progress toward the PhD. As part of the certificate program, students would formulate a capstone project, which could consist of a public humanities initiative related to their area of research and ideally include an internship. The initiative would provide funding for these projects to give students the opportunity to be creative and entrepreneurial.

The formulation of the initiative, we believe, reflects the interdisciplinary, collaborative, and entrepreneurial character of our campus. It avoids the problem of prodding reluctant

departments to take on far-reaching changes by setting up a program and curriculum outside of traditional departmental structures. At the same time, a certificate program in the public humanities provides an opportunity for those faculty and graduate students who embrace multiple career pathways a flexible way of integrating such training into their academic work. Once in place, a successful certificate program could have far-reaching consequences. Students who successfully complete the certificate requirements would attract more students to the program and initiate a process of cultural change among faculty and departments. Our Interdisciplinary Humanities Center, a key programmatic hub for humanities programming on campus, is an ideal administrative home for the new initiative. Under the leadership of Director Susan Derwin, the IHC has made a strong commitment to the public humanities through summer grants to graduate students, a new prison education program, outreach efforts to local schools, and a highly successful writing workshop for veterans. On July 1 the IHC will have a new Associate Director, whose own background strongly aligns with such an initiative. Our proposed certificate program is a way of connecting this burgeoning interest in public humanities with new programs in our Graduate Division, such as a new internship program.

We believe that such a program can work because it combines the decentralization of a bottom-up approach to give students the flexibility to make the certificate program work, while at the same time benefiting from the focus and resources that a more top-down administrative structure can provide. It is a way of changing the culture surrounding graduate training without relying on thirteen different academic departments to upend their own curriculum and degree requirements.

What Comes Next

The Core Committee will continue discussions to pursue our plan for a certificate program in the public humanities. Our goal will be to apply for external funding, but we also will try to find ways to develop the program without outside resources. In the meantime, we will send this report to the faculty and graduate student representatives, as well as to department chairs and the Executive Vice Chancellor. We will also create an audio podcast for our *Grad Post*, which is an electronic newsletter that goes to all graduate students at UCSB. Dean Genetti will also present the project and lead the discussion about the paper at the CGS Summer Meeting in July 2017, and we will look for other ways to disseminate our results. One possibility would be for UCSB to host a small conference of UC campuses that held NEH Next Generation grants.