

University of Cincinnati Next Generation Humanities PhD Planning Grant

1. Narrative

Abstract and Overview

The University of Cincinnati (UC) grants doctoral degrees in several humanities fields: Classics, Creative Writing, English and Comparative Literature, Rhetoric and Composition, German, History, Philosophy, and Romance Languages and Literature. While we see continued strong placement of our graduates in academia, especially in Classics, Creative Writing, and Romance Languages, many of our graduates are interested in finding positions outside of higher education. We anticipate that these non-traditional post-doctoral career paths will become increasingly important as universities decrease the number of faculty in the humanities. For this reason, we see great potential for the creation of a shared, interdisciplinary curriculum that would better prepare students for a fuller range of professions.

This shared humanities curriculum would take advantage of UC's size and its urban setting in multiple ways. First, our university has thriving programs in business, medicine, engineering, and pharmacy – all fields where our students might find positions upon graduations and from which they can learn. Second, Cincinnati is home to many national corporations that have standing relationships with the university. These include giant corporations like Procter and Gamble, Federated Department Stores, and Kroger, as well as smaller, creative corporations like Dunhumby and Fisher Design. Innovative employers such as these could provide invaluable guidance as we consider curricular changes, especially related to internships. Third, UC has recently renewed its tradition of community engagement. Our campus sits in the center of a demographically diverse city, with all the usual urban challenges and opportunities. Our humanities doctoral students should more fully engage the community through existing institutions, including non-profit organizations.

The principal activities of our proposed planning process will include facilitating interdisciplinary discussions to determine the desirability and feasibility of creating a shared curriculum that would help our graduates push the humanities into the broader public, through employment in what can be called the public humanities and in positions within corporations. We anticipate this shared curriculum will have room for internships and will emphasize mentoring from within humanities departments and from humanities professionals outside the university. We have decided to undertake an interdisciplinary approach to highlight the acquisition of skills that transcend individual humanities homes and trajectories. An interdisciplinary approach has the side benefit of improving the practicality of operating this program, since, individually, most of our humanities programs are relatively small. Furthermore, it will provide a novel avenue for enhanced collaboration among several departments, at a time when UC's McMicken College of Arts & Sciences is strongly promoting interdisciplinary activities.

The expected result of this program will be to institutionalize preparation for non-academic posts, providing an antidote to the palpable, if anachronistic, view that positions outside of the academy are merely consolation prizes. We understand that teaching is not the only noble path for people with doctoral degrees and that there is a genuine need for new directions in humanities doctoral education that reflects this. We know that graduates with humanities doctoral degrees find fruitful employment in a variety of areas outside the academy, including consulting firms, publishing companies, non-profit organizations, governmental agencies, museums and other cultural institutions, and positions within corporations seeking employees trained with broad, flexible analytical skills.

The planning process will involve current graduate students and recent graduates, as well as humanities professionals from around the region. We anticipate that the process will result in innovations that create structured participation by these individuals and their organizations in the shared curriculum. In particular, we envision developing new mentoring structures that can work across

humanities disciplines, perhaps staffed by advanced doctoral candidates or recent graduates, who can help students hone skills that are not always well developed in existing coursework and research. These might include entrepreneurial thinking and management skills. We also hope that colleagues from non-humanities fields will contribute to the planning process, including faculty in Anthropology and Sociology, where engagement with the public outside the academy is routine. In sum, our planning discussions with students, professionals, and colleagues will help us identify valuable skills beyond those traditionally acquired in doctoral training that would be useful to those seeking non-academic positions. These might include training in management, statistics, and in Geographical Information Systems, among others – tools that can be useful in a wide range of settings.

Over the course of the last two months discussions among potential planning committee members have already yielded common ground among three humanities programs at UC. We have outlined several priorities for broadening the career preparation of humanities PhDs. First, we must create a curriculum that retains the intellectual rigor befitting a PhD. This is essential to ensuring broad buy-in from humanities faculty. Second, we must assess and utilize resources already at the university, while exploring the possibility of regularizing relationships with other institutions, including publishers, museums, non-profit organizations, government agencies, and corporations, possibly through the establishment of co-operative programs. Third, while a shared curriculum in public humanities must augment rather than replace existing doctoral programs, we must work to create curricular space for internships, mentoring, and interdisciplinary coursework so that we do not lengthen already long times to degree. Keeping these principles front-and-center will help the planning committee obtain broad faculty support for this next-generation curriculum.

An important dimension of our planning effort will be a series of guest appearances by humanities professionals in an open colloquium on topics related to humanities outside the academy, ranging from project management to the digital production of humanities products. We will likely invite experts from a variety of fields, including publishers, librarians, and corporate consultants. A number of these speakers will be graduates of our doctoral programs. We expect that these speakers can help us develop a flexible and useful curriculum.

The budget will fund stipends for participants of the committee, travel, materials and supplies, and a graduate assistant who will conduct research on topics identified by the committee, make arrangements for visitors, and advertise the colloquium.

Planning Committee

The departments of History, English and Philosophy will take the lead in planning. The planning committee will consist of all required parties as outlined by the NEH Guidelines.

PROJECT DIRECTOR:

Dr. David Stradling, Associate Dean for Humanities, McMicken College of Arts and Sciences, and Professor of History, will chair the committee. For four years Dr. Stradling served as the Director of Graduate Studies in History, and in his new post as Associate Dean for Humanities he will be in a position to encourage interdisciplinary participation in the planning process.

FACULTY AT INSTITUTIONALLY-RELEVANT LEVELS:

Dr. Jay Twomey, Head and Associate Professor of English. Dr. Twomey has been active developing academic ties between English and other colleges with the goal of offering students new, career-enhancing skills (e.g., in digital tools and methodologies).

Dr. Angela Potochnik, Associate Professor of Philosophy. Dr. Potochnik is the Director of Graduate Studies in Philosophy, and her research interests include the social and political engagement of philosophy of science.

Dr. Charles Fritz Casey-Leininger, Educator Associate Professor in History, Director of Public History. Dr. Casey-Leininger has worked in Cincinnati for forty years, developing a large set of contacts with professionals outside the academy that he has used to develop placements for internships for students in the history department, as resources for his classes on the Civil Rights Movement, the history of Cincinnati, and various public history classes and seminars, and as sources of information for his research.

Dr. Lora Arduser, Assistant Professor of English and Comparative Literature and Acting Director of the Professional Writing Program. Dr. Arduser's interdisciplinary research focuses on the connections between the humanities and health and medicine. She has numerous connections in the UC College of Medicine and with area corporations, which will be useful for finding guest speakers and identifying skills PhD students need for a non-academic job. She worked as a writer and editor in industry before returning to academia, so is familiar with the skill sets employers are looking for in writing/communication positions.

HIGH LEVEL ADMINISTRATOR:

Dr. Arnold Miller, Senior Associate Dean, McMicken College of Arts and Sciences, Professor of Geology.

HUMANITIES-ORIENTED CAREER DEVELOPMENT PROFESSIONAL:

Marcy Hawley, Publisher, Orange Frazer Press, Wilmington, OH, has been specializing in cultural and multi-region book publishing for the commercial and custom book markets for 28 years. Her company's resource of writers, editors, and photographers educate those interested in books and book publishing, culminating in the creation of high end, award-winning publications. The company's use of college interns has developed careers as diverse as a director of hospital marketing to division head of e-romance novels at Random House.

(See also Dr. Bryan Smith, below.)

CURRENT HUMANITIES GRADUATE STUDENTS:

Anne Delano Steinert, current doctoral student in History with a concentration in Public History.

Niven Abdel-Hamid, current doctoral student in English and employee in the Office of Nationally Competitive Awards

ALUMNI OF THE HUMANITIES DOCTORAL PROGRAM:

Dr. David Merkowitz, Assistant Director of Ohio Humanities, Columbus, OH (UC PhD in History, 2010)

Dr. Bryan Smith, Director of the Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning, UC (UC PhD in English and Comparative Literature, 2014)

Planning Themes

1. RESOURCE ASSESSMENT:

The McMicken College of Arts and Sciences is part of a comprehensive university with a wide range of faculty expertise. The primary funded activity will be to assess resources across the university aligned to support this endeavor. This task will involve communicating with faculty and staff who work in areas that might be particularly useful to humanities scholars. In addition to identifying allies in this endeavor and stimulating the collaboration of the departments that have PhD programs, the planning committee will draw on the experience of other departments in the McMicken College of Arts and Sciences, likely including Anthropology and Sociology, which have a strong tradition of public engagement, and Libraries, where faculty are trained in digital humanities. We will likely tap into management expertise in the College of Business and in the Center for Organizational Leadership, identifying faculty to work with humanities doctoral students and finding existing courses that fit into our developing curriculum.

We will also assess regional assets for Public Humanities, identifying willing partners for career development and employment opportunities after graduation. These partners will likely include the substantial cultural institutions in the region with which the university has long-standing, active relationships, such as the Cincinnati Museum Center (the Cincinnati History Museum and the Cincinnati Museum of Natural History), Cincinnati Art Museum, National Underground Railroad Freedom Center, and the William Howard Taft National Historic Site. In addition, Cincinnati is home to facilities operated by government agencies, including NIOSH and EPA, both of which also have multiple ties to UC. We will seek engagement from regional corporations that hire professionals with PhDs.

2. IDENTIFICATION OF SKILLS:

The second most important task will be the identification of skills not typically associated with the humanities that would be of greatest use to graduates pursuing careers outside of academia. The acquisition of these skills would lay at the heart of proposed curriculum and the development of new courses. These skills range from management techniques to proficiency in GIS and on specific software, such as Adobe InDesign. UC has a prolific GIS program in the Department of Geography that is becoming increasingly accommodating of collaborations with other programs.

This process will require considerable involvement from current and past doctoral students. Recent graduates who have taken work outside traditional faculty positions will be especially important to this discussion, as they contribute their views about the skills that would have made their transitions into their positions easier, and their success more certain. Current students must also be at the table so that they can convey to the committee their own sense of the gaps in current curricula. The planning process may involve a formal survey of current students and recent graduates.

3. ALTERNATIVE DISSERTATIONS:

Although each humanities department has its own culture surrounding dissertations, they all tend to be in-depth, monographic studies steeped in existing scholarly literature. We recognize that the production of the typical dissertation might not develop the skills or expertise most appropriate or useful for those seeking careers outside the academy. A curriculum in Public Humanities should therefore develop guidelines for alternative dissertations. To achieve this, the planning committee, with the help of a proposed graduate assistant, will survey existing programs in Public Humanities to assess the range and utility of alternative dissertations.

4. RELATIONSHIPS WITH NON-ACADEMIC PARTNERS:

Preliminary discussions with current doctoral students and recent graduates have convinced the committee that the next-generation curriculum must integrate non-academic institutions. Part of the planning committee’s work will be to establish formal and informal relationships with partner institutions and organizations that could help doctoral students gain relevant skillsets through internships and co-op employment and through regular participation in colloquia. These partners will likely include: publishers and presses; museums and other cultural institutions; and private sector corporations.

5. STRATEGIES TO ACHIEVE FACULTY SUPPORT:

The Planning Committee includes representatives from departments with doctoral programs in the humanities, but additional faculty voices must be brought into the process. We will develop means for committee members to share ideas with and seek input from faculty in all humanities departments. The Associate Dean for Humanities, who will chair the committee, will initiate individual conversations with critical faculty, including the heads of relevant departments. The proposed curriculum must also include an administrative structure that allows for broad participation. The creation of this structure and the identification of appropriate support staff, will be an important part of the planning process.

6. APPROACHES TO STIMULATE COLLABORATION & PARTNERSHIPS:

Several members of the Planning Committee already have strong relationships with outside partners. For example, Dr. Casey-Leininger has worked closely with the Cincinnati Museum Center, and Dr. Arduser has connections in the publishing industry. Dr. David Merkowitz is the Assistant Director of Ohio Humanities and is well connected to humanities professionals across the state. These relationships should be reinforced and replicated with a broader array of institutions and businesses. Discussions, especially with visitors to the colloquium, must address how to create and maintain these relationships.

Fundraising

We have secured agreements from Dr. Ken Petren, Dean of the McMicken College of Arts & Sciences, and Dr. Chip Montrose, Dean of the University of Cincinnati Graduate School, to supply matching grants in support of Next Generation PhD planning. Additionally, the Department of English has access to funding that can be used to bring in relevant speakers.

Timeline

Date	Meeting	Task	Individuals Responsible	Expected Results
September 9, 2016	Committee meeting	Outline goals, align expectations, and establish responsibilities for individual members and the graduate assistant	Planning Committee	A clear articulation of goals for the year

September 23, 2016	Stakeholder meeting	Publicize the goals related to creating a degree in Public Humanities and identify willing partners; receive stakeholder feedback on the planning process	Committee, college and university stakeholders (potential partners in the Graduate School, University Libraries, the College of Business, the College of Education, Criminal Justice, and Human Services, and the Center for Organizational Leadership)	Refined expectations for the process; strengthened relationship with key stakeholders
October 7, 2016	Colloquium	Potential invitee: Dr. Kathleen Fitzpatrick, Director of Scholarly Communication of the Modern Language Association	Visit to be arranged by Jay Twomey, Department of English	Discussion of career opportunities in professional organizations
October 21, 2016	Colloquium	Potential invitee: Dr. Ken Reisman, management consultant and Stanford Philosophy PhD	Visit to be arranged by Angela Potochnik	Understanding corporate expectations for employees with advanced humanities degrees
November 4, 2016	Colloquium	museum director	Visit to be arranged by Charles Casey-Leininger	Assessment of career opportunities and skill requirements in cultural institutions; establishment or cementing of a partner relationship
November 18, 2016	Colloquium	publisher or editor of a regional press	Visit to be arranged by David Stradling	Assessment of career opportunities and skill requirements in publishing; establishment of a partner relationship
December 2, 2016	Second Committee meeting	Assess contributions from the colloquia; discuss advising and mentoring, especially in relationship to internships	Planning Committee	Draft goals for structured advising and mentoring of doctoral students.

Early 2017 (TBD)	NEH workshop in DC	Discuss strategies & anticipated outcomes	Program Director	
January 27, 2017	Second Committee meeting	During this meeting the Planning Committee will discuss potential curricular developments, with an eye toward integrating internships and structured internal and external mentoring	Planning Committee	Draft shared curriculum in Public Humanities
February 24, 2017	Third Committee meeting	The planning committee will discuss alternative dissertations, making use of materials gathered by the graduate assistant	Planning Committee	Draft descriptions of alternative dissertations
March 17, 2017	Fourth Committee meeting	Members will assess the advisability and feasibility of establishing the shared curriculum lines discussed and, if appropriate, develop a plan for its administration	Planning Committee	Draft administration plan
March 31, 2017	Second Stakeholder meeting	Discuss the draft with stakeholders who attended the September 23, 2016 meeting, describe potential next steps, and refine recommendations	Planning Committee	Stakeholder feedback
April 14, 2017	Present recommend ations and deliver White Paper to NEH		Planning Committee, Dean Ken Petren, McMicken College of Arts and Sciences, and Dean Chip Montrose, Graduate School	

NEH Planning Grant

PROJECT TITLE: The “Living Humanities” PhD for the 21st Century

Project Co-Directors: Eva Badowska, PhD and Matthew McGowan, PhD

OVERVIEW

Fordham University seeks the support of a \$25,000 Next Generation Humanities PhD Planning Grant, to be matched 100% by Fordham’s Graduate School of Arts and Sciences (GSAS), in order to rethink the foundations not only of the five doctoral programs in the humanities here at Fordham (Classics, English, History, Philosophy, and Theology), but also of the foundations of doctoral education in the humanities more generally. As Sidonie Smith, former president of the Modern Language Association, recently pointed out in *Manifesto for the Humanities: Transforming Doctoral Education in Good Enough Times* (University of Michigan Press, 2015), the times are “good enough” for such transformative efforts. Our goal in this planning grant is to bring together a diverse and representative group of faculty, current doctoral students, alumni, administrative, research and career planning staff, and external partners representing the community at large and prospective employers, to share, exchange, and strategize in a structured, stepwise process to produce a clear and comprehensive plan that establishes what a model PhD in the humanities for the 21st century should encompass. A very important intangible outcome we hope for is the creation of a “college” of collaborative thinkers that transcends the walls of Fordham and that will constitute the incubator for future roll-out and implementation of the new model. The tangible deliverables will include a white paper on the proposed model and a digital portal transparently documenting the process and its outcomes.

Humanities PhDs enter the current professional landscape at a highly challenging time. The American Academy of Arts and Sciences reported that analysis by *Humanities Indicators* demonstrated a steep decline in academic job postings from the six major humanities disciplines, amounting to a drop of about 30% in each field except Classics (where the decline was 14%) from a peak in 2007-08. As Leonard Cassuto, Fordham English professor and member of this grant’s Core Planning Group, points out bluntly in his recent *The Graduate School Mess: What Caused It and How We Can Fix It* (Harvard University Press, 2015): “thousands of professors are currently in the business of preparing thousands of graduate students for jobs that don’t exist” (2). Additionally, longitudinal data analyzed by the Council of Graduate Schools in its 2014 report, *Understanding Ph.D. Career Pathways for Program Improvement*, suggest that only approximately 50% of PhD holders across disciplines enter an academic job as their first job after graduation (4). The high percentage exposes the scope of the information gap we still have about career pathways and the need for training for compatible and/or alternative careers for doctoral students.

Thus, the historical trends clearly signal the need for a model of graduate education in which humanities PhDs are prepared to pursue a variety of career opportunities within and without the academy (e.g. cultural institutions, public education, academic administration, government, nongovernmental organizations, and the private sector). They also indicate the need for a broader rethinking of doctoral education in the humanities as inherently Janus-faced, providing universities and colleges with their future faculty but also facing the public sphere as a vital contributor of knowledge, expertise, creativity, and the workforce. In our planning activities, we will be guided by Sidonie Smith’s visionary direction to “hold the vision of inclusive excellence in sight; muster data for evidence-based counternarratives . . . ; recognize the larger community of activists throughout the academy and the resources they mobilize for making change happen; remember all the humanists and allies out there; and act to make doctoral education forward-looking for future humanists” (digitalculturebooks: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3998/dcbooks.13607059.0001.001>).

This particular interpretation of the landscape for doctoral education today - making our education “forward-looking” and partnering with “allies out there” - has resonated poignantly here at Fordham, and has been instrumental in shaping the ongoing discussions and strategic outlooks that inform the main elements of this planning grant proposal. As a Catholic university in a Jesuit tradition, Fordham has had longstanding, demonstrable strengths as a hub of advanced study, research, and teaching in the humanities. Nearly 27% of all PhDs awarded in 2014 were in the five humanities disciplines represented

here, second only to PhDs awarded in the social sciences (41.2%), a trend that has held relatively steady since at least 2010. Moreover, 23% in 2014 pursued interdisciplinary dissertation scholarship.

As a mid-sized university in New York City with a strong reputation in the liberal arts, Fordham is very well situated to initiate reform in humanities education. Fordham's Catholic, Jesuit mission has always been to prepare "men and women for others" and to foster knowledge that makes a difference in the world through service. We are thus uniquely positioned to explore the "Living Humanities" as the future of the PhD because we already have experience in placing our students in the community, both in local colleges and universities and in community organizations. The vibrant Dorothy Day Center for Service and Justice acts as liaison between the University and local communities and will be a crucial resource for this project as well. The career pathways that Fordham PhD alumni, including those in the humanities, seek and obtain have changed over time; they now include teaching, management, administration, industry/business, professional services, the nonprofit sector, and government. In 2014, for example, 59% of all Fordham PhDs obtained primary employment outside of academia. Added to this, three-quarters of Fordham PhDs overall stay in the New York metropolitan region following completion of their graduate studies, thus rendering a localized approach to rethinking career pathways, one that builds on collaboration with community constituents, all the more important.

More investigation and analysis are needed before those involved in graduate education gain a fuller and more nuanced understanding of how to prepare advanced degree candidates for the estimated 20% increase in new and replacement jobs requiring a doctorate or equivalent professional degree that will be needed in the U.S. between 2010 and 2020 (Council of Graduate Schools and Educational Testing Service, *Pathways Through Graduate School and Into Careers* [2012], 9). However, an overarching imperative is clearly emerging: the future of doctoral training in the humanities depends on innovative models that will deliver the competencies and skills that doctorate holders need to succeed in career pathways within our globalized knowledge economy and interconnected world. Whether they stay within or outside of academia, future humanities PhDs need to be educated in an expansive set of transferrable skills, such as collaborative teamwork and digital methods of pedagogy and research.

The work scope for this proposal includes 1/ key stakeholders who will serve as the critical human inputs, including a Core Planning Group and a Constituent Advisory Group, and 2/ an integrated planning framework that informs their work in a coherent, stepwise fashion. The principal activities we plan to undertake to achieve our goals have evolved from a careful review of secondary literature as well as preliminary discussions with key individuals. The result is that our planned activities center on six priority themes (elaborated in the Planning Themes section) that have emerged as being the most relevant to both students and faculty, the University and its mission, and our community both in the Bronx and the greater New York City area. They include:

1. Revitalize Learning Outcomes;
2. Inhabit the New Learning Ecosystem;
3. Mentor the Whole Person: Career-wise Counsel, Promising Partnerships;
4. Incorporate Service and Community Engagement;
5. Ensure Access and Inclusion; and
6. Cultivate and Curate a "Living Humanities" PhD model.

Fordham GSAS has already set in motion a complement of projects that intersect closely with some of the above-listed themes and which could serve as ideal points of departure in the planning for a new model for the humanities PhD. Most notable among them are: GSAS Futures; Preparing Future Faculty (PFF); Fellowship in Higher Education Leadership; and the Fordham Interdisciplinary Lab (created by the Graduate Student Association [GSA]). Amongst other activities are the recent "Assessing University Mission in Higher Education," a survey and assessment analysis funded by a grant from the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities (ACCU) in 2015 and a digital exit survey we now administer to all graduating PhDs to track career outcomes. These initiatives are explained in brief below.

GSAS Futures: In 2014 GSAS and the GSA jointly launched the GSAS Futures initiative, aimed at preparing students for successful and meaningful careers within and outside academia (in so-called compatible or alternative careers), in partnership with Fordham IT, Career Services, and the Digital

Humanities Group. The initiative creates and facilitates events that fit within its P.L.A.N.: Professional development seminars, Leadership programs and training in new technologies, Academic and collaborative careers and skill-building workshops, and Networking, career planning, and mentoring.

Preparing Future Faculty (PFF) Program: In close collaboration with its graduate programs, GSAS is currently piloting a new certificate program for its PhD students that will add value to their pedagogical training by building on existing structures and programs across GSAS disciplines and the University community. PFF is based on seven core competencies, each developed with specific learning outcomes and metrics, drawn on Fordham's Jesuit pedagogical heritage: discipline-based pedagogy; teaching with a mission; classroom observation/mentorship; digital pedagogy; diversity training; improvement through reflection/metacognition; and an optional e-portfolio.

GSAS Fellowship in Higher Education Leadership: Inaugurated in 2013-14, the Fellowship allows doctoral students to explore the world of academic leadership and administration through collaborative mentorship. Fellows work closely with senior GSAS staff members, and engage in the daily challenges and rewards of running a graduate school. They gain an insider's perspective on the day-to-day workings of a major University unit, and have opportunities to better the social and academic lives of graduate students at Fordham. Fellows help carry out the vision of the GSAS Dean, but also have a voice in shaping it. Each year's Fellowship is tailor-made to the strengths, interests, and skills of the Fellow. The Fellowship is paid, and requires a weekly 8-10 hour commitment.

Fordham Interdisciplinary Lab from the Graduate Student Association: GSA and GSAS Futures launched the inaugural Fordham Interdisciplinary Lab, to facilitate conversations and bring together graduate students across disciplines in pursuit of common topics of interest. The lab focuses on enduring and current social, economic, and political issues. During the spring 2016 semester, lab participants will meet every other week for a total of eight meetings. Participants can share works in progress related to the lab's theme, and Fordham faculty whose research, teaching, and service intersects with our lab's overall theme will also be invited. A series of related lectures featuring noted speakers accompanies the Lab programming.

Emerging Partnerships: Paideia Institute: Finally, and crucially for the purposes of this proposal, our priority planning themes build on the recognition that enduring relationships can and must be cultivated and sustained between GSAS faculty and students, our community, and potential employers of our humanities PhDs. A terrific example of a partnership we are particularly interested in exploring during the course of this planning grant is our emerging relationship with the Paideia Institute, a 501(c)(3) nonprofit educational institution in New York City, described elsewhere as a "Greek and Latin startup." We are also interested in exploring a pilot program for Fordham doctoral students to work at *Aequora*, Paideia's signature outreach program that brings the Latin language and humanistic study to socioeconomically disadvantaged youth. Using Latin as a vehicle to engage students in reading, listening, and speaking, the program exposes students to such fundamental questions as: what does it mean to be alive? to study the past? to be in the present? and to think about the future?

We are confident that our planning proposal will result in a new humanities PhD model that will ensure that future humanities PhDs will embrace the mandate that Fordham's President, Fr. Joseph M. McShane, S.J., so often implores graduates to assume: "go and set the world on fire."

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Fordham's collaborative strengths for reimagining the humanities PhD model have deep roots within and across its PhD-granting departments in the humanities, as well as beyond the University's walls into the vibrant diversity of New York City. Our colleagues were strongly supportive of our initial outreach and invitation to become involved in this initiative, and all are committed to making meaningful contributions to the planning process and outcomes.

Our proposed project will be led and managed by two Co-Directors, Dr. Eva Badowska and Dr. Matthew McGowan. **Dr. Eva Badowska**, Dean of GSAS and Associate Professor of English and Comparative Literature, brings to the project not only her experience as a faculty member in English who has mentored PhD students in her department, but also her broad administrative experience as first

Associate Dean and then Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, and former English Department chair. She is also serving as the Chair of the University Task Force on the Future of Liberal Education, and has initiated and implemented related projects in GSAS (as outlined above). **Dr. Matthew McGowan**, Associate Professor of Classics, has mentored PhD students and undertaken a substantial revision of Fordham's graduate curriculum in Classics. As a member of the University Task Force on the Future of Liberal Education, he is deeply familiar with the many challenges facing doctoral education in the humanities in the US and abroad. He has considerable program and budgetary management experience, including as former Director of the Fordham College Honors Program (2013-15) and President of the NY Classical Club (2009-15). In summer 2015, he was elected Vice-President for Outreach and Executive Board Member of the Society for Classical Studies, where he continues to sit on the Advisory Board for the NEH-sponsored Fellowship to the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* in Munich, Germany. In 2002-03, Dr. McGowan was a Fellow at the *TLL* and is familiar with NEH funding and reporting processes.

Dr. McGowan and Dr. Badowska will share all responsibilities for the planning process and outcomes, but with different emphases. Dr. McGowan, as a full time tenured faculty member in the Department of Classics, will have primary responsibility for conversations that may lead to proposed academic/curricular changes, as those are the domain of the faculty in the Fordham institutional landscape. As Dean of GSAS, Dr. Badowska will contribute to discussions of the current landscape for humanities PhDs and the realities and constraints of the possible implementation environment for proposed models; she will also assume the responsibility, through GSAS staff, for the administrative support of the project.

Drs. Badowska and McGowan will collaboratively establish the agendas for each planning meeting, using feedback from both the Core Planning and Constituent Advisory Groups (see below) throughout the planning process to refine successive agendas. They will advocate to transform the culture at Fordham to be more open to a broad array of career possibilities for humanities PhDs. In tandem, they will serve as a hub for information created at each meeting and will share the actionable items with all stakeholders in a timely fashion. After each meeting and throughout the course of the year, they will be jointly responsible for organizing all committee activities and overseeing the successful completion of the final draft of the white paper.

In order to ensure that the planning process is transparent and inclusive, we will incorporate the following elements. We will create a simple, clean web portal for the project, to serve as a living repository for key background documents, agendas, meeting minutes, and other documents, including an RSS feed for relevant media and news that relate to our work. Drs. Badowska and McGowan will also share relevant information during the planning process with the GSAS Graduate Council, the body which is responsible for deliberating and enacting changes to GSAS program curricula. Second, we plan to create a Twitter feed that GSAS will manage during the course of the planning process. The feed will provide real-time project updates and facilitate idea diffusion to various communities, including the graduate student community, interested faculty, the media, Fordham alumni, NEH, and others. The Twitter feed will also help build the outside interest and support for the Fordham/NEH project, capitalizing on the network we already have established to support work on the Future of Liberal Arts.

We have organized our project planning into two forums or groups: a **Core Planning Group** and a **Constituent Advisory Group**. The Core Planning Group comprises a diverse and inclusive range of humanities departmental faculty at both junior and senior levels; current PhD candidates in several humanities disciplines; recent humanities alumni; and senior administrators within GSAS and Arts and Sciences. This arrangement comports with faculty governance norms regarding curricular design and content. The Constituent Advisory Group includes stakeholders hailing from within the University (e.g., faculty or staff professionals working in a particular area relevant to planning, such as Career Services, Modern Languages and Literatures, Fordham University Press, and International Initiatives). It also includes representatives from a range of humanities-oriented organizations located in the Bronx and New York City, Fordham's closest community allies, and features cultural institutions, historical societies, museums, nongovernmental organizations, and other professional sectors who are sources of knowledge and expertise concerning applied humanities training and career pathways for humanities PhDs.

We envision these two groups working in an integrated, functionally-oriented arrangement to leverage their respective collective and individual expertise, and to facilitate continuous, stepwise workflow throughout our eight-month planning process. We plan to convene both groups simultaneously, twice during the project, at the initial and concluding planning meetings. In the interim monthly meetings, the Core Planning Group will meet with subsets of the Constituent Advisory Group to engage them in-depth on select planning themes that will form the focus of each monthly meeting. For example, exploration of the Service planning theme (see below) would include Core Planning Group members to discuss whether and to what degree there is utility and value of including new service components within/across their PhD programs, and select Constituent Advisory Group members with critical insights and best practice knowledge in this area, and/or who are interested in establishing new service partnerships with humanities PhD programs and students as part of new models of experiential doctoral learning. As the interactions between these two groups unfold and deepen, the Project Co-Directors will continuously channel relevant lessons learned into subsequent meetings, which will aid ultimately in structuring the project's final recommendations for a new model of doctoral education in the Humanities at Fordham and possibly a new model that may be applicable outside of Fordham.

Core Planning Group

Core Planning Group Members are committed to participating in all monthly meetings, as well as working as members of sub-groups for the purposes of exploring specific themes as identified by the Project Co-Directors.

Confirmed

- **Dr. Nathan Ballantyne**, Assistant Professor of Philosophy and Director of Professional Development and Placement in Philosophy
- **Dr. John Bugg**, Professor of English, Director of Graduate Studies in English, and former National Endowment for the Humanities fellow
- **Dr. Leonard Cassuto**, Professor of English and “The Graduate Adviser” columnist for *The Chronicle of Higher Education*; author of *The Graduate School Mess: What Caused It and How We Can Fix It* (Harvard UP, 2015)
- **Dr. John Drummond**, Robert Southwell, S.J. Distinguished Professor in the Humanities and Department Chair of Philosophy
- **Dr. Glenn Hendler**, Professor of English and American Studies
- **Ms. Lisa Radakovich Holsberg**, PhD candidate in Theology
- **Dr. J. Patrick Hornbeck, II**, Associate Professor of Theology and Department Chair of Theology
- **Dr. Matthew Keil**, 2015 alumnus of the PhD in Classics, public high school teacher in Queens, NY
- **Dr. Melissa Labonte**, Associate Dean for Strategic Initiatives, GSAS and Associate Professor of Political Science
- **Ms. Erin McKenna**, PhD candidate in Classical Philology
- **Dr. Nicholas Paul**, Associate Professor of History and Director of Graduate Studies in the Department of History
- **Dr. Sarah Peirce**, Associate Professor of Classics
- **Dr. Kirsten Swinth**, Associate Dean for Curriculum and Planning in Arts and Sciences, Department Chair of History, and Associate Professor of History and American Studies
- **Dr. Magda Teter**, Shvidler Chair in Judaic Studies and Professor of History
- **Mr. James Van Wyck**, PhD candidate in English and past GSAS Senior Fellow in Higher Education Leadership

Constituent Advisory Group

Members of this group hail from a range of backgrounds and represent organizations whose work and missions are closely associated with humanities disciplines, or specialized professional staff at Fordham. They will attend select meetings and provide advice and insight into the working sub-groups of

the Core Planning Group. Their role is primarily as sounding boards for the ideas generated by the Core Planning Group as they relate to select planning themes, and to aid that group in innovating elements that further the goals of increasing the relevance of the humanities for the 21st century workplace, strengthening the links between the humanities and the public sphere, and integrating these elements into a new model for humanities doctorates.

Confirmed

- **Ms. Maureen Bateman**, member of the Board of Directors, American-Irish Historical Society, NYC
- **Mr. Armando Borja**, Director, Jesuit Refugee Service North America Region
- **Ms. Ellen Bruzelius**, Executive Director, Bartow-Pell Mansion Museum, Bronx Pelham Bay Park, NY
- **Ms. Elizabeth Butterworth**, Director of Development, Paideia Institute for Humanistic Study, NYC
- **Mr. Brendan Cahill**, Executive Director, Institute of International Humanitarian Affairs, Fordham University
- **Dr. Steven D'Agustino**, Director of Online Learning, Office of the Provost
- **Mr. Michael J. Dowling**, President and Chief Executive Officer, Northwell Health (formerly the North Shore-LIJ Health System)
- **Dr. Jeannine Hill-Fletcher**, Faculty Director of Service Learning and Associate Professor of Theology
- **Ms. Lisa Lancia, J.D.**, Director of International Initiatives, Office of the Provost, Fordham University
- **Mr. Fredric W. Nachbaur**, Director, Fordham University Press
- **Dr. Mark Naison**, Founder and Principal Investigator, Bronx African American History Project, and Professor of History and African-American Studies
- **Mr. John O'Neill**, Curator of Manuscripts and Rare Books, and Head of Library, Hispanic Historical Society, New York City
- **Dr. Francesca Parmeggiani**, Associate Professor of Italian and Comparative Literature, Associate Chair of Modern Languages and Literatures
- **Dr. Jennifer Udell**, Curator, Fordham University Museum of Greek, Etruscan, and Roman Art
- **Ms. Abigail Woods-Ferreira**, Career Counselor for GSAS and the Graduate School of Education, Office of Career Services, Fordham University

Invited but not yet confirmed

- **Ms. Malkah Bressler**, PhD candidate in English and Vice President, Graduate Student Association
- **Dr. Martin Chase, S.J.**, Editorial board member of *Traditio*, member of the Fordham University Faculty Senate, and Associate Professor of English
- **Mr. Stephen Haff**, Chief, Still Waters in a Storm (a one-room schoolhouse in Bushwick, Brooklyn)
- **Mr. Lester Long**, Principal, South Bronx Classics Charter School
- **Dr. Jeannine Pinto**, University Assessment Officer
- **TBD**, Office of Research, Fordham University (Fordham is in the final stages of a national search for this position)

PLANNING THEMES

1. Revitalize Learning Outcomes

Consideration of a new model for the humanities PhD must begin by re-imagining the learning outcomes our students aim to achieve. What will PhD holders of the future be required to know? What will they be required to know how to do? How will their experience as PhD students be transformative for themselves and the public sphere?

- What are the key student learning objectives (SLOs) for the PhD in a humanities discipline today and for the future?
- How must the design of the doctorate be re-imagined to meet these new SLOs?
- What types of requirements will be helpful in facilitating the achievement of these SLOs?

- Is the dissertation still the necessary formative experience of the PhD in the humanities? If not, what other formative experiences might be proposed? If yes, what alternative formats might the dissertation take? What are the SLOs for the dissertation in particular?
- What role might experiential and practical learning play in a new humanities PhD?
- How might collaboration and team approaches figure into a new humanities PhD?
- How will a model humanities PhD ensure the mastery of the discipline while remaining open to interdisciplinary possibilities? Or is this a false opposition?
- What might the progression of requirements look like in a particular discipline?
- What is the ideal time to degree for a humanities PhD, assuming that there is consensus that current average times to degree are too long? How will the SLOs be met in that new time frame?

2. Inhabit the New Learning Ecosystem

Graduate education must be re-imagined in the context of the emergent learning ecosystem, which involves not only digital technologies as tools but, rather, constitutes a fundamental shift toward learner-centered, active approaches to curriculum design, study methods, curation of knowledge, and research protocols.

- What are the appropriate learning environments and delivery formats to meet the SLOs?
- How will we ensure that a new model makes the doctoral candidate the active center of all learning?
- What “classroom” formats will be most appropriate?
- What pedagogies should be explored, deployed, and taught?
- How will the design of new PhD programs facilitate new learning and new knowledge discovery?
- How will a new model facilitate collaborative and interdisciplinary thinking, collaborative research, and collaborative writing? How will a new model respond to the dominance of the “solitary scholar” paradigm in the traditional humanities?
- How will a new model prepare students to engage with digital methods of scholarship, communication, and pedagogy?

3. Mentor the Whole Person: Career-wise Counsel, Promising Partnerships

A new model for humanities PhDs must remain cognizant of the fact that approximately 50% of doctorate holders nationally go into careers outside of academia and that PhD programs must, therefore, support these multiple career outcomes. At Fordham, we have traditionally emphasized the Jesuit value of *cura personalis* - care for the whole person. We now propose to embed this principle more deeply as a hallmark of our PhD degrees as well.

- What fundamental transferrable habits of mind and skills do PhD candidates acquire in their degree programs? How can programs support the development of these skills, and help candidates make these skills visible and flexible?
- How will the role of faculty mentors shift and evolve?
- What other types of advising structures should be developed to support doctoral candidates?
- How can alumni of humanities PhD programs be deployed in re-imagining mentoring and advising of doctoral candidates?
- How can we include community partners and prospective employers in mentoring and advising PhD candidates? What experiential/practical/shadowing opportunities can be created to facilitate career options?
- How will PhD program curricula imaginatively include outcomes other than academic placements, in addition to academic placements?
- How will the new PhD in humanities operationalize relations with non-academic partners to support career opportunities for graduates?

4. Incorporate Service and Community Engagement

We see service and community engagement as a key theme for our planning, not just because of Fordham's traditional emphasis on service learning but because this mission-driven focus connects with the needs of today's students and the professional landscape they will inhabit and enrich.

- How can we meaningfully build partnerships with community organizations into the design of our curricula?
- Can we viably integrate doctoral study and service without compromising the academic rigor of the one and the steadfast commitment required by the other? Or is this a false dichotomy?
- How can we ensure that our service partnerships benefit both the University - its students, faculty, and academic culture - and the members of the community and their institutions?
- How can we effectively cultivate and redeploy the skills acquired in service projects and community engagement for conducting research and completing a doctorate?
- How might our study of the humanities enrich the communities we serve?
- What would success look like for a humanities doctoral program with a service component, and what methods will we develop to assess and monitor it?

5. Ensure Access and Inclusion

This theme lies at the heart of Fordham's mission as a Jesuit institution of higher learning, and requires seeing beyond our certainties to ensure that humanities departments and programs embrace progressivism, promote a greater social justice in word and in deed, and empower their students, faculty, and communities. A new humanities PhD model must address the concerns and requirements of students from underrepresented, underserved, and marginalized communities. Current *Survey of Earned Doctorates* data tell us, for example, that the percentage of first generation college students (traditionally hailing from underrepresented and minority communities) who go on to complete PhDs has fallen from two-thirds in 1963 to one-third in 2014. Coupled with this worrisome trend, the prevailing structure of PhD program admissions emphasizes narrow specialization and presumes one possible outcome: an academic career in the professoriate. Any attempt to include a variety of outcomes in a model PhD program that also is accessible to these communities must center on recruitment and admissions.

- How can we reimagine the role of recruitment and admissions as mutually reinforcing platforms to advance meaningfully the goals of attracting and retaining a diverse and inclusive student body and faculty?
- In what ways can the application process itself be reconfigured to attract communities of PhD applicants which are currently not being reached? How should humanities PhD programs rethink the notion of a model applicant/student?
- How can we develop new models of financial support that promote inclusion and advance the goals of reforming time to degree?
- Are there modes of pre-PhD mentoring and preparation that can be designed to serve potential applicants from our community in becoming successful humanities PhD program applicants (both here at Fordham and possibly elsewhere)?

6. Cultivate and Curate a Living Humanities PhD Model

Establishing a new PhD model for the humanities should not be considered the ultimate endpoint that is reached following a long and difficult journey. Rather, the new model *is* the beginning point of constructing social change. As we plan for this new model, we must reconsider the space in which we are operating; the resources and information that are available to us (and that can be created); and the attachment points and relationships that bond the process in its entirety. Ultimately, the change processes we will engage in will be sustained through the creation of dynamic, flexible, context-based platforms that are able to adapt and respond to new challenges and environmental shifts.

- How can we build hubs and platforms that better connect faculty and students across different humanities disciplines?

- How can we devise effective data collection and analysis frameworks that can be synthesized into measures that not only quantify but qualify the outcomes of our model?
- In what ways can we tailor assessment methodologies and instruments at all levels to inform and create productive feedback that is then utilized to revise and adapt - and improve the platforms we create?
- What roles and responsibilities should we ask our humanities PhD students to assume as curators of the model?

FUNDRAISING

As stated in the commitment letter from Eva Badowska, Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Fordham GSAS is willing and able to commit up to \$25,000 to this project between September 2016 and April 2017, since it will directly benefit its faculty, programs, and students. The funds will be derived from two sources: 1/ monies to support a half-time Graduate Assistant (stipend and health subsidy) will be drawn from FY 2017 operational budgets in GSAS; 2/ remaining needs for stipends, books and supplies, refreshments and the like will be drawn from the GSAS Annual Fund, which is the Dean's discretionary resource to support new programmatic and student initiatives. The GSAS Annual Fund relies on support from GSAS alumni and brings in, on average, \$100,000 annually.

TIMELINE

For each meeting below the co-directors will:

- collaboratively set agendas, using feedback from both planning groups,
- share the actionable items with all stakeholders in a timely fashion,
- be jointly responsible for organizing all activities,
- oversee the successful completion of the final draft of the white paper,
- distribute agenda, meeting goals, discussion questions and materials in advance,
- post all these materials to the web portal.

Month (persons responsible)	Planning Theme/Tasks
SEPTEMBER Badowska & McGowan	Initial meeting of full Core Planning and Constituent Advisory <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • introduce groups, project, and rationale • discuss the six Planning Themes • organize work flow and identify presenters • set up a web portal/twitter account in advance of this meeting • conduct individual outreach to begin forming group for October focus • distribute primary reading materials (AHA, MLA, and CGS reports; books by L. Cassuto and S. Smith, etc.)
OCTOBER Badowska & McGowan	Planning Theme 1: Revitalize Learning Outcomes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • consult an assessment specialist (Dr. Jeannine Pinto) • collect existing learning outcomes from programs/create charts prior • conduct individual outreach to begin forming group for November focus
NOVEMBER Badowska & McGowan	Planning Theme 2: Inhabit the New Learning Ecosystem <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • consult a digital pedagogy specialist (Dr. Steven D'Augustino) • prep materials on the new learning ecosystem as background • distribute questions and background materials prior to meeting • conduct individual outreach to begin forming group for December

<p>DECEMBER Badowska & McGowan</p>	<p>Planning Theme 3: Mentor the Whole Person</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • consult career services and community and employer partners • gather and distribute data on placements and career paths • plan interim site visits to prepare for January focus
<p>JANUARY Badowska & McGowan</p>	<p>Planning Theme 4: Incorporate Service and Community Engagement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • consult community partners and employer prospects as possible • develop models for experiential learning and community engagement • prepare for consults on admission and access/inclusion
<p>FEBRUARY Badowska & McGowan</p>	<p>Planning Theme 5: Ensure Access and Inclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • consult recruitment and diversity specialist • gather literature on diversity and inclusion in graduate education
<p>MARCH Badowska & McGowan</p>	<p>Planning Theme 6: Cultivate and Curate a Living Humanities PhD Model</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collect information on data analysis and data types available, to create a data dashboard • conduct individual outreach to begin forming group for April meeting on the basis of what we aim to accomplish from the final session involving both Core Planning and Constituent Advisory Groups - focus on cross-cutting themes and reaching consensus on core elements of the new Humanities PhD model
<p>APRIL Badowska & McGowan</p>	<p>Final meeting of full Core Planning and Constituent Advisory Groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • revisit key questions and explore cross-cutting themes, present final reports of any working sub-committees • present and arrive at consensus on final recommendations • write up results (results would form outline/scaffolding for final report), incorporate revisions/changes resulting from discussion, distribute to planning group members, and post to web portal
<p>MAY-JULY Badowska & McGowan</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • consolidate and review all documents and reports • solicit feedback from all Core Planning and Constituent Advisory Group members, as well as any other appropriate constituents • draft and revise White Paper with final project outcomes and recommendations • finalize and submit all financial reporting