

# **New Faculty Institute 2015**

## **Introduction: Judith D. Singer, Provost Alan Garber**

JUDITH D. SINGER: Thank you all for coming out to today's new Faculty Institute. I'm just going to make a few opening remarks and then introduce provost Alan Garber, who will also make some opening remarks. And then I'll come back on.

One request I have is don't sit next to somebody you know. The whole purpose of this is to meet people you don't know. And we are trying to encourage those kinds of opportunities. And there will be a break, and there will also be a reception afterwards where there will be more opportunity for that.

Just want to say a few words of introduction about why we do this new Faculty Institute. I am the Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity. I started in this role in 2008.

And one of the commitments that I had when I started was to try to make faculty at Harvard feel not just part of their department or their school, but part of Harvard University. Harvard is a fabulous place with lots of interesting people and lots of rich opportunities. But historically, the university had too few opportunities to do these kinds of things.

In fact, I was just talking with one of our panelists about this. And when I was hired in 1984-- so it's 30 years ago-- I was given keys to an office and I was told to go to an HR orientation to learn about my health benefits, and then I started teaching.

So Harvard in those days did nothing. Harvard in those days did not have a tenure track. It did not have a commitment to its assistant and associate professors. The Harvard of today is really quite different in terms of what we are trying to accomplish as a university, and why you were all selected by your colleagues who put in an enormous amount of work to identify you as people to come into our vibrant community.

What you'll learn, if you haven't already, is that Harvard's a great place to be a faculty member for a variety of reasons, some obvious, some not so obvious. The obvious ones are fabulous colleagues.

I mean, when you came and interviewed, when you had conversations, you really got a sense, hopefully, of the excitement. There is a little bit of Harvard exceptionalism that we sometimes take too much advantage of and sometimes can make light of. But one of the things today is to meet colleagues who are not in your immediate sphere.

So either people from other parts of the university who do work similar to you or people in your part of the university who do work dissimilar from you. And I hope you take the chance to do that.

How many of you are teaching right now? Yeah. So once you start teaching, you just get a sense of how vibrant the students are, how exciting they are, how challenging they are, how they make you think.

They make you think you don't know things you thought you know. They make you go home and work on things that you didn't know you were going to work on because they asked you a question you actually don't know the answer to and you're terrified.

You'll also have fabulous opportunities. This is part of the Harvard exceptionalism. Being here opens doors. Being at Harvard, people like to have people on panels. People like to solicit people.

And it's also just a great place to do research and scholarship and engage, whether it's with our library collections, with our art collections, with our scientific facilities. Whatever it is that you're interested in, Harvard has a wealth of resources in this.

So I'm going to stop right now because Alan's time is rather tight, and introduce Alan Garber who is our provost. He is now no longer a newbie. He has been here-- this is your--

ALAN M. GARBER: Fifth year.

JUDITH D. SINGER: --fifth year, wow. OK. It's Alan's fifth year. Alan bleeds crimson. He went here as an undergraduate, did some training here. He is an MD/PhD, PhD in economics, and brings his skills both as an MD and able to work with people and as a PhD in economics in terms of analyzing higher education and the finances of higher education and how things run.

And we've invited Alan here to just make a few welcoming remarks, and also if we have some time to take some questions from folks in the audience. So let me introduce Alan Garber.

[APPLAUSE]

ALAN M. GARBER: Thank you, Judy. First of all, I just want to add my welcome. We're delighted that you're all here. I'm not talking about for this afternoon's event, although we are happy about that, but that you're here at Harvard.

And for us, success means that your career grows beyond your wildest dreams as a result of your coming to Harvard to be faculty. Whether you are a junior faculty member or a newly recruited tenured professor, Harvard is a place where we want you to achieve your professional aspirations.

I don't have a lot of advice for you. Sometimes I'm asked for advice. And I have four children, I should add, and I know how rare it is to be able to give somebody advice where they ask for it and they'll actually listen to you.

As provost, people will always at least go through the motions of sounding grateful. But I have some advice that I think is really worth following, and this is the advice I want to give you.

When you think about what Harvard offers, Judy touched on a lot of what makes Harvard great. We have the largest university endowment. Although if you look at a per student or per faculty basis, we do not.

We have the most distinguished faculty in the world, arguably, although we do have plenty of competition. Tomorrow's New York Times is going to have a story that rankles a little bit having to do with economics. But we certainly do have a distinguished faculty.

We have the world's largest library. Largest research library, I should say. And it's the fourth largest library in the world by many measures. We have our art museum. We have many museums on campus.

Our art museum is by some measures the sixth largest art museum in the country. Not among academic institutions, among all art museums. And the list goes on and on. We have many treasures that we own. We have many things that make Harvard look like a spectacular place.

But what I think is the genuine distinction of Harvard and why it is so terrific to be a faculty member here or a student here is that our excellence extends across so many different areas. So many areas of academic, of intellectual pursuit. Very few universities are even competitive with us in this regard.

So many of you have come here to be in the top ranked department in your field, or at least one of the top ranked departments. And you undoubtedly will feel that it's a great environment for you to advance your career, to conduct your research, to teach with tremendous students, and so on.

What I want to urge you to do is to look beyond your department, even to look beyond your school. And now I'm going to be shameless about this for a moment. But one of the things that's challenging about Harvard is it's difficult to get to know people who are not in your immediate environment. And we try to create opportunities for you to meet other people.

This afternoon is one of them, but we need to have many more and we do have many more. And I want to urge you to take advantage of them, of those opportunities. If it's 4:30 in the afternoon on a Wednesday, you may have a stack of student papers to grade, referee reports to write, recommendation letters to write, a whole series of things that you have to do every day.

And I know all of you are very busy already. And you have many, many things weighing on you. The easiest thing to do is to always plow through the work that you have ahead of you and ignore some of the invitations, some of the seminars, some of the performances that you get invited to in the normal course of a week at Harvard.

I want to urge you to think about sometimes dropping that work that you need to do for a while to take advantage of an event. Judy's office sponsors many events to get faculty together. Sometimes these are special performances at the ART, the American Repertory Theater, arguably the greatest regional theater in America, which we also own.

But there are many, many activities that she sponsors and you will have other activities of that kind. And what I want to urge you to do is get to know people in other areas. Go to a seminar occasionally that's outside your immediate department or area, but maybe that has some loose relation to something you're interested in. Get out there. Get to know people who aren't in your field.

Sometimes the way to get to know other people is through students that you may share in common, particularly at the graduate level. But also undergraduates can be a bridge. Sometimes you will be invited by your students to attend events at the houses or in Annenberg. If they're freshmen, they have faculty nights.

Accept those invitations. Not only get to know students, get to know other faculty. There are many, many opportunities, and the biggest barrier is the demands on your time. And those demands, as you know, are to a great extent internally imposed.

You'd certainly have obligations to others who make demands on your time, but you will have to make a decision about what the priorities are. It's not sacrificing your career to take advantage of some of these riches and people that Harvard has to offer. You will not have a fully successful Harvard experience if your entire academic life is lived within your department.

So please, please take advantage of the breadth of what Harvard has to offer. You will sometimes even find very direct payoffs in terms of your work from having interacted with people outside your immediate area. The unexpected collaboration or sometimes you may read something you wouldn't otherwise read when you get to know other people in the Harvard environment outside your area.

So make the most of this experience. I wish you every success. And Judy's office and the provost's office stand ready to help you in every way we can. Have a great experience.

Let me just ask if people have questions or want to make any comments. And let me add one other thing. Don't let the river be a barrier. Many of you are here from the School of Public Health, the med school, the business school.

The river, it's a very narrow river, and the traffic can be bad at rush hour but it's pretty quick to get in between during other times of day. And I would hate to think of Longwood as a different universe or that Allston is a different universe. A lot of what we're going to be doing in the next several years is helping people understand that Allston and Cambridge are all one campus.

OK, thank you very much. Good luck.

[APPLAUSE]

JUDITH D. SINGER: Thank you, Alan. I'm going to make a few remarks about the university before we go around the room and say who we are and what department we're in so that people can get a chance to know each other. The first thing I'm going to talk about is-- I'm a statistician, so I'll give some statistics.

As Alan was implying, Harvard is a huge place. And not counting the hospitals, which have about 10,000 faculty, we have 1,500 ladder faculty who are spread across our campuses. They are increasingly diverse, which is something we are very much committed to.

About 70% of the faculty are tenured. About 30% are tenure track. 29% are women. That's an all time high for Harvard. It's really remarkable, the progress that we've been making.

And in the earlier ranks, the fraction of women is up to 38% which is also an all time high. So we're really making progress in diversifying our faculty. This year, 22% of our faculty are members of minority groups. That's an all time high.

And once again, in the assistant and associate professor ranks, we're at about 30% minority. Your entering class is also diverse. 39% female, 30% minority. There are some places at the Harvard faculty club where all you see are pictures of dead white men. That's what Harvard was.

So when you look around the room and you see very different faces, it's a sense that this is a new Harvard. And that's an institution that very much I want to be a part of and I hope you want to be a part of.

The other part of Harvard that's changing is to some extent it's the way we're organized and structured, but it's also about the opportunities that Alan was talking about. You may hear people talk about every tub on its own bottom, or the tub system. This is a system where the budgets are decentralized. Each dean controls his or her budget.

And part of that tub system contributed to a lot of city-states that were somewhat balkanized. And part of the mission of the provost's office in general, but also President Faust since she took office in 2007, is the phrase we use is "One Harvard." We actually want this to be a university where people feel part of the university. They can move across the university.

And that's what Alan was trying to get at when he was urging you to meet people. The other thing we've discovered is that newer people are much more interested in meeting people than people who've been here for 30 or 40 years. So part of today is focused on people who are new to the university and giving them an opportunity to get to know each other.

If you haven't signed up for our geomap, you should have gotten something in your packet. I just met somebody who's living down the street from me. So it's a good opportunity to get to know faculty who live in your community. Find people you might carpool with or have a barbecue with, who might live near you or have kids the same age as your kids, and to feel part of Harvard.

Let me say a word about today's program, and then I'm going to have us go around the room. The idea here is we're going to have two faculty panels, and I'm pleased to see the first panel actually has arrived. I was beginning to have that fear you have, where are my speakers? Thank you for coming.

And the first panel is going to be from people who were relatively recently promoted from assistant to associate professors to tell those of you who are assistant professors that it actually can happen and does happen at Harvard. And then our second panel is going to be of some

tenured faculty who have been here for varying numbers of years who will give you a perspective on the university that they have from their perch.

Some of the questions we've asked people to talk about are what are the critical factors essential to your development and feeling part of the university. What kinds of resources have you found particularly effective? Where do you go when you have a question? How do you find out how to maneuver around this very large and vast campus?

And how do you develop relationships and collaborations with faculty? And how do you balance those demands of hunkering down and you've got a paper you need to get out and taking advantage of those opportunities. And so different people have different perspectives on this.

And so what we're hoping is by hearing these six different voices who come from different schools, different disciplines, and are at different career stages, you'll get some food for thought that hopefully will stimulate your own thinking and also conversations that can take place at the breaks and at receptions.

Both of the panels are going to be introduced by my colleague. Elizabeth Ancarana, who's the Assistant Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity. And I would say that if you don't have a place to go to ask a question, Elizabeth, me, we are open to all kinds of questions. And we can direct you to the right place if we're not the right place.

So to start breaking down some barriers, let's go around the room and have everybody introduce themselves. For time reasons, let's keep it short. So basically your name, your school, and your department or field. And one sentence about your research. Hit it.

[Introductions of Attendees]

NATASHA SUMNER: I'm Natasha Sumner. I'm in Celtic Languages and Literatures. And I work on a heroic corpus in Irish and Scottish Gaelic.

JUDITH D. SINGER: Perfect.



SCOTT CARTER: Scott Carter. I'm a computational biologist at the Harvard School for Public Health in the Dana-Farber. I'm working on human cancer, genetics, and evolution.

MATTHEW HERSCH: Matthew Hersch, faculty of Arts and Sciences, History of Science. I work on the history of aerospace technology.

ISAAC CHIU: Hi. My name's Isaac Chiu. I'm in the Department of Microbiology and Amino Biology at Harvard Medical School. And I work on the interaction between the nervous system and immune system and inflammation and pain.

MAOFA LIAO: Hi. My name is Maofa Liao. I'm in Cell Biology Department at Harvard Medical School. We mainly use electromicroscopy to study protein structure and function.

GARETH DOHERTY: My name's Gareth Doherty. I'm in the Department of Landscape Architecture at the Graduate School of Design. And I work on the intersections between design and anthropology.

CHRISTOPHER STANTON: I'm Christopher Stanton at the Business School, and I'm an applied microeconomerician.

STEPHANE VERGUET: Hi, Stephane Verguet, Harvard Chan School of Public Health and Global Health Population. And I work in priority setting in global health, and particularly equity and poverty issues.

NIR EYAL: I'm Nir Eyal. I know this guy, sorry, because we're in the same department. Global Health and Population in the Public Health School. And I'm an ethicist. I do ethics at the level of populations.

TAMARRA JAMES-TODD: Hello. I'm Tamarra James-Todd. I'm also at Harvard Chan School of Public Health, but I do not know the two gentlemen that I'm sitting next to. I'm in the Department of Environmental Health and Epidemiology, and I look at environmental and reproductive predictors of women's health outcomes.

TIM REBBECK: Hi, I'm Tim Rebeck. At the Chan School of Public Health and the Dana-Farber, and I'm a cancer molecular epidemiologist.

BETHANY HEDT-GAUTHIER: My name is Bethany Hedt-Gauthier. I'm a bio-statistician at Harvard Medical School, and I do research on health system strengthening and research capacity building, primarily in Rwanda.

DAVID STERN: My name is David Stern I'm in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences in the departments of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations and Comparative Literature. And I work in classical medieval Jewish literature and culture, and the history of the book.

BRANDON TERRY: Hi. My name is Brandon Terry. I'm also in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. I'm in the Department of African and African-American Studies and Social Studies. I'm a political theorist working on African-American politics and political thought.

JOE ALLEN: Hello. Joe Allen, Harvard Chan School of Public Health, Department of Environmental Health. I study buildings and their impact on health, trying to figure out how to optimize indoor environments for improved health.

MELANI CAMMETT: Hi. I'm Melani Cammett. I'm in Arts and Sciences in the Department of Government, and I work on the politics of economic development in the Middle East and have a lot of projects actually on the politics of access to health care, so sort of wannabe public health person as well.

YUHUA WANG: I'm Yuhua Wang, also in the Arts and Sciences in the department of Government. I'm a political scientist doing work on Chinese politics.

STEPHEN GRAY: Hi, I'm Stephen Gray. Graduate School of Design. I'm an urban designer in the Department of Urban Planning and Design, and I focus on the intersection among design democracy and development in the city.

DANIELLE LEE: Hi, I'm Danielle Lee. I'm an economist at the Business School, and I study the economics of science.

CHARLIE CONROY: I'm Charlie Conroy. I'm in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences in the Astronomy department, and I study the formation and evolution of galaxies.

SOROUGH SAGHAFIAN: Soroush Saghafian from Harvard Kennedy School, and my area is in operations research and operations management. I use them for studying basically health care systems.

LUKE MIRATRIX: Hello. I'm Luke Miratrix. I'm in the School of Education. And I work on statistical methodology for determining causality and observational data, and also do data mining for text analysis.

STRATOS IDREOS: Hi, I'm Stratos Idreos. I'm a computer scientist in the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences. And I work on data systems. That's how you store, access, and analyze large amounts of data.

MADHU SUDAN: Hi. I'm Madhu Sudan. Sorry, I'm also a computer scientist from the School of Engineering, so I'm sitting next to Stratos, but I didn't really know him till today. I work in the mathematical theories of computers and communicating devices.

JEREMY FRIEDMAN: Hi. I'm Jeremy Friedman. I'm at the Business School too, and I'm a historian of communism and revolution.

GARY ADAMKIEWICZ: Hi, I'm Gary Adamkiewicz. I'm in the Department of Environmental Health at the TH Chan School of Public Health. And I mostly work on issues that connect housing to health with a focus on low income communities and environmental health disparities.

ANDREW HOLDER: I'm Andrew Holder. I'm in the Department of Architecture at the Graduate School of Design. And I'm working on the resuscitation of the Rococo and contemporary building practice.

NICK MENZIES: Hi, my name's Nick Menzies. I'm one of many people, it seems, from the Chan School of Public Health. I'm in the Department of Global Health and Population. And in my work, I look at, I guess, predicting the long term outcomes of infectious disease control policies.

ANKUR PANDYA: I'm Ankur Pandya. I'm also from the Chan School in the Department of Health Policy and Management. When not introducing myself to economists, I call myself a health economist.

[LAUGHTER]

SHEILA ISANAKA: I'm Sheila Isanaka. I am at the School of Public Health in the departments of Nutrition and Global Health and Population. I do clinical and community-based research looking at methods to treat and prevent child malnutrition and infectious disease.

JUSTINE LANDAU: Hello. I'm Justine Landau. I'm at the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and the Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations. I teach classical Persian literature, and I study mostly theories, classical theories of literature, and poetics.

SEAN EDDY: I'm Sean Eddy. I'm in the Department of Molecular and Cellular Biology and also in Applied Mathematics. I'm a computational biologist, and I develop computational tools for analyzing the evolution of biological sequences over very long time scales.

SI NAE PARK: My name is Si Nae Park. I'm in the department of East Asian Languages and Civilizations. I look at pre-modern Korean literature through the scope of cosmopolitan and vernacular. I'm interested in history of reading and oral storytelling and written texts.

DEMBA BA: Hello. My name is Demba Ba. I'm in the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences. And I use mathematics, statistical modeling, and computing to understand how large scale systems operate when they work the way they're supposed to and when they don't work the way they're supposed to. So more recently, I've been interested in applications of math, statistical modeling, and computing to neuroscience and understanding how the brain works.

ELIZABETH KNOLL: I'm Elizabeth Knoll. I'm the Assistant Provost for Faculty Appointments working with Judy, and I'm delighted to see that you're all really here.

MINA CIKARA: Hello. My name is Mina Cikara. I'm in the Department of Psychology, and I study the cognitive affective and neural bases of inter-group conflict and violence.

SCOTT KUINDERSMA: Hi, I'm Scott Kuindersma. I'm in the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences. I work in robotics at the intersection between control, optimization, and machine learning.

ELIZABETH ANCARANA: And as Judy mentioned, I'm Elizabeth Ancarana, the Assistant Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity in the office of the President and the Provost. And I join Judy and Alan and my other colleagues here in welcoming you all to Harvard.

We're just so delighted to see you here. I have the pleasure of introducing our panelists. But before I do, I just wanted to echo Judy's comments about how we really are here for you as a resource.

In addition to our colleagues in the dean's offices, in your departments, your department chairs, et cetera, over the years Judy and I and our colleagues have amassed a vast network of people that we can help to introduce and connect you to as you navigate your experience right now in the beginning during your transition to Harvard and the Cambridge-Boston area, but as you develop and progress through your career at Harvard.

I was in the FAS doing faculty recruitment for a decade before moving into the provost's office almost three years ago. And a lot of faculty come our way, and it's just such a pleasure to work with all of you. So any time you have a question, you don't know where to go, you don't know who to ask, give us a ring and we'll make sure you're doing just fine.

## Tenure-Track Faculty Panel:

**Katia Bertoldi, James Mitchell, Laurence Ralph**

ELIZABETH ANCARANA: So now, I turn to our panelists. And thanks again for coming and talking to our new faculty here today. It's just a delight that you're here. We have Katia Bertoldi who's the John L. Loeb Associate Professor of the Natural Sciences at the Johnny Paulson School of Engineering and Applied Sciences. After earning her Ph.D. in Mechanics of Materials and Structures from Trento University in 2006, Katia did a post-doctoral fellowship at MIT and

then served as an Assistant Professor of Engineering Technology at the University of Twente in the Netherlands. She joined the Harvard faculty in 2010. Katia's work focuses on the relationships between the internal structure of a material and its mechanical properties. Her research on materials, especially those with tunable properties, has direct use in many critical fields, including acoustics, optics, and electronics.

Next to Katia is James, or Jay Mitchell who's is an Associate Professor of Genetics and Complex Diseases at the Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health. After completing his doctoral training at the University of California at Berkeley on Human Telomerase Biochemistry, he did his post-doctoral studies also in the Netherlands at Erasmus University in Rotterdam where he focused on the genetics of DNA repair and aging. Jay came to Harvard in 2008, where since, he's been focusing on the restriction of calorie or nutrient intake to increase stressed resistance, particularly during major surgery, and the improvement of metabolic fitness and the extension of longevity.

We also have Lawrence Ralph, who's the John L. Loeb Associate Professor of the Social Sciences in the Departments of Anthropology and African and African-American studies in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. After earning his Ph.D. In Anthropology from the University of Chicago in 2010, Lawrence served as a Mandela Rodney Dubois a post-doctoral fellow at the Center for African and Afro-American studies at the University of Michigan. He then joined the Harvard faculty in 2011. His scholarly work explores how the historical circumstances of police abuse, mass incarceration, and the drug trade [? naturalized ?] disease, disability, and premature death for urban residents, showing how violence and injury play a central role in the daily lives of black urbanites.

So we have a nice array, a very interesting array of work and backgrounds. Each panelist will speak for about 10 minutes, and then we'll open it up to questions from the audience. So would you want to maybe start with Katia?

KATIA BERTOLDI: Yes. OK. So first of all, welcome to everybody to Harvard. So I was here in 2010, so a long time ago. So as Elizabeth told you, I started in January 2010-- no, sorry, it was

in 2009 because I started in 2010. So now you might think it's a long time ago. But you'll see, time will fly. And soon you will be on this side of the table speaking to a new faculty.

So what do I remember of the first days? The first days are kind of mixed feeling, right? At least for me was. On one hand, you feel the pressure. On the other hand, you would like to do things, but you don't know what to do and you don't know how to move. And then, you need to adjust. Adjust to the new place. In my case, I was moving back from Europe, so you need to fix your family life. My husband needed to find a job. So all these sort of different pressure coming to you.

So what can you do to deal with that? So I think the best suggestion I got was, before coming here, I was deciding whether to leave Europe and come here and to accept this offer or not. And my mentor in the Netherlands just told me, look, Katia. This is a unique opportunity. We know that there's going to be-- probably you're going to have some pressure. It's going to be tough. But it's really unique. And there, you have the opportunity really to do great things because mostly the environment. The people around you, the resources.

It's a seven year period that is tenure, yes. It's not so easy to get tenure. But forget about it, and try to enjoy every day, and really to make sure that at the end of the seven years, you can say it was worth doing it. And just make sure that you take advantage of the resources. And this, I think, was the best advice I really got. So try it try to forget about the fact that there's going to be a promotion. There's going to be several promotions. One in between, and then the final one. And just really take advantage of the resources.

Now how of take advantage of resources. So in my case, I was lucky because people in my area-- so I'm in the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences. So people working in an area related to my area of expertise go for lunch together every day. I was the only junior faculty. Now there are a couple more. But this has been very, very helpful. It's true that maybe you waste one hour of your day every day, noon to 1:00. And maybe you could write a paper or do something. But now I realize how important it has been because in this informal discussion, you get to learn how people move around.

And I was assigned, as probably most of you, to a mentoring committee at the very beginning. Honestly, because of these informal lunches, daily informal lunches and discussion, I never used the committee just because I have this informal committee every day. And I find it much more useful, because after a while, after you go for lunch every day, you can also ask these sort of questions that maybe are intimidating. You don't want to ask to somebody that you just meet once a year. So this has been quite helpful for me.

And what else can I tell you? Clearly, at the beginning for me was also difficult to suddenly manage so many tasks. Before, I was a post-doc. I was a faculty for a while in the Netherlands. But there, the environment was very different. I was sort of a senior post-doc because the structure of the academic system is very different. So suddenly, I was pretty much spending all my time doing research. And then when I started here, suddenly I had to manage a group. I have currently 20 people in my group. So it's a medium-sized group, I would say. You need to write grant to make sure that you get money to support the group. You need to teach, mentoring these people, and write papers.

So it took me a couple of months to adjust. But then what I figured out was in my case very useful. Every morning when I wake up, I just try to make a list of things on a piece of paper and just cross lines during the day as things move. And make sure that I try to balance all the different things, because sometimes, I have the tendency only to focus on one. And then it's 5:00 PM, and suddenly you realize you have to do other three things. So trying to find a balance is always useful.

Beginning, I found it particularly difficult to manage students and manage post-docs. So maybe I was a bit unlucky. At the beginning, I had some cases that were not so easy. Also, this was also because of me, because probably at the beginning, I was not so sure about the quality [INAUDIBLE] into the people I was hiring. So I can see that now, over time, I improve a lot. Now I can select people in a much better way, and I'm much more sure that the people I'm hiring are exactly what I expect. But you learn by mistakes. So I spend quite a bit of time also dealing with managing people.



I didn't take much advantage of the resources around campus that I-- I just mostly talk with senior colleagues around me. And this was after I solved the cases, and to try to basically smooth out all the issues, I figured it out. Something I found particularly useful was to try to put a limit on travel. So at the beginning, I look at this as a compromise with my husband. Clearly you can travel, and you can spend almost all your time on planes and visiting beautiful places. And not only visiting, but also giving talks at conferences.

But you also need-- life is a compromise. So clearly, my husband was not at all up for that. And so we realized, OK, why don't we try to limit. We came up with sort of agreement, let's try to limit the travel to once a month. It's not a strict rule. But let's try [INAUDIBLE]. Sometimes it's two. Sometime it's zero. Sometimes maybe three, but try to put some limit. A cap, at least. At the beginning, I look at that, I thought a fine compromise, but a limitation. Now what I realize is that helped me a lot. The fact that I need to think where I want to go and I need to think why I want to go, and I need to be selective, because traveling is tiring and takes out time that you need to spend doing other things.

So I find it really-- now that when I look back, I'm thinking that this is helping me a lot. So basically compromising between all the different tasks. So still keep visibility, but also being very selective and making sure that you choose where to go in such a way that you maximize some of the visibility. And make sure that you meet the people that you need to meet and you want to meet. And yeah, I don't know. What else do you want me to tell you?

ELIZABETH ANCARANA: Well, that's a good start. Maybe we'll have each panelist talk, and then we'll open it up to questions.

JAMES MITCHELL: Yeah, OK. I'll take over then. Jay Mitchell from the School of Public Health. I was going to apologize at the outset because I'm a research scientist. I run a lab. And I thought that might be not so common with what people in the Engineering School do, but perhaps not so different. So I'm going to take you through some of the things that I've done over the last eight years that have gotten me to this point, and some of the lessons I've learned.

So what Elizabeth told you, just to refresh on what I do specifically, basic research lab. I'm trained in genetics and biochemistry. And my lab focuses on aging and nutrition, and the

mechanism by which, when you eat less, you live longer. That is you if you were a rodent. And we work on mice primarily. Or if you were a fly or a yeast, the same thing holds true. But what I actually do is study how the mechanisms that allow you to live longer actually increase your stress resistance. And that turns out to be very handy when you have a planned stress in your life. And so what we actually work on is surgery. And we're trying to figure out what you should-- or in this case, shouldn't eat-- before you go into a major surgery to increase your body's resistance to stress.

So that's what I do. And the reason I tell you that is because the first key lesson I learned at Harvard is to be able to define what you do in two sentences. And it has to be hopefully exciting, and it has to sound really important. And most importantly, you have to be the best person in the world at that. So you really have to define your niche carefully. And I still struggle with that, because my lab actually does a lot more than just that. We work on different organisms, different pathways. And I continually struggle with how exactly to define my niche, my role. To make myself that most important person doing that most important thing. But I think it's a good lesson.

And for me, learning that lesson has helped with a lot of other aspects of the business that are very important. Publishing, for example. Getting grants. It's easier to publish and get grants based on things that people know that you're the best at. Things that they trust that you know how to do. When you get outside of your core business, you're area of focus, people don't have that trust. They don't know you. And unfortunately, a lot of this business is based on personal interactions. Who you know, their judgment of you personally. So it's enormously helpful just to keep that focus. What is your core business? What do you work on? What are you the best at? And build out from there. Not easy, but very important.

So a corollary to that is writing. And I wasn't a particularly good writer coming in, and I've really had to sharpen my skills. Communication in general. I wasn't a very good speaker. And I've tried to sharpen my skills. These days, it's not good enough just to write well and speak well, but I think you have to be even more clever with social media and other ways of getting your message out. So the more often you can get your message out, I think it does have benefits. And this can be at meetings, traveling, perhaps in the public realm.

The media itself, sometimes they find something you do interesting. And you can try to use them as a route to convey your message and how interesting it is, and how it should be funded, for example, by the NIH. That's a bit of a double-edged sword, too, because the media can take what you do and twist it into something else. But it's by and large probably worth it to try to get that attention on what you do. So that's the key lesson, the two sentence, the elevator pitch.

Setting up a lab. An assistant professor is like a small business entrepreneur. You have to run a group. You have to obtain funding. You get your investor. The university gives you, in our case, about two and a half, three years. At least that's how it was eight years ago. But you probably have no training-- at least if you're a geneticist like me, you're not trained in organizational skills. You're not trained in finance. And you're certainly not trained in choosing people or managing them. And for me, that's been the biggest struggle is to choose good people.

Of course, Harvard's wonderful. The students, the post-docs, even the technicians that we have access to is tremendous. But I really wish I had a sixth sense to know, that's the one that's a good fit for my lab. A mutual good fit. And I don't. And talking to my colleagues, even the senior ones, they get better. But I don't think anybody really has the secret to choosing people that are a good match. But we keep trying.

Grants after the three year start-up package runs out fund everything, including, in my case, 70% of my salary is through my grant. So that's primarily what I do these days is write for grants. But of course, to get grants, you need to have the papers. And for the papers, you need to choose the good people, the students, the postdocs who then deliver the data. And it's that preliminary data, then, that allows you to get the grant. So it's just a revolving circle. And where do you start? You come in here. It's your first year. I've seen two different patterns that people follow to break into the business. One is to hire senior people, a senior lab manager or technician, senior postdocs, and to have a very high burn rate. Just churn out mature data rapidly, and then enter the publications and the grants.

I chose a fundamentally different route-- to do everything myself very slowly, and to learn and make all the mistakes along the way. I think both paths can be successful. It probably just depends on your personality. So there are unfortunately no generalizations that I can make. I've

seen both succeed, I've seen both fail. The one thing that I can say is choosing my path, at least I do know how to do everything. And also coming from Europe, there was some necessity to that because I didn't have any idea how things here worked. So that's maybe situational. But I think those two paths can work.

Taking advantage of resources. Of course, as we've heard, they're tremendous. And I already mentioned the students, and we heard from Alan Garber, the faculty are also wonderful resources not just for what you do, but for things that are tangentially related, which might have some influence at some point. Collaboration is a wonderful thing, but I'll give one example for me that it was enormously enriching. But I entered it with a false pretenses of what I thought I might get out of it.

So being in the School of Public Health-- and we have a Department of Immunology and Infectious Diseases-- I struck up a collaboration with a biologist who works on malaria, which I know nothing about. We were interested in how what the host eats-- and the host being the mouse, in this case-- how what they eat affects the course of disease. And we found some really interesting stuff. Namely, that if you restrict food intake, you don't succumb to the illness. So very interesting. And I thought, this is wonderful. It's really enriched how I think about my core business.

But the mistake I made is to think that I could turn that into another core business. And that has been enormously difficult. To go, then, to different study sections, different journals who don't know me. I'm not a malaria guy. And to try to recapitulate the same thing that I'm doing in my core didn't work out, in my case. That was my expectation, to diversify my funding. And it was a false expectation. I keep trying, because it's really interesting. And so I would say the take home was that it was so interesting and so enriching for my core business that it was totally worth doing. But it's hard to predict ahead of time. So I just don't have false expectations of what you might get out of it.

Equipment is another thing maybe specific to the lab sciences. But it's all out there. You just have to figure out where, and who to ask, and how to ask. And I don't have any good advice except for perhaps things like this. So if there's anybody who has a GC that detects hydrogen

sulfide, I would love to talk to you. It's worth a try. Navigating the Harvard environment, there is very little here that is as it appears. And you get to learn that probably pretty quickly. You've probably already figured that out.

So for me, mentorship was really a key to surviving this opaque environment. And mentorship from the tenured faculty was enormously helpful in figuring out how the school, the School of Public Health and the university, how they interact. How that works. What's important, where I should spend my time. But wasn't really helpful for how to climb the tenure ladder because they had done it in a different era. So for that, getting to know your colleagues who are just one step above you is enormously helpful, because it's different, I think, now that it was even five or 10 years ago.

Lastly, the relationship with your department chair, who you can't, choose, by the way. It's like kids and parents. You're here already. You've got a department chair. But it really is of critical importance. Although I don't see my department chair except once a month at faculty meetings. He's also my formal adviser, so I see him annually to discuss mentorship-related items. But my relationship with him it's critical if I run into a gap in funding. It's going to be my department chair who's going to pull me through or not. He's the one who sets the pace of the tenure ladder. So again, it's not something you control, but it's certainly something you should be aware of, at least in my case. And I've heard this in other institutions in the lab sciences, too, of the critical importance of your relationship with your department chair.

Finally, a piece of advice. And I think we just heard it from Katia. Don't worry about the tenure too much. In our case, it's a 10 to 11 year process. So maybe it's easier for me to say. I have other colleagues who it's a five to six year process, and that seems far more stressful. But in any case, with the longer clocks, you can really say-- I can say in all honesty, possibly I'll get another job with a bigger salary running a department somewhere before I make tenure. That's something I see happens to my colleagues all the time. Another thing that might happen is you run out of funding and you don't have to worry about it anyway.

But hopefully you will enjoy, you'll find a good work-life balance. And that period of time, you won't just be focused on making tenure, but you'll actually learn and enrich yourself during that period.

LAURENCE RALPH: Hi. Again, I'm Laurence Ralph. I'm in the Department of Anthropology and African and African-American Studies. I guess I'll begin by just reaffirming some of the things that the panelists have said, and offering some concrete details. I think the first thing is use the people around you as a resource. I think not only professionally, but personally. One of the biggest things in my first year was that the people that I met in orientation in this Institute as well became people that I would hang out with for happy hours or what have you because we were all new to Cambridge. And we were all going through the same process at the same time. And we still have sustained relationships. So I think that's a critical thing. Or at least it has been for me.

The second thing I'll say is that my first year, I had a striking experience at this very faculty club. And it wasn't during this Institute, but shortly after, when my department had an event here. And we were upstairs in one of these rooms, and there were waiters with gloves on and silver trays passing out lobsters or something like that. And it was like a glee club in the background. And I was looking around, and I was like, where am I? And I had just come from the University of Michigan State, a state school. And just as I'm having this thought, like, what is this place? One of my colleagues said, man, before the recession, we got two lobsters.

And I couldn't believe it. I say that to say that there will be moments like that here at Harvard. And those moments can intimidate you, right? Because at the same time, you need to interact with people. And what's especially jarring is the juxtaposition between those moments and the conversations that you have with people who are actually down to earth and friendly and funny. But you might not think so in particular environments here. So I would say that that's an important thing to remember because again, the people in your department are resources that you can turn to for particular things, right?

I'm in two departments, so I've had different takes on how Harvard operates. And even how a department operates, relationship with the chair of the department and what have you. And what's interesting is that in terms of things like mentoring, there's no real one fixed way that you

can expect to be mentored, I think. In both of my departments, mentoring has been really active at particular moments. And you can tell that senior colleagues had a discussion about, this is what we're going to do about mentoring, and they've implemented something. But at other moments, it's not been on the radar in the same way. And it's oscillated between both departments.

So I would say that what's presented to you now might not be how it is in the long run. So it's important to take advantage of the opportunities that you have, particularly around mentorship, because they might not always be there. One faculty member might be really into mentorship, and that might be her thing or his thing. And they might be driving the other faculty members towards that direction. But they might be on leave the next year or something like that. So you don't know how it's going to pan out.

I think in light of that, one of the best ways to approach a mentorship, I think, is around your research, and around your area of expertise. And soliciting feedback on what you do. And I think this goes back to what Jay says about knowing your strengths and knowing who you are as a scholar, and branding yourself, for lack of a better word, as the type of scholar that you want to be. I think that particularly around if you're writing a paper, if you're writing a book chapter-- my field is a book field.

But also, when you're applying to grants or things like that, when you can have concrete things to share with people and solicit their feedback, it can be a way both to get help on what you're writing, but also a way for them to know what you do so when they see articles, they might send it to you. Or when something comes across in the news, you might have those happenstance conversations about that particular area or that particular research topic.

And I think that it's especially critical coming from another university, or if this is your first job coming from graduate school where you have a built in network of your cohort, or you have a built in network of your dissertation committee or something like that, this is like-- I would think of it as reconstituting another network of scholars that can help you in the next phase of your career.

And there's particular-- at least in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, there's particular centers that can help you with that. One is the FAS Research Administration Services. And I would assume that other schools have similar things, where if you have a grant, they can not only give you an idea of what kind of things that you can apply for based on your topic, but also what faculty members are doing similar research. So they'll put you in touch with different faculty members, even in different schools, actually. You can get a letter of collaboration that can help your grant and things like that.

Another thing is the various centers around Harvard could be a way to present your research and develop organic relationships in that way with faculty that are doing similar things. And I would say that developing this kind of network can be a way of thinking about Harvard as a home base for your research agenda, right? What I mean is that it can be quite daunting to think about yourself as a researcher that has to have a public presence, that has to have a website, that has to have Twitter, Facebook, and all of these things that-- not only are you doing research, but there's more and more obligation to present your research to the wider world. Make it accessible to the wider world in ways that we're often not trained to do. In ways in which we are not necessarily comfortable doing. But I think one way is to think about it as, what are the various ways that you can just promote your research around the university, right? And that's less daunting, right? Can you develop a relationship with the Harvard Magazine, or the Crimson or something like that that can also promote your research in a different way that's not at the same scale, in a way that allows students and colleagues around the university to know about your research, know about your research agenda, and have these organic conversations.

And just a quick story on that note is that the last research grant that I received, it was different in the sense that your department had to nominate you for the grant. Then it went up the ladder and the provost had to select different applications out of the nominations from each department. And then it went to the granting agency. But in my case, the reason why my department chair knew that this grant would be great for me, that was a great fit for my research was because I had just shared with him a NSF application, right? And so he had read the NSF application. He had wrote a letter of support for the NSF application.



And that application wasn't successful. But this other grant was that was particularly for my research topic, right? And he wouldn't have known that and had that on the forefront of his mind if I hadn't been active about sharing my research, and sharing my research interest with him at that particular moment in time. So I think that it's never a lost cause when you try to build a network. It might take time and it might take energy and things that are kind of difficult that you don't always have. But I think that in the end, it will pay off for your ultimate research goals.

[Q&A for Tenure-Track Panel]

ELIZABETH ANCARANA: Thank you. OK, lots of great, great advice. And just to follow up on what you were saying, Lawrence. There's also a resource available. It's open access. It was created in our office a few years ago. Faculty finder. So you could just even Google Harvard faculty finder and it'll come up. Or the office website is [faculty.Harvard.edu](http://faculty.Harvard.edu). And there are lots of resources available to you there as well. But Harvard faculty finder on faculty finder, you can find other faculty at Harvard that are working on similar research topics as yours. And that's a way to develop your network around your scholarship as well. Do we have questions for any one of our panelists? And we have a [INAUDIBLE] mic that's coming around.

SPEAKER 1: I have a question. This is for Jay or any of the other panelists if they want to give a stab at it. So I want to follow up on the comment you made about being an assistant professor or running a new lab essentially as being a small entrepreneur and running a startup, which is something that I've read about. And one thing I wanted to ask is, how does this analogy carry over to getting funding? So from the perspective of this analogy, what does it mean about how proactive one must be, or what kind of strategies, essentially, one could use to get your venture funded.

JAMES MITCHELL: Right, so the rules used to be that you can rely on the NIH for biomedical research. And now you have to diversify. So I think we try to train our post-docs, and even our students these days-- I wasn't trained in this way. But to always think about a strategy to take those data and turn them into more money. And that can be in the form of NIH grants, of course. It can be in the form of foundational support for some disease. It can even be from corporate sponsorship. And Harvard is fantastic at bringing in corporations who are interested in funding

research at Harvard. And I've recently been able to take advantage of one of those types of grants.

So the idea is about diversification of funding. And I made the comment about the department chair is the one who, if you can't make payroll, they're the one who'll bail you out, because that's how it is. You can see things-- NIH grants at least last typically around four years. So you can see it coming. But it's not something that you can turn around rapidly. So it could take you a year or two to get one renewed. But I think the people prepare a certain way these days. You just take this into account. You're going to have to diversify beyond the traditional sources, and be creative. I've heard on the radio about crowdsourcing of certain things. It hasn't come to that for us, but I think we all have open minds now.

And I have to say, I don't think it compromises our research at all. It's the same data, the same interest. A lot of what I do is obviously translational. If somebody wants to pay for that, that's great. And I don't see that as compromising our mission at all.

KATIA BERTOLDI: Can I add something? So on a very practical side, [INAUDIBLE] very different strategies. So I've seen young colleagues basically say, OK, I'm going to write one grant per month. Even two grants per month. And I've seen them sticking to this plan. And some of them have been very successful. Some of them, not so successful. I've seen colleagues instead be more strategic and say, let's first collect-- let's put together a very good idea. Let's refine this idea. Let's maybe have some preliminary contact also with managers, with NSF Manager, NIH manager, and make sure that what I'm going to write is likely to be funded. Again, also in this case, you're never sure, right?

But also in this case, I've seen 50% of this class of colleague being successful, and 50% not. So I believe there is not really a single path to go around it. And also, something I found very useful, anyway, in my case, is money from industry. So don't forget to talk to also people outside academia, outside funding agency, because if you are able to start the right relations and meet the right people, that might be very, very useful.

ELIZABETH ANCARANA: We had another question.

SPEAKER 2: Question for anyone. How close to the vest or not close to the vest do you keep your ideas, or intellectual property. I hate that term for what we do. But intellectual property-- I've seen senior faculty, and not even senior faculty be very secretive with things they're working on, and that makes me kind of sad as someone in academia. At the same time, I had lunch with a friend of mine. She's a post-doc and she applied for a faculty job at another institution. And a couple months later, the chair of that search committee didn't talk about the job but said, oh, can you look at this grant that I'm writing. It's basically an idea that came from her application.

And then I thought back a couple months ago, where Professor x from Institution y said, oh, what are you working on these days? And I kind of said, well, I'm thinking about this new space. And they're like, well send me what you have. I'd love to just look at it. And I didn't send anything, but I was like, oh no. What did-- that makes me kind of sad. So how did you think about that at all.

LAURENCE RALPH: Yeah, I can say a few words on that. I think the fields are a little bit different, but I think on things like this, it can be kind of counter-intuitive in the sense that if more people know about your work, I think it's less likely that somebody takes your idea. But if you keep it close to the vest, it could be more likely because the person that you shared it with could then take it. So I think that speaks towards getting your ideas out there, having them in circulation, presenting your ideas.

And I also think that you're here for a reason. You're here because they believed in what you do. And so I think that they ultimately want you to develop that core sense of your research agenda. So I think that you have to have conversations with your colleagues about these kind of things. And getting your ideas out there. I think can help.

JAMES MITCHELL: Just a quick note from my perspective. We've all heard these stories, and they're real. These things do happen. And I think it's a risk assessment. You have more to gain, or more to lose. And I like to say that, for the most part, I think I have more to gain by sharing. That being said, people are creatures of habit and do develop reputations for doing these things. So to some degree, that can be part of your risk assessment. You can find out-- if somebody's specifically asking about an idea of yours, that it's in an idea state, check it out.

SPEAKER 2: Thoughts, Katia?

KATIA BERTOLDI: No, I totally agree with what Laurence and Jay say. Typically I tend to be open. I know there is some risk associated with that, but I really think that the advantages in being open are much larger and much more than the disadvantages, because what you want to make sure is that people know about what you're doing. And if you are very secretive, and you keep everything as a secret, people don't get to know. And maybe then you really run the risk of somebody get the same idea without knowing what you're doing, and they get it.

JAMES MITCHELL: Last thought. People love collaborating with Harvard. So if they're from without, it can definitely be used to your advantage.

SPEAKER 3: I just had a question. I was reflecting on all the various things you said, and in some sense, it's, no offense, a bit of a downer. I was curious if you could speak to-- the point of this exercise is to have fun on some level, and to live an interesting life. And I was wondering what things you've done over the years to preserve the actual point of the exercise in the face of worrying about money, and worrying about promotion, and all of that. How do you keep the joy?

KATIA BERTOLDI: Well, I'm still proud when I meet people outside Harvard in the evening. And after a while, they ask me, what's your job. And I tell them what I'm doing. They're very surprised. And what I always tell my husband, the day they assume I'm a faculty, I'm going to quit. So I think it's possible to keep a level of joy inside, and to combine it with an academic career and with your job. And also, within the job, I think it's a lot of fun. I really enjoy interacting with the students.

And I'm probably more fun now than when I was a post-doc and I was doing the research. I was in the lab by myself. Now I'm in the lab only over summer a few times. Most of my time, I'm in my office writing or a meeting with people. But it's still a lot of-- it's even more fun because now I have the ability to work on multiple projects and develop more ideas, and to work with these extremely smart people, it's just amazing.

LAURENCE RALPH: Yeah, I would echo some of those comments. I think that the people in both of my departments are leading figures of the kind of research I do in different ways. And so

the ability to have just conversations with them, the ability to pick their brain, the ability to get concrete feedback from them is actually enjoyable, and it's actually helped me personally and professionally as well. And so I think that things loom large in the background. But I think that being here and having the platform that we have and having the kind of interactions that we have is a humbling experience. It's a fun experience.

And also, just the amount of people that circulate through Harvard at any given semester, let alone a year, is a really, really fun experience. And you really have the resources to just imagine what you want to happen. There's no person that I can think of that I couldn't imagine inviting to Harvard, period. That includes, I don't know, entertainers. It includes scholars. It includes athletes. It includes anybody who I would want to meet. And I think it's not out of the realm of possibility that they would accept an invitation. And so I think being able to have that kind of imagination is fun. It's part of the reason why I wanted to be a professor in the first place.

ELIZABETH ANCARANA: Jay, do you want to add anything?

JAMES MITCHELL: I'd just echo these sentiments. Doing research is what drives me, and this is the best place in the world to do it. And that makes me very happy. And I feel very lucky to be able to do that.

STEPHEN GRAY: I have a question. Stephen Gray. I have a question to sort of follow up on that one that relates to balance and time management and joy. Being someone-- I just recently came from private practice and I had a half time appointment at MIT. But primarily, my contribution was through my practice. So now I'm moving fully into the academic realm, which is a little bit different for me. But I also have a young child, and I have a partner. My wife, who would love to make sure that she sees me at the same hour all the time in some sort of predictable way. So what do people do for balance with their partners and their children, and carving out time strategically to do the things that we need to do in order to push thinking in our respective disciplines?

JAMES MITCHELL: I'll take a stab at that. I have three kids who are in the middle school to high school range. And I think one of the biggest advantages of being in academia is you can set your own schedule, largely. I don't travel that much by choice. So I can do all the little things

that many of my colleagues in other fields can't do. I can go to breakfast shares. I can go to plays in the middle of the day. I can do all those little things that cumulatively, I think, really enrich my life.

KATIA BERTOLDI: I think one of the big advantages of academia is flexibility. But then we need also to be very careful about that because my husband has an industrial job. So it's 7:00 to 5:00. At 5:00, they get out and it's over, right? And then you start the day after. When you have a flexible job, you have the tendency to run over, right? And there's so much to do. But I think at a certain point, it's important to recognize that even if you spend eight days a week and 48 hours a day, it's not enough to do what you should do. [INAUDIBLE].

There are limits. And you need to accept your limits. And apparently, it's not possible to do everything you would like to do. And just accept that, and try to find a good compromise. And it's also true that the tenure process is quite long. In Engineering School, it's seven years. It might be longer, but probably I don't think it might be much shorter. So maybe you want to spend-- if it's one month time period, you're willing to spend all the period just doing one thing. But for seven years, it's 1/10 of your life. So it's really important to make sure you find a good balance.

ELIZABETH ANCARANA: Question here?

SPEAKER 4: Thank you. My question is directed to all the panelists, but I think it's gets a little bit to the point around networking. And it's about how much time you try to dedicate-- if there's a specific amount of time-- to engagement in non-research or non-academic activities within your departments or schools. And I'm specifically thinking about committee engagement.

I have two extremes. I have a secondary appointment in the Department of Biostatistics where literally in any given week, I'll get three requests for committee membership of academics or curriculum that would take five hours a week for months. On the other extreme, in my primary appointment in the Department of Global Health and Social Medicine, I know these committees exist, but there's no open invitation to join them. And I'm just wondering, one, how much do you value these memberships in committees both in terms of your professional enjoyment, but also your professional advancement.

Two, do you have a set idea of how much time you would want to try to commit to those activities? How do you balance that when you, like you said, have so many things that you're trying to balance. And then three, are there any committees that you've just really learned a lot from, or that you would recommend that junior faculty get involved in because they can learn a lot about the underbelly of the school, or how things work, or how promotion committees work.

LAURENCE RALPH: Yeah, I'll take a stab at that. For me, it's been trial and error, actually. Just figuring it out. I think my approach has been committees that-- particularly when it's outside of the department or the departments that I'm in, just wider FAS committees, it's been things that I enjoy, and that I know that will nourish me in a different way. So I'm on the committee for public service. And I think thinking through those ideas around public service and meeting students who are interested in public service in particular, I think that is fun for me. Or women and gender studies, or ethnic studies.

So basically, I'm on committees that enhance my research interests outside of what I specifically do. But as far as committees for the department, I think setting limits is a good idea, especially for me in two departments. I think that it's fine to say that I'm on this number of committees in this department, and this on this, so I really can't take anything on. Or there's committees that are only particular to specific times of the year that you can plan to manage, or manage your time in different ways.

Prize committees are like that. So if you're on a prize committee, it's really at the end of the year that you would have to read a lot. But it's only sustained for a couple of weeks, and then it's over. So you could do that. Like the Hoopes Prize is one of those things where it's actually enjoyable. You actually get to read a lot of different theses from students doing amazing work. And it's a lot of work, but it's a lot of work for a particular amount of time, and then it's over. And this same thing with selection committees for graduate school when you're admitting graduate students. That's a particular time of the year, at the end of the first semester. But once you're done that, it's kind of done.

And that way, you can be a good citizen to your department, but you're not in committees where you have to meet on a regular basis for the whole year. And so I would think strategically about

the kinds of committees that you like personally. The ones-- what kind of time commitment they take up. When in the year they take up those time commitments. But at the end of the day, I think it's trial and error, because you'll figure out which ones that you enjoy, and which ones that you don't want to do. And it's really a personal thing on many levels, whether you enjoy curriculum or you enjoy hands on student committees, or you enjoy things like that.

JAMES MITCHELL: No is a full sentence. For me, it's very difficult to say, and I think the advice from Laurence is really good. But even some committees-- the one I least like to serve on is the IACUC committee, the animal ethical committee. It's a huge time commitment. But I'd have to say, I've learned a tremendous amount from that one. Not just about the business itself, but also because it's on a Harvard Medical area, the Longwood Medical area level. So it's closer to a university level committee. And that's been really interesting starting as a young assistant professor who naively accepts an offer from his department chairman who said, oh, it's just a few times a year. Really not a big deal.

So it was a hidden opportunity, I would say, to learn a lot.

SPEAKER 5: So actually, following up on that exact point. I'm curious to know what your strategies have been around the art of saying no, whether it's committee meetings or service, maybe guest lecturing, or doing review articles or chapters. How have you all navigated saying no, particularly to senior level people within your departments?

KATIA BERTOLDI: It's not easy. It's not easy. So at the beginning, I was afraid to say no. And so I said a lot of yes. But then I ran into trouble. Big trouble, because I was over-committed, and then I was not able to deliver what I promised. So quickly realized that that was much worse than saying no at the very beginning, because if you say yes, then the person expects something from you. And then, you need to deliver. So I quickly realized that. Fortunately, at the beginning, you have the excuse, you're young. So you can use the excuse, sorry, I over-committed. I didn't realize that. And come out with this sort of apologies.

So if you say too many yes, you will learn at a certain point you need to say no. But I think it's better to say no from the very beginning, so yeah.



LAURENCE RALPH: So some strategies that are complicated that I've had trouble with. One is the deferral strategy, because people do remember and they do ask you later. So that one doesn't always work. I think setting limits actually is a good one in terms of-- this is what I've committed to for the year, and I can't do anything above that in order to do what I have to do. I think people understand that. And that goes for, I think, travel as well, like when people are inviting you to things. You'll get suddenly a lot of invitations, and setting limits.

Really thinking intentionally of how many times this semester am I going to leave or go out of town, or something like that, because that will affect your ability to deliver what you promised here as well. And I think one of the biggest strategies, though, is asking people how to say no, too. I think this office is good at giving advice about that. Like you can ask somebody, or even ask a mentor, what kinds of things can I say no to, and what kinds of things are really good for me to do, or expected of me to do? Or if you can't actually do something. A lot of times, you can't actually do things because you can't be in two places at one time, things like that. But just the minutia of knowing how to frame a response to somebody, you can seek out help for that. And it can be very useful.

ELIZABETH ANCARANA: We probably have time for one more question, if anyone has any. OK, well this was really informative. Really wonderful. Thank you to all three of our panelists, Katia, Jay, and Laurence. We have time for about a 15 minute break, but we're going to start again right promptly at 3:45 with our tenured faculty panel.

## New Faculty Institute 2015 – Tenured Faculty Panel

Julie Buckler, Darren Higgins, Devah Pager

ELIZABETH ANCARANA: Well, it's great to see everybody talking and getting to know each other. And it's a lot of energy, positive energy in the room. It's really great to see. So now we'd like to start our next faculty panel. We have three tenured faculty who are going to give some good advice on navigating your professional path as a scholar. So I'd like to introduce them now.

They'll each speak again for about 10 minutes, and then we'll open it up to questions and discussion.

So I'll start with Julie Buckler, who is a professor of Slavic and comparative literature in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. She also currently holds a half-time position as the humanities director of academic ventures at the Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study. Julie received her doctorate in Slavic from Harvard and has spent her academic career here, appointed as a junior professor, assistant professor in 1996 and awarded tenure by the faculty of Arts and Sciences in 2003.

She works on the literature, performing arts, cultural life, and urban environments of Russia, with a focus on the imperial period and its legacies. For the past several years, Julie has also been a central member of the steering committee of the humanities project, which works to foster arts and humanities initiatives that build intellectual community and integrate the humanities into urban studies more broadly as it is practiced in the fields of urban planning, design, architecture, the social sciences, and public policy.

We have Darren Higgins, who is a professor of microbiology and immunobiology at the medical school. He holds a PhD in microbiology and immunology from the University of Michigan Medical School and completed his postdoctoral studies at the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine and the University of California at Berkeley. Darren came to the Harvard Medical school as an assistant professor in 1999 and was promoted to professor with tenure in 2009.

His laboratory currently focuses on understanding fundamental host pathogen interactions that lead to virulence in the development of protective immunity to intracellular bacterial pathogens. He's also the inventor on several patents and co-founded and serves on the Scientific Advisory Board of Genocea Biosciences, Inc., a company that commercializes key breakthroughs in vaccine discovery and development with a focus on intracellular pathogens.

And we have Devah Pager, who is a professor of sociology in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and a professor of public policy at the Kennedy School. She's also the Susan S. and Kenneth L. Wallach Professor at the Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study and the director of the Harvard Multi-Disciplinary Program in Inequality and Social Policy Devah holds a PhD from the

University of Wisconsin at Madison and was a Fulbright Fellow in Paris, studying changes in crime policy and patterns of immigration and ethnic tension in contemporary France.

Her research focuses on institutions affecting racial stratification, including education, labor markets, and the criminal justice system. Her field experiments investigate racial and economic consequences of large-scale imprisonment and discrimination against minorities and ex-offenders in contemporary US labor markets. So again, welcome to our panelists. And maybe we start with Julie for some sound advice.

JULIE BUCKLER: Can you hear me? Yes? Well, welcome. Welcome to Harvard. I hope you'll be happy here and this place will be good to you.

I've been here for a really long time. I've been on the faculty since 1996, as Elizabeth said. I was hired as a freshly minted PhD, the ink on my degree not even dry, no postdoc, nothing, just dived right in. And I was tenured in 2003. And my tenure, I think, came at the beginning, in the early years of a big wave of internal promotions such that there's quite a cohort of us now who are tenured from within by support of departments and mentored by colleagues and given sound advice. And I'm very grateful to those who had helped me.

I'd like to share with you some wisdom that I have acquired in my now 19 years on the faculty here, both as a junior person and as a tenured person. And also, now being 12 years out from tenure, I feel like I've learned a few things about what it's like to be senior. And I know that this audience consists mostly of junior tenure-track faculty but that there are also some senior hires here. And welcome. And so I'm going to offer some advice to both groups since I now have some thoughts on that.

So for junior faculty, now, of course, everything I say comes from my experience in the humanities. So I apologize if some of it isn't pertinent to people in other fields. In the humanities, the old standard, the old gold standard was two books by tenure. And that's a lot in a seven-year junior appointment. But I did it, because--

SPEAKER 1: You're choking.

[LAUGHTER]

JULIE BUCKLER: And then I had to get over my post-tenure stress syndrome. I did it because it had to be done. It was made very clear to me that that was what it was going to cost me to be considered for promotion, to be considered seriously for promotion.

I think the standards are more flexible and more broadly defined now. And I think that's very positive. I kind of would have liked not to have written my second book in such a rush. But that's OK. At least I wrote it.

So my advice is this to junior faculty. The junior appointment seems like it's going to be very long, but it's actually very short. And it's really important to get control of your time. And it's really important to have a master plan.

Sit down and really give some thought to what you would like to be able to put on the table the year you come up for review. And then really think about how you're going to get there. But most of the things that you want to have to show, you're going to build up in stages. And so you need to plan the staging, plan the multiple talks, the course, the new acquaintances, the collaborators, et cetera, that are going to lead you to the publications that you want to have.

Harvard is renewing itself very much in the area of teaching. We have the Harvard Initiative for Learning and Teaching. We have HarvardX, and really good and innovative teaching is highly valued here now, as is significant service, program building and other ways of really serving what we do.

That said, your publication record is still the most important thing in your dossier. And so it's very important that you don't let it get lost in the shuffle. So look for the synergies, and then be very conscious about the decisions you make regarding the projects you invest in deeply, having educated yourself about the view that Harvard tends to take on these things.

So in my field, for example, doing an extensive translation of poems by a particular poet with a long scholarly introduction is certainly a worthy project but one that most people would probably think was better done after you were tenured. And you may decide to go ahead and do that

translation project anyway as a junior person, but you should at least understand the choice that you're making. And you might get tenure, too, but just-- so let your senior colleagues tell you what the expectations are, and make your own decisions based on your own priorities.

January is now a huge boon. The academic calendar changed a few years ago, and now January for faculty is heaven, pretty much. Fall semester is over, spring semester hasn't started, and you can kind of lay low and really get some work done. It never used to be possible to get any of your own work done during the academic year, I mean, except for little bits and pieces.

So I'm just a proponent of getting your tools set in order, whatever you use, bibliographic management, presentation software. Be proactive and entrepreneurial. Organize things yourself so that you can be on the panels you want to be on. Apply for a Radcliffe exploratory seminar, run a talk series at one of the centers with a colleague. All of these can be done collaboratively, but they're all good ways to extend your reach at Harvard without overextending yourself.

And so my best piece of advice is do get out there. See if you can get an interesting service assignment or two. I was on the freshman seminar committee when the freshman seminar program expanded a lot, and it was a wonderful committee assignment, because I got to see these really wonderful proposals and syllabi from all across the university.

And I learned a lot, and I thought a lot, and we had great discussions. And I was just very happy that I agreed to be on that committee. And so you can't allow yourself to be completely bunkered in your own department. It won't be good for you here. But you also can't be running around all the time and never sitting down and getting down to business.

And for teaching preparation, I recommend top-down planning. It took me years to figure out that the best way to prepare to teach was not to read everything and take an enormous number of pages of notes so that I would feel I had mastery of the topic and then come into class. Much better to do top-down planning, really thinking about what you want to accomplish during each class, what the goals are, and kind of filling in that way, top down. That way you don't waste a minute, and you don't need to be your own best student, if you know what I mean.

So that's my best advice for junior people. Keep your head down, but not too much. Make a plan. Really make a plan and keep track of it. Keep yourself honest. Use all the tricks they talk about in business books on how to be more effective. Don't look at email for certain hours of the day, reserve one day a week to stay home and work on your own stuff if you can, et cetera.

My advice for senior faculty is somewhat different. When you're tenured, you will accrue a pretty heavy service load, because that's who can do a lot of the work-- task forces, promotion reviews, searches, chairing departments. The list goes on and on. And it's important. And when you get tenure, you kind of owe it to Harvard to pitch in on that stuff.

But you can also get buried by the work. So I've found that collaborative projects have worked really well for me during this stage in my career, because they allow me to invest in projects I really care about and to advance them because I have partners who are helping me. That's working really well for me.

I'm also really interested in nontraditional forms of scholarly output, like websites, and I'm especially enamored right now for a virtual exhibition software tool called Omeka. It's kind of a repository, and it allows students to do more than write traditional papers. It allows them to do more with design and presentation and to incorporate different media.

I find it's more engaging for students. And I also find that it's a nice and tempting format for my own scholarly production but not something I would have attempted as a junior person. So when you're senior, you have to be kind of cagey about finding ways to advance your projects while also doing the things you're supposed to do.

And other people swear by writing groups, by having trusted peers who read their work, by setting up networks, connections, commitments that are going to support you in getting your own work done. You can't just wait for, live for your next sabbatical. You can be making small deposits in your piggy bank for the four years leading up to a sabbatical. That's what I've done.

And just keep socking stuff away. Keep buying books. Keep files of things. Give the same talk several times but in different venues or from a different perspective. I mean, things take such a long time to develop, so allow that space for it to happen.

So that's my best advice. Those are my hard-won truths. I think you can really thrive and prosper here, but you have to make the institution work for you. Because it is a very fast-paced, and there's just an enormous amount going on. You have to stay grounded. So best of luck. And I mean that sincerely, not ironically. Thank you.

[LAUGHTER]

DARREN HIGGINS: I'll pick up from there. And I unfortunately didn't get a chance to see the previous session, but I think a lot of things that all the panelists will say will resonate and cross boundaries.

So I'm at the medical school. And as the intro said, I'm starting my 17th year here. And unlike the humanities, I do very little formal teaching. I was hired to come and set up a research lab and basically have productive, scholarly work in terms of papers, in terms of research development. And that was sort of my primary goal.

I also came at a time, which is, I think, less of a kinder, gentler time. And it certainly has changed. And I just want to say at the beginning, I have one theme throughout the 10 minutes I'll speak, and that's basically, don't work in a bubble. Don't work in a vacuum. And I'll try to interject kind of some practical strategies of how to actually do that and follow from what Julie said.

And I remember when I first came here as assistant professor, I was like, OK, go in and get your lab set up, and go get your R01 grants, and just go to it. And I remember sitting about three months after I showed up back in 1999, and I thought to myself, I could die in my office today. Nobody would know.

[LAUGHTER]

Nobody would care--

[LAUGHTER]

--until the smell permeated far enough down the hallway that someone said, go figure out what's going on. And I remember I had this candy dish in my office, so when people came it was like, hey, do you want to sit and have a talk and talk to me?

[LAUGHTER]

And usually it was someone saying, oh, we heard you had this piece of equipment. You don't have it. Goodbye. And so I realized at that point that working in the bubble and trying to do everything on your own isn't going to work. And I said, well, how do I get out of this?

And one of the things I'll cross to is people talk about mentorship. And I really think you have to develop multiple mentors and think of your career as if you were the general contractor of your career. And you don't have to do everything perfectly, but find the people that do things really well and lock onto those individuals to get good, sage advice.

I remember I called my graduate mentor, who was a very engaging person, who is now a dean at Michigan State. And he says, well, what you need to do is just engage the other faculty, get out there, and I know you a little bit, so just go ask them to lunch. Because everyone has to eat. And do something to break the ice.

And I remember I asked all my senior faculty to lunch, and I was very nervous. And I spoke to people. Mostly I told him about what I did a little bit. I'm doing this. OK, great. And about two months later, a student comes to my office and says, oh, I want to talk to you about rotating in your lab. I went to one of your senior colleagues, who is very well renowned, they don't have space, and they said I should come talk to you.

And I realized that person did me a favor, informed this person about what I was doing. They could use their legacy to say, hey, here's someone who you might want to talk to. That person was my first graduate student, that student, and was the first author of the first paper and helped me get my first grant. And things took off from there. So I realized very quickly you have to come out of the office, you have to engage at different levels.



The other thing to do that I think is very important, as Julie says, to keep stock of what your expectations are, how you're going to be evaluated, how you're going to be promoted, and get this sort of general-contractor group of people. So I noticed that there's faculty in my department who are phenomenal authors, their papers are always in the top journals, and so I kind of went to them and said, well, could you read my paper and give me some advice? And they would say, the science is fine, but the presentation needs some work in terms of how you have to project it to individuals so they can understand it better.

And then I realized something, that I am the best person to explain to other people what I do and why it's important and why you should promote me, why you should keep me around. But if I cannot explain that in a way that you understand, I'm doing myself a disservice. So one of the things someone told me is they said, write your own recommendation letter.

And that's a hard thing to do. But when your department chair or someone comes and says, we want to put this person up for this, or you want to apply for this, and they say I have to write this recommendation letter for this new assistant professor in my department-- who did we hire again? What is this person doing? What have they done in the last few months? And you need to be able to say exactly why that's important.

And so what you might want to do is find a colleague who has had experience with that. And there's one thing Julie says-- as you become a senior person, you sit on promotion and evaluation committees. You have this experience. Find out who in your department does that, because it's someone, and say, OK, what do I need to do? Where am I going? How can I actually get to this direction? And that's advice, too, about not working in the bubble.

One thing I would say, too, in terms of your time, in my opinion really as a Harvard professor, other than air, water, and food, your most precious commodity is time. It's a limited resource. There's only so many hours in the day, so many days in the week, and everyone is going to be jockeying for your time. And I'll come back to how to reserve your time.

So I think that what you want to get in the process of is sort of getting a schedule in terms of what time you can allot to specific things. And one thing I want to say now and come back to is the work-life, home-life balance. Many of the assistant professors, you may or may not have a

partner, you may or may not have kids. At some point during the next decade that may change for you. And it's very important for you to kind of set aside time. And for

And for me, for example-- I was talking this morning-- I'm a single dad of twin daughters, and I have a set amount of time. I have a schedule. Everyone in my life knows my schedule.

They know that Mondays and Tuesday nights, I'm free to stay late, I'm free to work with you. Wednesdays and Thursdays I'm with my kids. Don't call me. I'm not going to call you back. If it's an emergency, you can text me something or send me something, but this is my allotted time. And I think that once everyone can understand that and say, hey, this is when I'm available, they will respect those boundaries.

The other thing I want to say, too, about not working in a bubble is at some point during your time here, you will have a crisis. That is life. Whether it is a death in the family or an illness or basically an accident or someone you know or something or your house burns down, there will be something that will take you away from your focus on the work that you will have to go and deal with.

And I think it's very important that you recognize that that will happen and to be very honest to the people around you and let people know what's going on in your life. You don't have to be an open book and tell everyone all your business. But what I found is I went through a few crises and issues I had to deal with, and by my department chair and my business administrator and people knowing in general this was going on, behind the scenes they kind of kept things away.

I was talking this morning-- I noticed that I wasn't getting as many emails. I wasn't getting as many people asking me to do something. Julie knows this. As one of the few African-American tenured faculty members at Harvard, I get asked to do stuff all the time. And suddenly people weren't asking me as much. And that was a blessing, because people knew what was going on in my life, and again, not working in the bubble.

Also with the promotion side, one practical thing that I would tell everyone to do is at least every quarter, every three months, update your CV. Because what's going to happen is that next year some time someone will say, hey, we want to put you up for this, or this is going on, and then

you have to sit down and think about what am I actually doing. So just every time you have a calendar-- well, I gave this talk, I did this, I'm writing this article, I'm writing this book-- update your CV. And if you have nothing to put on it, if you have nothing on your calendar that is coming up, that's a sign that, hey, I need to kind of get out of the bubble and go talk some other individuals.

One strategy for researchers is that one of the criteria that you're promoted by is your recognition in the field. That comes from various ways-- publications, presentation, promotions. You may have to do some self-promotion.

So for example, some of the colleagues here at Harvard are probably world-renown in the fields that they do. You might go and say, hey, if you're on this journal, I would be willing to be on the editorial board for this journal at some point. Please consider me. If you are basically putting this conference together in three years, you should come look at the work that I'm doing and just consider me for giving this presentation.

Those little things of just saying, hey, I'm available, will often very much help you. Because we're all very busy, and at the last minute someone says, I need to do this. Back when you had cover pictures on journals, one of the colleagues in my department was the cover editor for the journal and then basically came to me and said, I saw that you had an article in this issue, and you didn't tell me. Give me something so we can put on the cover. Oh, OK. That networking aspect works. So I think that you want to be aware of what your colleagues are doing just in general, because they can avail you.

The last thing I'll say is about the tenure. When I first came here, someone said, getting tenure means being able to say no, that now I've arrived and now I can tell people no. And I think that's not the case. I think getting promotion, getting to tenure, having a successful career means being able to say no to protect your time to allow you to accomplish what you want to do.

So how do you do that? One of the things about the general contractor is to identify people that can help you. And you have to identify someone that can help you say no. So for example, for me it was my department chair. I was asked to do this, I'm trying to protect my time, I have a

colleague who's a senior colleague who I don't want to offend, trying to do a collaboration with them.

So I went to my department chair, and he says, of course you don't need to be doing this. So I said, well, can I send people to you? He said sure.

So when someone came to me and said, Darren, we want you to do this. I go, my department chair says I can't. You should go talk to my department chair. He says, no, he's not going to do this. If you have a problem, you can speak to me. Problem goes away.

So I think, again, you want kind of identify the areas that you want to get to, how you want to get those, and who can help you get to those particular areas. So I'll stop there, and we can re-address anything during the question portion. But that's kind of my general sage advice. And I hope that applies to everyone here in terms of what school, what department, researcher, teacher. But I think those could be very helpful along your path here to Harvard. And welcome, and I wish you continued success and that we'll be colleagues for a long time.

And I have to say if this is the first and last time you ever see me, that's your problem.

[LAUGHTER]

I'm now one of those people, right? We're now one of these people that you can seek out for sage advice, right? Add that to your list now.

[LAUGHTER]

DEVAH PAGER: awesome. Hi, everyone. I'm Devah Pager. So I've just been here two years now. I'm a relative newbie on this panel. Prior to coming to Harvard, I spent nine years at Princeton and before that two years at Northwestern. So I have some comparative perspective. So some of the comments I'll offer will be Harvard-specific and some more universal to how to make this professional life work.

So my first piece of advice-- I think most of you are probably just starting your first jobs in your first semesters. Is that right? How many of you are here in your first semester of your first job?

Oh, just a small fraction of you. So others of you have been here for a while now or are starting--  
OK.

Anyway, well, welcome to all of you, wherever you're coming from. I would say if you have moved here from somewhere else, whether this is your first job or your second or nth job, I would plan on your first semester being a time for you to enjoy and settle in and not plan to really get any work done, especially if you're teaching this semester. I think the first semester is really a time for you to be settling in, learning where the coffee maker is, signing up for your gym membership, keeping your classes running smoothly, figuring out where you are in the world, and don't put too much pressure on yourself. In a way, the tenure clock is short, but in another sense, you need to take a semester to really settle in. So give yourself that time.

My advice for the first year or for the early periods of your time here is to really spend some time finding a community. And keep in mind that that community may very well be outside your department. I'm talking about an intellectual community as well as a social community. Harvard is a large and diverse campus. It's full of centers and institutes and departments with all kinds of opportunities to meet folks.

And this is an opportunity, especially early on, to really sample from that diversity of opportunities. I think one huge benefit of turning your life upside down to move somewhere new is that you don't have the same things that tie you down and get you stuck in routines and in a particular rut. So while you're kind of unsettled and freewheeling, take this as an opportunity to sample from all kinds of things that you wouldn't ordinarily select into. If that means going to talks in different departments, going to the university events like this one, signing up for recreational activities, meeting people from across campus, I think all of those really enrich your networks and will make your time here more profitable.

When I first got to Northwestern as a new assistant professor, all faculty were required to attend an all-day pedagogy workshop that was put on by the teaching center. This ended up being a completely worthless waste of time in terms of the content. It was just full of really boring and useless information, unfortunately. I think those kinds of workshops could be done very well. I hope they do them better now. But the content ended up being fairly worthless.

But at this workshop, I met two faculty members, one who was a new professor in the psychology department, another new professor in the history department, who became two of my closest friends and remain so to this day. They were close intellectual colleagues, as well as friends, and that was really enriching. So there's a silver lining to spending days sitting and listening to boring panels-- no offense.

[LAUGHTER]

And there can be really terrific things that come out of those events. So really spend some time early on developing those networks.

To echo something that Darren said, I think you also want to think about developing community within your department as well. And I think cultivating mentors is a really important part of that community. I think most new faculty, when they enter a department, some people really take the time and say, I want to get coffee or I want to go to lunch. But the truth is that most people, especially when they've been in their rut and in their routine and are busy with a million commitments, they are thinking to themselves in the back of their mind, oh, I'd really like to get to know this person better, but they just never are able to stop and take a moment and reach out and find a time.

So you should take that initiative. And every semester, make sure that there are at least one or two faculty members in your department that you're reaching out to and say, hey, do you want to get lunch? Do you want to get coffee? And cultivate some of those relationships. Because your colleagues really, really do want to get to know you, even though they're just caught up in their own little bubble.

My third piece of advice is to learn to say no. And more specifically, I'd say just say no more often than you're saying yes. That's kind of my general rule, I think, especially for junior faculty. Now, of course you want to be a good citizen, you want to be a member of your community, and your colleagues will notice that you are contributing and that you're pitching in, and they will appreciate that for sure. But you can't do everything, and you won't get tenure just for being a good committee member.

So figure out where you can make a contribution to your department. Figure out where you can make a contribution to your university. And do those jobs really, really well. But don't get penalized for doing those jobs well by getting roped into participating on 15 other committees. So just plan strategically with your time.

And that goes for professional activities as well. So let's face it. We have awesome jobs, and we get to do all kinds of things that for the most part are really, really enjoyable. So I love giving talks in different departments. I really like going to conferences.

I like speaking to non-academic audiences. I like meeting with policymakers. I like meeting with student groups. I like being included in special edited volumes. There are all kinds of things that are parts of our jobs that we really, really enjoy. But we can't do all of them.

So how do you figure out what to do and what not to do? Well, I have a really, really great litmus test for you. So you have to think to yourself, when you get asked to do something, if you would be willing to do it next week, you probably want to do it. If you wouldn't be willing to do it next week, don't do it at all.

So here's my thinking behind that. Academics get asked to do things six months in advance, 12 months in advance, like well beyond any reasonable sense of having a time horizon or what that feels like. And the temptation is to think, oh, yeah, six months from now, my docket will be clear. Like now is the busy time. This is the crunch time. But once I get past these next few deadlines, things will really clear out.

But the truth is, what you are experiencing now, that's how you feel next spring and the following fall and the year after that and every semester until you retire. So if you're too busy to do it now, the chances are you'll be too busy to do it a year from now. So there are things that I get asked to do that if I had to do them next week, there's no way that I would say yes. And sometimes I get roped into doing things because I've been asked a year and a half in advance, and then I get to the point where I actually have to turn in the chapter or attend the conference, and I'm thinking, what the heck was I thinking? I really don't want to do this.

And there are other things that when they come up, like I really want to be a part of those things, and I would clear my schedule to do them if they were coming up much more quickly. So if you wouldn't want to do it now, you probably won't want to be doing it a year from now. Say no.

OK, last few pieces of advice-- delegate and ask for help. I think this is consistent with the general contractor model. Harvard has a lot of bureaucracy. It's probably the most bureaucratic institution that I've ever been a part of.

[LAUGHTER]

But in my experience, staff, from the level of administrative assistants all the way up to deans, are exceptionally highly qualified and really, really good at their jobs and committed to doing their jobs well. And they're there, for the most part, to help you do your work better. So take advantage of that. Figure out what those resources are and how they can help you.

There are people that can help you with data analysis. There are people that can help you filing your receipts, with sending out your letters of recommendation, with maintaining your bibliographies, with setting up and maintaining your website. There's all kinds of staff out there that can help you do your job better. Sometimes it takes more effort to ask someone else to do it than just to do it yourself, but that's only the first time. So if there's anything that you plan to be doing more than once even, if it's only once a year, find someone else to help you do it and delegate.

And then the last thing I would say is keep in mind that everyone feels like an impostor at least some of the time. Your colleagues did not make a mistake in hiring you. Unless you are Michael LaCour and made up all of your data, there were some very good reasons that your colleagues chose you out of what was an enormous pool of applicants, I am sure. So keep in mind what you love about your work, and your colleagues are going to love it as well.

ELIZABETH ANCARANA: Thank you.

[Q&A for Tenured Faculty Panel]

DEVAH PAGER: Yeah. OK. So interesting to hear from all of you. Questions?



SPEAKER 2: Sorry this is a negative, sad question.

[LAUGHTER]

But in your experiences, what are the characteristics-- unscientific observation, fine-- of the people who didn't get promoted? We've heard a lot of the good things that we should be doing, but then like what about the pitfalls?

SPEAKER 3: You ask negative questions.

[LAUGHTER]

SPEAKER 2: Oh, yeah. My first one was really negative, too.

[LAUGHTER]

JULIE BUCKLER: I can speak to that briefly. And then I'm sure my two colleagues also have something to say. In my remarks, I talked about taking control of your master plan. I mean, obviously it's not a rigid thing, but the people I've seen who haven't gotten tenure have been a bit hapless about it. Many times they're brilliant, but they didn't really take control over their process of doing the work and bringing it to completion. And so often they were just too slow to produce work that could then get a response in the world, and so Harvard didn't have the information it wanted in order to make that judgment.

The fact that we don't have tenured associate rank it means that you have to look like a good prospect as a full professor at the end of your junior appointment. And that's a really tall order. And you just cannot get there without really deliberately making it happen. So that's my advice.

DARREN HIGGINS: Yeah, I think for me, I think it's a multitude of reasons. But really, it can come down to a few things. One is I think the people I've seen who haven't been successful are people who didn't say no and just got too distracted and too diluted in terms of what they were doing and also maybe had a different perception of how they were going to be evaluated and what that criteria were.

So for example, in my particular field, the scholarly production, your publications, how people perceive you in the field, and your research work was very important. They've changed the tracks now in terms of teaching, et cetera, but you've had people who said, well, I've done all these other things, all these other committees, et cetera, but then when you look at the promotion criteria, someone says, that that didn't really count.

One thing now that they do is, for example, the actual letter that gets sent to the people who will write your review of you is available. That is a specific, worded letter. So if you look at that, it's very clear what those criteria are in terms of how you will be evaluated. The question is how you get there.

And the last thing I think, as we all talked about, is people who didn't take advantage of saying, let's go get some assistance to help me get to this point and find people who say, OK, this is an area that you need to work with. You may want to get some more, et cetera, you may want to do some more outside work here, you may have more focus on this. So let's come up with a plan on how to do that.

So really it's this thing I call PPEP, which is Perceived, Planned, and Executed to Perfection. So if you don't perceive what the challenge is, how you're gonna get it and then plan for it, then you can't execute it. But if you do that, then it's not going to be a problem.

And another thing I'll add, too, is tenure is not the end-all, be-all. I've seen a lot of people who leave this institution well before that time frame because they've been so successful in other places they get sucked away. And that's not a bad place to be.

I've seen people leave and go to industry because they've taken that work that way. I've seen people leave and go to other aspects, go start companies, go do things, and they've used the time here to develop that. So I would just add that thing. That's not the end-all, be-all. All if you're enjoying what you're doing and happy and productive, then that's the best place to be.

DEVAH PAGER: Yeah, I would echo those comments. And I think the faculty that I have seen that have not been successful have been folks that have diverted their attention to other activities that maybe gave them more immediate reinforcement but weren't the kind of scholarly

production that they needed in order to pass that 10-year bar. And I think sometimes it's like the process of writing articles or books is a long one, and there's very little feedback, and you really have to be extremely patient and endure a lot of criticism, where other things, other parts of our lives, even teaching, for example, where we're getting immediate feedback and where we're feeling like the interaction with the students is really stimulating and that is fantastic-- and being able to combine an active teaching and research life is the ideal, but in some cases, you shift the balance to the thing that's giving you the most immediate gratification.

I'll also say that in addition to the fact that some people do leave prior to tenure and find other things to do, my sense is that not getting tenure at places like Harvard has a very different impact from being at other universities. And so everyone I've seen both at Princeton and Harvard who have not gotten tenure have gotten great jobs at Research 1 universities elsewhere. So in that sense, this isn't the only place in the universe to do good work. [LAUGHING]

[LAUGHTER]

SPEAKER 4: I just wanted to follow up on the comment from both Julie and Devah about the adjectives "slow" or "fast" scholarly productivity and sort of generally the nature of productivity. I would love to hear you talk a bit-- of course, it would be sort of discipline-specific about what really counts as good productivity and what doesn't. Because sometimes people can think they're doing the right thing, and it might not, in fact, be the best investment of their energy, even if they're intelligently not getting on 17,000 committees or not getting around to doing their work. So can you say something about the sort of temptation to do the wrong kind of productivity and the best ways of judging where your best input for your energy is?

DARREN HIGGINS: I'll make a comment to that. And I think that the best indicator of future success is prior success. And that's a real issue that you bring up in terms of doing something that you may really want to do that gives you a lot of gratification but may not be the best direction that you might want to go in terms of your evaluation for promotion, et cetera.

And so that's where I think having people who are in your mentor checkbox who have sat on the committees and been involved in the evaluation process, who can look at what you do-- and they'll ask you point blank, where are you going with this? Where do you see this beginning,

middle, ed? What do you hope to get out of this? And when are you going to get something out of it?

And if someone says, well, this is something that's going to be seven years from now, and they say, well, you're going to be evaluated for associate in five years, this is not where you want to invest your time. So I think it's really getting the benefit of people who can sit down and tell you point blank. You don't want to surround yourself with warm fuzzies-- that's great, that's fantastic, go do it, yes, yes, yes. You also don't want to surround yourself with people who are just, oh, that will never work, don't do it.

You want to find people who are very pragmatic who can then evaluate and say, well, if you do want to do this here are the things that you need to be concerned about. And then ask yourself, am I willing to actually do that? And if the answer is yes, then you might want to take that chance to go and do that. And if the answer is no, then that's a good way to steer you away from those aspects.

JULIE BUCKLER: Well, I said be conscious about your decisions. And by that I mean be informed. Because it is really such a challenging balance, and frankly, it continues to be challenging at every career stage now, in my experience, which is to say that you have to push really hard to move things forward and make them happen. And especially as a junior person here, you really have to work hard to deliver the goods.

But on the other hand, you have to live your life. You do have to find some balance, and you can't turn yourself inside out. And many of us have other commitments of various kinds that are important to us, or there are things we also need to do for our mental health.

So it's really quite tricky. I mean, it's something I guess you decide on a daily basis, which is why I also advocate the use of a master plan so that you can be doing short- and long-term planning. And it's a marathon, basically. You need to be able to sustain your pace. And you need to be able to last. [LAUGHING]

DEVAH PAGER: So I just say that in the social sciences, we tend to work on multiple projects at once. But the danger is that it's a much, much more fun to start new things than it is to finish older things. And I think that's a temptation that needs to be resisted.

So whenever you start a new project, you have to be really, really thoughtful about, is this the thing that I'm really going to commit to going forward, or is this just going to distract me from the work that I already have ongoing? And I feel really strongly about the idea that there is no such thing as a quick and dirty project. So there's often the temptation to think, oh, this new issue came up, or I just found this new source of data. I'm going to do this quick and dirty analysis, and it's just going to take me a week or so, and then I'll write it up, and it just be a little side piece. In my experience, those projects end up taking just as long as the projects that I feel like are really big and important, or can, and so keep in mind that there is no such thing as that quick energy project.

And I just wanted to say for me when I'm evaluating files, I feel like a smaller number of really important, high quality pieces is worth so much more than a long CV of mediocre pieces. And so I would invest more in every single project or publication rather than trying to just stuff your CV full of less meaningful entries.

JULIE BUCKLER: I just want to add something. There was an earlier question about how to describe people who were not successful here. And I am thinking of a particular example of a person who was kind of a writing and publishing machine, endlessly producing and publish-- it's actually not that difficult to place things and get them published. But then it's out there, and the work was kind of shallow. And now that I'm not under that same pressure, I actually publish pretty slowly, because I really don't want my work to be published unless I feel it's my very best work.

And so that's another one of those tensions and paradoxes about the appointment at Harvard, that they do want to see some quantity, but you can't be obsessed with quantity, because it will lead you in the wrong direction. I really agree completely with what you said.

ELIZABETH ANCARANA: Other questions or comments?

SPEAKER 5: What do you do when you get rejected?

JULIE BUCKLER: You mean like something for publication, or--

SPEAKER 5: A book manuscript, a paper, a grant proposal. It's going to happen to everybody in this room. And it's one of the most awful things to happen to a faculty member.

DARREN HIGGINS: That's an evolution. It's funny you say that. First off, rejection is part of it, because everyone has an opinion, and their opinion is not going to necessarily be in tune with yours. And so in terms of the rejection, that's a part of it. My question would be, how many times did I get rejected? So for me, the average time that somebody submits an R1 grant, and I think it's like four times before it gets in. Nowadays, publications, they get it rejected at least once or twice, because people want to see more.

And so I think you have to kind of look at it as, what's the rationale and the reason? And so for me, rejection is this is part of it. Did you put something that was-- as Julie was just saying, was it your best effort? Was it not shallow? Was it very well crafted? Great. If someone rejects it, why did they reject it?

And I give you three examples. So sometimes you may get it rejected because of the wrong reasons, which is a competitor saw it, and they just don't want it out there for certain reasons. If it's a publication, I have a habit now of what I do is I just go right to the editors. And I'll call the person-- and they love this-- and I'll say, well, the paper got rejected. Here are the reasons why, this is what I'm willing to do to improve it, This is what I think is completely off base. What do you think?

And they'll say, oh, OK, no we can't do that. Great. I'm going to send it someplace else. Often times, they will agree with you, and they say, well, the reviewer asked you for something that really is not reasonable. That's five more years of work. That's not really reasonable. So if you don't agree, I'm not going to do that, and this is what I'm going to do.

So the benefit of that is now when it goes back, we've addressed all the potential things so it doesn't get rejected again. So it's minimizing the rejection.

In terms of grant processes, as I said, it's many, many times it will get rejected. You certainly have a smaller [INAUDIBLE] larger amount of times you can send it in. The question I would say is, well, did you go get the appropriate advice to see what are the reasons why? Is it not scientifically sound?

And sometimes someone will say, this really isn't scientifically sound. We don't think it's going to work. At that point, you may say, I may have to go to a different direction.

So my answer to that is really, what's the reason for the rejection? And is it based on something that's grounded? And what can I do about that? But rejection is just part of it.

DEVAH PAGER: Yeah, you definitely can't take it personally. There is so much randomness in the review process, in every review process. And some of my favorite papers have gotten rejected by one of the top journals and then accepted by the other top journal in my discipline. And the reviews just read the paper very differently. So I definitely wouldn't take it personally, and in some cases I would just turn around and send it right back out.

There are other cases where you get the reviews back and you realize, you know what? I didn't communicate that idea effectively, and at least for this subset of readers who are coming from a different perspective from me, they need a different set of evidence or arguments that's going to convince them. And then I try to make it better and get out there again.

JULIE BUCKLER: It's a learning process. It seems like whenever I try to move into something new, my first attempts are not successful. And then I try to figure it out from there. But it is disconcerting to realize that, yes, you can submit an article to one of your field's top journals and have it rejected even though you're tenured at Harvard. And it can happen. It does happen regularly. So I don't know. I think thickening your hide a little bit is good, is helpful.

DARREN HIGGINS: One thing I'll add to that is using whatever the rejection was for future information. So for example, in my field there are certain study sections of the evaluation panels that just don't like certain things. And I had this experiment one time, which was a great experiment. I couldn't have designed it any better. I submitted a grant in response to a request for

applications, and they had so many requests that they said, we're going to extend the time for evaluation. We're going to give 25 grants, and we have 600 applications. So we have to extend it.

And they said, so we're going to suspect this rule, and you can now submit the exact same grant at the same time as this one to a different study section and just change the name. Because we think there's going to be some great grants, but we don't want you waiting around for six months to get one of these 25 when you could just go to a regular study section and probably get it now. So I said, OK. So I just changed the name and submitted it.

So when I submitted it to the regular studies section, it was triaged-- boom-- wasn't even reviewed. This is horrible. It will never work. It's not innovative. It's not creative. We don't understand why he's submitting this.

But I got one of those 25 grants from the first one. And it was the exact same grant. And what I realized was that that grant for that study section that they asked for for this specific thing was perfect but for the general sort of thing really wasn't as appreciated. So from now on, whenever I submit something, I would say, it needs to be here. It has to get here, it has to get in this particular review panel.

And what I didn't realize in, and one of my mentors told me here, was that you have a right when you submit grants to have your grant reviewed in the most favorable circumstances. So if it gets sent to a study section you don't want it in, you can call up and say, please move it. And I didn't realize that, and I had a grant. It got rejected, another one.

I called up, and I said, this is not the right place. They sent it to the other one, and it got funded. So a lot of it is just the context of who's seeing it, who's looking at it.

And I just want to add this one point now, because this is one of the best pieces of advice that I ever got as a faculty member at Harvard in the last 17 years. And I have to credit my colleague Steve Lory who told me this. And he asked me, he said, how is your stuff going to get reviewed? Do you understand how it's going to get reviewed?



And I said, well, of course I do. They get it, it goes at this study section, it goes to this panel, it goes here, it goes here, great. He goes, no. You don't you know. It's not going to get reviewed that way.

What's going to happen is there's going to be somebody who's tired, who's working all day, who just had a fight with their spouse, whose kid got in trouble with school, whose dog got into the neighbor's yard and messed it up, who's mother-in-law is coming and crashed the car. And they're going away for some other meeting, and they have this limited window of time, and they pull out your paper, your grant, to read it on the plane while they're going to wherever they're going to before they come back to everything that's going on in their life.

So your stuff is going to get reviewed under the worst possible circumstances. So you need to make sure you understand that and make sure everything is clear. And he just gave the sage advice of, if I read this page and I stopped, and then I picked it back up again and I looked at it, what's most important? Put that in highlight. Do this.

Every time you start a new section, repeat the same thing. If I'm having a conversation and I interrupt your conversation, I come back, OK, catch me up to where I am. That's how it's going to get reviewed. So it's these little sort of pieces of things and understanding the realities of the process which I think will be very beneficial.

And that's the thing, because it takes time, as Julie said, to understand the realities. But once you understand that, I think it becomes more tenable. Because now whenever I write anything, I assume this is going to be read by somebody on a plane in the worst possible lighting with the kid behind him kicking in the seat. Because I have reviewed things in that same way.

[LAUGHTER]

SPEAKER 6: Hi. So let's say you're in a field which is very ideologically polarized with a lot of political controversy. Let's say your work can be controversial. And that will affect, of course, reviews. That will affect what people are going to say when they send things out for tenure and stuff. How would you navigate that, sort of knowing in advance that this is the kind of field

you're in and there are sort of big ideological stakes, there are going to be divides and angry opponents, things like that? How do you navigate that in terms of tenure?

DEVAH PAGER: So every field and every department are different. My advice would be to keep in mind that affect can overcome ideology, and you shouldn't automatically assume that whatever factions exist in your department are immediately going to be imposed on you. And so you may have natural allies, and you may fit in better with one set of senior faculty than another. But you shouldn't give up on cultivating relationships and contact with the wider pool of faculty, because if people see you as a human being, not just a member of this warring faction, I think they're going to be more invested in understanding your work and seeing its contribution and seeing it in light of its full scholarly potential rather than just seeing you as one part of an opposing army. So, yeah, that would be my advice.

JULIE BUCKLER: I think it's absolutely right that you find allies in strange places and at its best, people practice here this kind of culture of civility, where you sit around a table at a department meeting talking about a search or some intellectual issue. And there are real differences in views, and people really care a lot about the outcome, and it's quite a challenge to remain civil and to keep things from getting heated and to stand your ground. But when it works, it's such a beautiful system. You'll see it in operation in your department and program. And it's such an invaluable skill.

It's never a good idea to send an email when you're annoyed, to snap one off-- always a bad idea. And it's always a bad idea to snap at a colleague in a meeting. And you just really have to have good self-control.

DARREN HIGGINS: Yeah, I think just to echo the two things is the word ally. I think if you're going into a field where there's a lot of political issue, a lot of contention, the question is, who are the most prominent people that may have some sensitivities to what you're doing and how you can actually change it or direct it? That gets to the thing I mentioned about writing your own recommendation letter in terms of being able to clearly articulate what you're bringing to the table that no one else is and how your view may be productive.

And just focus on the focus on the positive aspect. Here is something that may be able to unify and get past some of the contention that you're having and you're having to come to a unified agreement. And this is how I'm going to approach it and how I'm going to do that. And I think as starting someone new, that actually a benefit. My own personal experience, there was a little bit of warring factions in my group between the Americans and the French and the Germans. And then this Canadian scientist came in and collaborated with all of us secretly--

[LAUGHTER]

--and then published his paper with everybody on it that we then realized, like wow. And then we said, this was someone who came completely from a different field, who really changed our thinking and was able to overcome this sort of entrenched political squabble. And we realized, yeah, this person did us a service. So I think if you can position yourself in that way, that's a way to overcome that initial angst of moving into a direction that way.

ELIZABETH ANCARANA: Well, that was really very informative. Thank you to our three panelists for joining us today.

[APPLAUSE]

And now Judy will provide some closing remarks.

JUDITH D. SINGER: Thank you. Well, actually, thank you all for being here. It means a lot of us to see all these new faces and to think about what the faculty of the future of Harvard is going to be like. And also thank our colleagues here for taking the time and our prior colleagues for taking the time.

Essentially I just want people to get to know each other. So I think we're going to provide a break time. But you have heard some themes here that I just want to reiterate-- some of the phrases of having a master or being the general contractor of your life. I always say have a mission statement.

And part of that is being strategic. Time is short. And so I think a lot of the questions, a lot of the comments were about ways in which people try to be strategic about their time and their energy and their resources.

Another part is, learning to say "I don't know" is one of the hardest things for a Harvard faculty member to say. Because we selected you. We expect you know everything. And you know something? You don't.

And so whether it's learning to say "I don't know" to a student, when it's learning to say "I don't know" to a colleague, when it's learning to say "I don't know" to a colleague. "Can you give me some advice?" And then never only ask one person. Because if you only ask one person, you'll be convinced that that person just gave you the right answer. And chances are that person didn't. So learning how to ask questions is something that has come up time and a time.

And reaching outside of your boundaries is something that we're very interested in. I've had the pleasure reading most of your dossiers. So a lot of the work that's done by the people in this room increasingly is interdisciplinary. And so learning how to cross boundaries, but also being strategic and not crossing so many boundaries that you're splat on the floor and you haven't done the kinds of strategic things that you need to be successful. And if the success leads to tenure, great. If it doesn't, at least you'll be true to yourself.

And so being successful and strategic and time management-- I think several people said that's probably the most important thing. Learning to say no is about time management. Being proactive is about time management.

Instead of waiting to see what committees you're asked to be on, think about what the two things you want to do are, go to your department chair or your academic dean and say, these are the things that interest me. They're perfectly happy to figure out how to work around that. So instead of just waiting for things to happen, being proactive and having that align with your mission becomes another way to think about being successful here.

I'm going to close it out by just saying there are going to be a lot of other events the semester. Some of them you've already gotten e-mails about. We have an event at the Houghton Library at

the end of the month. The Houghton library is a jewel box on the Harvard campus. It's the rare book collection.

[INAUDIBLE] Menand from the English department is going to be giving a talk. You're going to be able to go and touch Emily Dickinson's desk. And you can pick out books, first editions, notes by various authors. You can think about your favorite author and go find the papers that he or she might have given. So I encourage you to join us.

There will also be a publishing event, where we're inviting editors from Harvard and MIT Press. And we've got a book agent. So if you're interested, if you're in a book field, learning about the book world-- even if you're not yet there, it just sort of gives you an idea about the issues involved in book publishing.

On the fun side, we've got bank of tickets for the ART in December. We hold a reception at the ed school, which is right across from the American Repertory Theater. So I encourage you to join us for that.

I hold lunches for tenure-track faculty during the year. So we've got a whole bunch of things planned. We often do things on social media, on op-ed writing about getting your voice out there. So we're always looking for ideas. So if you have any idea about something you'd like to learn more about, chances are you're not the only person. Let Elizabeth-- Elizabeth there conveniently have the same name-- or me know, and we'd be happy to steal your idea and magnify it for other people.

So why don't I stop here? We have a reception upstairs. You can go check your email and do all of those kinds of things. Hang out in the lobby, or just hang out here. Or come up to the reception to meet. We have about another 30 or 40 people coming from across the university.

So I just want to say thank you very much for joining us. And I look forward to meeting every one of you and talk. My goal is to know every Harvard faculty member. I'm actually not bad at it at this point. So I look forward to talking to all of you. And thank you.

[APPLAUSE]