Duke UNIVERSITY | Academic Council

012 Allen Building
Campus Box 90928
Phone: (919) 684-6447
FAX: (919) 684-9171
E-mail: acouncil@duke.edu

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Academic Council

Thursday, January 15, 2015

Joshua Socolar (Physics/ Chair, Academic Council): Welcome everyone. I hope all of you had an enjoyable holiday season with perhaps some rest and relaxation as well.

I'd like to take a few minutes to let you know how the agendas for the Council meetings this spring are shaping up. We have a lot to cover. The bad news is that we will almost certainly have to extend our meeting times in April and May because of the number of essential items that cannot be scheduled earlier.

We will need to hear two proposals for master's degrees in time for them to be approved by the Board of Trustees in May. One of those, a Master of Arts in Political Economy, is ready for us now but ECAC has decided that we will postpone the presentations of any master's degrees until after we have heard from Dean of the Graduate School Paula McClain about her study of the impact of master's programs on academics and associated resources on campus. That pushes these master's programs into April because Paula's report will come at our March meeting, along with President Brodhead's annual address to the faculty.

We will also hear reports from the AC Ombuds Committee on its review of the structure of our Faculty Ombuds office; from the AC Faculty Compensation Committee on its biannual salary equity study; from the AC Diversity Task Force, more about that later, and from Vice Provost Nancy Allen on the Faculty Satisfaction Survey results. All of those have to fit in somewhere and all of them presumably require some time for discussion. By the way, about the Faculty Satisfaction Survey, that part of the program is going to be much more interesting if we all respond to the survey (laughter). Just do it, and make sure your colleagues do it too.

Somewhere in there we also have to fit in reports, as we always do, from the chairs of APC, UPC, GPC, and Athletics Council, as well as a report we requested from the chair of ACIR on transparency in Duke's investments. It's just not all going to fit. So, the provisional plan is to ask for these in written form and they will be distributed to you in April and if anybody wants to pose questions to any of these people after reading the reports, we'll provide an opportunity to do that. So I hope that's okay with everybody. It occurs to me also that we might want to hear from our new Chancellor for Health Affairs, Dr. Gene Washington, who's scheduled to arrive in April. But I'm thinking maybe we should give him a summer to settle in before we subject him to the faculty inquisition (laughter). I don't think we'll try to fit that into our agenda but we do want to recognize that it's a big deal that he's coming here.

The good news about having so many items that cannot be handled before April is that it gives us some room in our schedule in January and February to have more extended discussions of some other topics.

The February meeting will be devoted to

developments at DKU. Provost Kornbluth will lead a discussion on the nature of faculty positions at DKU and on issues associated with the offering of an undergraduate degree in Phase II, which is expected to begin in 2018 or 2019. We will hold the February meeting in Executive Session, which means faculty only, so that Sally can speak freely with us about the various options under consideration. So that's what's in store in the coming months.

APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER MEETING MINUTES

Now let's turn to today's agenda. We'll start by approving the minutes from our December 4th meeting. That was the one that included the memorable remarks from Board chair David Rubenstein.

(Approved by voice vote with no dissent)

EARNED DEGREE APPROVAL CONDUCTED BY ECAC ON JANUARY 7th

Socolar: I now want to report to you that ECAC has, on your behalf, approved a number of degrees earned during the fall term. At our January 7th meeting we approved the following number of degrees dated 12/30/14:

Trinity College of A & S: 76

Pratt School of Engineering: 118

Nicholas School of the Environment: 15

Fuqua School of Business: 216

Divinity School: 21

School of Law: 10

School of Medicine: 9

School of Nursing: 131

Sanford School of Public Policy: 8

Graduate School: 150

Congratulations to these graduates and if anyone is interested in details beyond those numbers you can come to the Council office.

ACADEMIC COUNCIL NOMINATING COMMITTEE FOR CHAIR FOR 2015-17

Socolar: I now call Susan Lozier, former chair of this Council, and chair of our Nominating Committee, to present the candidates for Chair of the Academic Council for the 2015-17 term.

Susan Lozier (Nicholas School of the Environment): Thank you, Josh. My first task is to thank the committee members who served with me on this nominating committee. Peter Feaver, Political Science, I'm not sure if he's here. I see George Truskey here from Biomedical Engineering; José-María Rodríguez-García from Romance Studies is here, and the last member was Elizabeth Livingston who is from the School of Medicine. My second task is to say on behalf of the committee I'm very pleased to place two names before this Council in nomination for the next AC chair. Our first nominee is Nan Jokerst. Nan is the J.A. Jones professor of Electrical and Computer Engineering in the Pratt School. Nan joined the Duke faculty in 2003 after serving on the Georgia Tech faculty for 14 years. In addition to teaching and a research interest in photonics, Nan has very extensive leadership experience and also faculty governance experience here at Duke. As for leadership experience, she's currently the Executive Director of the Shared Materials

Instrumentation Facility in the Pratt School. She recently completed a term on ECAC and she also has experience on the Academic Programs Committee. Our second nominee is Emily Klein, professor of Geology in the Nicholas School of the Environment. Emily came to Duke in 1989 after completion of her PhD studies. In addition to her teaching and her research interests in Marine Geochemistry, Emily also has a strong record in leadership and also in faculty governance. Emily was the former senior associate dean in the Nicholas School. She was the founding faculty director for the Baldwin Scholars program, which for those of you who don't know, is a leadership program for undergraduate women. Emily also has experience on ECAC. These candidates are both exceptional faculty members with exceptional service to the university. So for all of us in this room who really have a strong commitment and a strong belief in a strong governance, we owe them a thanks for their willingness to stand for election to this post. I'm confident that both would do a fabulous job. Thank you.

Socolar: Thanks, Susan, and other members of the nominating committee. And thanks very much, Nan and Emily, for agreeing to run. In terms of the election, Council members will receive an email early next month with a link to a Qualtrics survey to cast your votes. Please respond promptly because we want to announce the result at the February 19 meeting. So watch your email for that.

I also want to remind you that the process of electing Academic Council members will begin later this month. All faculty will get an email asking whether they are willing to stand for election, and in order to be included on the ballot you must opt in. I strongly encourage you to opt in yourself if

your current term ends this May and to encourage your colleagues to opt in as well. If you are worried about the competition, just encourage colleagues from a different division or school (laughter).

The next item on our agenda was to be a discussion and presentation from Mike Schoenfeld. Mike is our Vice President of Public Affairs and Government Relations. Mike oversees communications and advocacy for the university and medical center and serves as Duke's chief spokesperson, and ECAC thinks it would be good for faculty to be informed about the scope of the work his office does. As it happens, we are getting a lesson in that right now. Mike cannot be here today because he is responding to the public reaction to the announcement that Duke Chapel will hold a Muslim call to prayer on Friday afternoons. He's swamped today with emails of the type that I'm sure are not the highlight of his year. Let's wish him well and hope that we can find another time for him to talk to us about how Duke is viewed by our peers, the funding and regulatory agencies, and politicians in Raleigh and Washington, as well as the public at large. Let us also affirm our support for the acceptance within our community of the religious activities that are important to the individual lives of our students, faculty, and staff.

ACADEMIC COUNCIL DIVERSITY TASK FORCE UPDATE

Socolar: The final item on our agenda today is a presentation by the co-chairs of the Academic Council's Diversity Task Force, Nan Jokerst and Trina Jones. The task force is identifying and focusing on issues directly related to faculty recruitment, promotion, and retention, but we view this as a piece of the bigger project of establishing a truly welcoming and inclusive

environment for a diverse Duke community.

Nan Jokerst is the J. A. Jones distinguished professor of Electrical and Computer Engineering and the executive director of the Duke Shared Materials Instrumentation Facility.

Trina Jones is a professor in the Law School and is a leading legal expert on the differential treatment of same-race individuals on the basis of skin color.

I want to emphasize that their presentation today is not a report on the findings of the task force. It is instead an opportunity for Council members to hear about the way the task force is structured and the topics they have chosen to pursue. Most importantly, there will be time for questions and comments, and the task force is highly interested in any feedback you can offer that will help make the report as relevant and effective as possible.

Trina Jones (Law School/co-chair, Academic Council Diversity Task Force): Thanks, Josh. Good afternoon. I'm Trina Jones from the Law School. Nan and I are delighted to offer this update on the work of the Council's Task Force on Diversity, which we fondly refer to as the DTF. First, I'd like to acknowledge the members of the Steering Committee, whose names are listed on the slide. These individuals have worked tremendously hard on weekends, evenings, and holidays to make sure that our work is on track. I want to also underscore that these individuals come from across the university. Each of Duke's ten schools has at least one member on the Steering Committee. If Steering Committee members are present, and members of the subcommittees, would you raise your hand so that we can acknowledge you? Thanks. As Josh alluded to, in the spring of 2014 the Council created

the Diversity Task Force and charged it with articulating a vision for a diverse and inclusive Duke, examining Duke's current position in relation to that vision, and recommending actions that will move Duke towards that vision. Co-chairs of the Task Force were appointed in March, the Task Force was assembled in April, and it began its substantive work in May. Although the members of the Task Force have been working since May, we realize that some of you have limited knowledge about the DTF. So the purpose of this meeting is to provide you with an update on the structure and the work that we've been doing over the last 8 or 9 months. As Josh said, it's not to share conclusions or recommendations which we feel are too preliminary to share at this point. We'd like more time for examination, reflection, and deliberation. But we do welcome your feedback during the course of our presentation today so if you have any questions or commentary as Nan and I speak, please feel free to interrupt at any time. Consistent with its charge, the DTF is focused on understanding Duke's current status with regards to diversity and inclusion, examining best practices, both internally at Duke as well as practices that have been employed elsewhere and articulating a vision for the future which includes, at minimum, making recommendations for specific, tangible action items. We're not interested in making general recommendations like "diversity is good," or "leaders should be held accountable" or "more education is required." Rather, what we aim to do is to articulate why diversity is good, how leaders can be held accountable, where educational programs can be useful, and what types of programs have proven effective in the past. In addition to making concrete recommendations, we're interested in creating mechanisms for ongoing review of these recommendations as well as

identifying next stages in the process. Although the Council, in the spring of 2014, did not limit the scope of the Task Force, we decided early on to focus on faculty diversity. This is not because we think that student diversity and staff diversity concerns are less important. What we realized is that we had one year within which to do our work and we wanted to be thorough. We hope that the work we've done will serve as a template for future investigations and exploration of other types of diversity on campus. I'd like to talk for a minute about the DTF structure. You'll note that we have approximately 59 faculty volunteers and there are 7 subcommittees. Each subcommittee is chaired by a member of the Steering Committee and each subcommittee has a number of faculty drawn from across the university. The subcommittees were deliberately designed to be comprehensive. But note that within this broader scheme, each subcommittee has a defined task. Some focus internally on what happens at Duke. So, if you look at Subcommittee 1, it's focused on Duke's history and values. Subcommittee 3 is looking at internal Duke structures that are designed to promote diversity and inclusion. Subcommittee 7 is designed to listen to the Duke community and to hear more about how you feel about where we are with diversity and inclusion and where we're going. And then Subcommittee 4 is looking at demographic information with regards to diversity factors. What I'd like to do now, in addition to looking internally at Duke, we're also looking externally. So, if you notice Subcommittee 5 is interested in benchmarking diversity at Duke, comparing Duke to national trends. So this is comparing Duke in terms of demographic information which Nan will discuss later in this presentation. In addition to that, Subcommittee 6 is looking at best practices both internally at Duke as well as practices

that have been employed elsewhere. So what we'd like to do for the remainder of this presentation is to spend some time going through the work of the individual subcommittees. Subcommittee 1, whose primary chair is Kerry Haynie, was tasked with understanding Duke's core institutional values as expressed in the mission statement, the strategic plan, the bylaws, and other documents and statements that describe what Duke aspires to do as well as what Duke wants to be. Subcommittee 1 has also been reviewing past diversity initiatives like the Black Faculty Initiative, the Black Faculty Strategic Initiative, the Women's Initiative, and the Faculty Diversity Initiative, in order to understand how Duke has historically defined diversity and how diversity fits within Duke's institutional values. This subcommittee is not just looking to the past but it's also looking to the future. So in addition to considering issues of diversity with regards to traditional status markers like race, gender, and sexual identity, the committee is also considering things like intellectual diversity and what diversity means in the global context in which Duke operates. Subcommittee 2 was charged with examining the relative costs and benefits of diversity for Duke. The co-chairs of this committee assembled a team of interdisciplinary scholars from Duke who examined social science research regarding the effects of diversity in the university setting. The research that they looked at considered the effects with regard to the education, training, and recruitment of students, faculty research and scholarship, as well as the effects with regards to the broader campus community and our broader society. And then there's Subcommittee 3 which was tasked with understanding those internal structures at Duke that are responsible for fostering diversity and inclusion. So far, the committee has interviewed 28 individuals including Ben

Reese and all the directors in the Office for Institutional Equity, the Ombuds, the Vice Provost for Faculty Diversity and Development, the deans of the ten schools in coordination with the Provost's Faculty Diversity Standing Committee, task force members within the individual schools as well as faculty within those schools, the head of HR, the CEO of Duke Hospital, the General Counsel, and other key administrators across campus. What the subcommittee is seeking to do is to understand how these entities are promoting diversity and inclusion at Duke as well as to identify best practices and potential areas of improvement. With that, I'll turn it over to Nan.

Nan Jokerst (Electrical and Computer Engineering/co-chair, Academic Council Diversity Task Force): Thank you, Trina. So you can actually see me, I've got a lapel mic (laughter) and I'm going to stand over here. I'll be talking to you, first of all, about Subcommittee 4. Subcommittee 4 and Subcommittee 5 are focused on data. Subcommittee 4 is looking at our ten-year demographic data. And I want to start out by thanking David Jamieson-Drake and Sally (Kornbluth) for access to this data in an extremely accessible format called Tableau that they've provided to the task force. So we've been able to look at both the ten-year, and I'll show you in Subcommittee 5, data compared to other institutions that really lets us benchmark Duke as a function of time and against other institutions. So, Emily Klein is the chair of this subcommittee, and I've really enjoyed working closely with Emily, so this whole election thing is kind of interesting (laughter). I actually said, "Susan Lozier, seriously!" Because we're such good friends, you know? So, understanding the demographics diversity of the Duke Faculty, we're looking at this ten-year data, we're reviewing the faculty climate survey data in

2010, and once again I'll echo Josh. We would really like you to fill out your Faculty Satisfaction Survey because we are going to access some of that data for our report as well. Needless to say, some of this data that we're looking at is highly confidential and so we're going to be aggregating and drawing conclusions without being very specific about where particular data is coming from to preserve confidentiality. We're breaking out the data as I'll show you on a chart in just a minute, by school, division, department and by gender, race, ethnicity, and rank. So this is an example of what we get from the Tableau database. What we're able to do is query the Tableau database based on what division we're interested in looking at. Internal to that division we can look at any particular department within that division. And this applies to all of Duke, the School of Medicine and the University side. Internal to each of those, so in other words, I can put a checkmark on Pratt, and I can then look at departments within Pratt. What we can also choose by is gender, race/ethnicity, and tenure status. So this is a de-identified example. This is just an example of the kind of traces we get. It's a little hard to see but down here we start at 2004 and we go all the way to 2013. Every single one of these points is corresponding to a number out here. So for example, the blue line is the tenure track professors as a function of time and we pull back the numbers here and that would be for a specific department and anything else that we want to check. In this case, the yellow line is the tenure track associate professors, tenure track assistant is the green, and non-tenure track regular rank faculty would be the red. What we have done is we have looked at every single school and every department internal to every school and looked at the trends and tried to correlate them to events that might have occurred in those schools. As Trina

said, we have on the Steering Committee at least one representative from every school and we have 59 faculty all across many schools. So we're going and talking to those faculty and saying, "does this look about right?" Now, one interesting thing about this data is that we all self-identify who we are and what we are demographically. So, the data is only as good as what we have provided to Duke per our employment. If anybody has any questions, please raise your hand. We'd be very happy to answer questions throughout the presentation.

Helen Solterer (Romance Studies): The categories of faculty, I see that some non-regular rank are listed, for example professor of practice. Are lecturers a part of this?

Jokerst: Yes, lecturers are indeed. And we actually do have on the Task Force people who are currently lecturers at Duke and they have had a significant voice and helped us to understand what their perspective is. So we have very aggressively sought out people from all ranks to give a voice.

Dan Gauthier (Physics): Some departments take post-doctoral research associates and give them a faculty title. Have you teased out that difference?

Jokerst: If they are regular rank faculty, they are included in this data. If they are not regular rank faculty, they will not be included.

Gauthier: So some departments they are, some departments they aren't?

Jokerst: It's highly dependent upon department.

Mary Fulkerson (Divinity School): You may have said this earlier, but is sexual identity not a part of this?

Jokerst: We have no data on the LGBTQ status of the faculty. We don't gather data and, as I'll show you in the next subcommittee, we have no comparative data from the AAUDE institutions either. So at this point we perceive that this is a big hole in our understanding of the demographic data at Duke.

Nancy Allen (Vice Provost, Faculty Diversity and Development): But the current {faculty satisfaction} survey does ask that question.

Jokerst: Absolutely right, Nancy. The current survey does indeed include some questions related to this.

Roxanne Springer (Physics): Is there an option, possibly in the future, for getting more specific race/ethnicity data? Because many people identify as more than one of the subgroups identified there.

Jokerst: That's a very good question because, interestingly enough, in the AAUDE data, which I'll show you in a minute, we also have Native American and more than one race, and it turns out Duke is showing zero in both of those. That is probably a demographic, data-gathering error or lack of demographic data opportunity because other schools show non-negligible percentages in those two categories and we show zero. That must be a data anomaly. There is no way we have no greater than one race people here at Duke. I think we may not be collecting that data. I'm chairing Subcommittee 5 with Viviana Martinez-Bianchi, who is in the School of Medicine, so we've got a great mixture in this subcommittee of people from the School of Medicine and people from the University side. So there's an American Association of

Universities, it's the AAU, and we participate in the data exchange associated with AAU, so that's AAUDE, the American Association of Universities Data Exchange. That's great information for the academic side. On the medical side, we're using the American Association of Medical Colleges, AAMC, database. We're looking at data from 2012. That's the last year that we have very good data for. So we're looking down to each school, department, and division. I'll show you in a minute the kind of data we're getting from that Tableau database provided to us by David Jamieson-Drake in the Office of Institutional Research. Now, another thing we're looking at here in terms of demographics is the pipeline. How does the PhD graduating pool compare to the faculty that we have and also we're looking at customer populations. So back in Subcommittee 2, there is a correlation between customers and providers. We have customers at Duke. Some of our customers include college-bound and college students. For the Health System, it's our Health System patients and also, in general, the US population. We're looking at demographic trends for the population in the US. This is the Tableau database comparison for gender between Duke and AAU institutions. The genders are separated between blue and yellow. You can see I've attempted somewhat to cover up the actual data. I want to show you the actual format. This is the list of schools we're comparing to. The list of schools goes further down. This is just a screenshot. These are all the schools that report for this particular division and department. We have check boxes, so I've checked everything. These are all the schools that report because I've checked all the schools. We can pull out all of the departments here. So if I click on Pratt, I can pull out all of the departments. We have multiple values of race and ethnicity that we can pull out of the data and I'll show you a

race and ethnic diversity data shot in the next slide. And then we can pull out tenure status and we see male and female. So on the left will be Duke, and this is for professor, associate, assistant professor, and regular rank faculty for Duke and AAUDE. So we can compare on a percentage basis, not on a numbers basis, but on a percentage basis how Duke compares in percentage per gender to our AAUDE colleagues. This is the race and ethnicity data that we get from Tableau. I blew this up because it's impossible to see, but going across, for every one of these racial and ethnic identified groups we get a little bar chart for professor, associate, assistant, and other. Of course we can choose by tenure status, male/female, and department and by division. In many cases we have a much-reduced list of universities that we are comparing to. For example, in the Divinity School, there are only three schools that offer data that is associated with a comparative school such as the Divinity School. We can only report or look at data for at least three AAU institutions to preserve the anonymity of the individuals at that institution. So our subcategories are Asian, Black, Hispanic, Native America, White, and greater than one race. As I said, we're showing zeroes here and here, probably something that we need to address.

Harvey Cohen (Clinical Sciences): Are schools of nursing integrated into these databases?

Jokerst: We have some nursing school data. Viviana, does the AAMC database have the Nursing School?

Viviana Martinez-Bianchi (School of Medicine): No.

Jokerst: So I think we did use the AAUDE data for the Nursing School. So we have data for the Nursing School.

Cohen: That does include nursing?

Jokerst: Yes, we have data from every school and division right now.

Speaker: I don't think the AAMC data is going to reflect PT or PA data, physical therapists or physician's assistants.

Martinez-Bianchi: That's correct. The AAMC is only going to be medical.

Jokerst: However, I will say that for many of the departments through the AAUDE data, we're only seeing maybe three to five comparisons for the medical side and we wanted a lot more comparisons for the medical side. So that's why we're going to the AAMC data. But we may end up picking and choosing based on the number of comps that we have.

John French (History): How do these categories relate to the issue of foreign-born or foreign nationals? Because we don't really reflect the world there with these categories, which is an oddity.

Jokerst: Excellent question. One of the questions that has arisen as we have gone through a lot of our discussions is internationally-born faculty: are they treated differently from faculty that are born in the US, regardless of race and ethnicity? Once again, this is all based on self-reporting for these universities and for Duke. So, for example, Hispanic individuals born overseas will self-report Hispanic or self-report White as to their own preference.

French: US data has tended to, for example, North Africans, Middle Eastern and Indians

are reported as White, which then you get into an odd self-identification.

Jokerst: I completely agree with you. I actually went in and looked at a couple of departments very specifically to see. It's easier on gender than it is on race to find, honestly. I was a little surprised at the data. We all control our data. Today, you can go in and you can change your race and ethnicity. Gender might be a little questionable, but you can go into the database and in your own identification you can identify what your race and what your ethnicity is. So I agree with you completely. This is very much subject to the validity of the data. Excellent point.

Speaker: This is terrific that this task force and these committees are looking at this. You said that you encourage everybody to complete the survey. You said that it's also important for the responses to be valid, honest and accurate. And it's terrific that you're analyzing the data. But, to get honest, valid responses, the responder has to be assured of the privacy and confidentiality. So I wonder who actually sees the raw responses? Because there are only so many of us and at the raw response level these data are highly identifiable. So David Jamieson-Drake I trust implicitly to actually see the raw responses and analyze the data. I'm not sure how many more people I want to see raw responses.

Allen: That's pretty much it. It's the Institutional Research Office. It doesn't go beyond that at all.

Speaker: So when you say you look at a department or you look at data, you're looking at aggregate data?

9

Jokerst: Completely aggregated data. There is absolutely no individualized data that we have access to.

Speaker: To communicate that to faculty even more in future years would enrich the validity of the responses you get.

Jokerst: That's a very good point. Because one thing that is very clear is that people need to feel secure if we're going to get what they really think. I completely agree.

Allen: David's shop will only report if there are more than five.

Jokerst: For our comfort level, we actually think five is a little too small, so we're actually writing the report in an even more highly aggregated manner. And the Faculty Satisfaction Survey is all confidential. So it is a very small number of people on the Diversity Task Force that have access to that data.

Speaker: I trust David's office, I trust you all in using it. When I recall completing the survey, I wasn't sure who was going to see my responses. Anything you can do to communicate the confidentiality of the responses would help the survey.

Jokerst: Excellent point.

Jim Dobbins (Medical Physics & Radiology): I have a question about Hispanic or Latino identification which is really more of a cultural identity than a racial identity. I, for example, have asked these questions separately about ethnicity being Latino or not and the racial identification of a person. Is any of that on this database, or does it just show up as a major category, not broken down?

Jokerst: What they've done here in this database is they've mixed race and ethnicity. So it is impossible to report more than one. When we say more than one race, what they probably mean is race plus ethnicity but I'm showing you exactly what we see on the Tableau database. But it's a very good point and I know people at Duke who go into more than one race/ethnicity and they're zeroes here so we must be missing that. We had some very good discussions with OIE last spring about what the definition of a Hispanic is. What is the definition of African American versus the definition of Black, and there are federal definitions. And the federal definitions are what the AAUDE is using. I agree, the data is a little bit mixed. It's mixed race/ethnicity. But I'm happy to have the data, at least. All really good questions and questions many of which we asked as well. We have two more subcommittees I'd like to show you today. Subcommittee 6 is one of our most important subcommittees and that is identifying best practices because a number of recommendations are going to flow from this subcommittee. This subcommittee has done a fabulous job. They have actually interviewed people from other institutions to talk about, "Well we read about this best practice, tell us what really worked?" So they're looking at key action areas including searches and recruitments, tenure and promotions, mentoring, equity, retention, administration, and culture and climate, which is very important. So they're looking at other schools and departments, other entities such as businesses, nonprofits, what's really working out there, and then of course, we are most interested in what is actually already working at Duke. What can we transplant from this school or department into the entirety of Duke? So they did a very good job of looking at all that. This is a big subcommittee.

Ed Balleisen (History/chair, APC): I'm curious to hear a little more about where they're looking. The impulse may be to look at peer institutions when maybe a place like Maryland/ Baltimore County would be better.

Jokerst: Thea is the lead chair. Thea, could you say something?

Anathea Portier-Young (Divinity School/ co-chair, Subcommittee 6, Academic Council Diversity Task Force): I'll say something about our process at the very beginning. At our very first meeting, we invited the task force members to bring two lists with them. One of five schools that they would consider within their department or school to be the main peer institutions that they like to compare themselves to and then the other being, within their field, schools that they would identify as having made outstanding progress or having achieved really clear benchmarks or advances in terms of diversity. And those lists were often very different lists. There were a lot of surprises. Schools we would not have otherwise thought of. But we did a good bit of research on the front end to flag the places that had shown outstanding performances in the area of diversity and those were typically not Harvard, they were often schools that wouldn't be in that top list.

Speaker: I apologize if everyone knows the answer to this, but what do you mean by the climate?

Portier-Young: Climate can mean a few different things. It's sort of grouped with culture but it's not identical to culture. Culture might include shared practices, beliefs and assumptions and so forth and climate refers to, let's say someone is an underrepresented minority faculty member, or a woman faculty member or a sexual minority faculty member, how do they experience their work environment? Is it a hospitable climate? Is it a climate that promotes inclusion actively? Is it a climate in which they feel excluded or devalued? Those are the kinds of things that we would be looking at. The things that make up climate are going to come about as a result of a host of interactions, whether it's posters and art you see when you enter your building, what kinds of things are said in public remarks by administrators and leaders in faculty meetings, and what is the classroom like for that person?

Speaker: And that is distinct from what equity covers?

Portier-Young: Equity in this report, under the rubric of equity, we're very specifically looking at salary and benefits. So that's a term that is used in a few different ways in studies of diversity in the academy and elsewhere. But specifically here we're looking at salary and benefits, packages and resources.

Jokerst: Good questions. I must say, I have been so impressed with the knowledge and the dedication and the work of our subcommittee chairs and all of our task force members. They have given a lot of time and it's been wonderful to meet and to spend time with all these folks. So let's look at Subcommittee 7. Subcommittee 7, part of what we're doing today, is listening to the community. This is something very important. One of the basic things that we wanted to do with this task force was to be transparent and open and listen to the Duke community. So we undertook a variety of methodologies for letting faculty, students, staff, anybody communicate with us. And we've had communications via all of these methods. Website, email, letters, some of

which have been anonymous, town hall meetings, focus groups and informal conversations and meeting with individual faculty that requested it. So we have really attempted to listen to the Duke community and since each of you represent your school, please pass it on to your colleagues that we are still in collection mode in a big way. So if there are comments that you'd like to give us or your community would like to give us, we want to hear your comments and your input. So, what progress have we made? Well, we were authorized last February, we started last April, and we actually did a fair amount of work during the summer, interestingly enough. The old rubric of faculty taking the summer off certainly didn't apply in this case. We have a preliminary draft of subcommittee reports from six of our seven subcommittees. We're right now going through in the month of January every single one of these draft reports. The Steering Committee is reading all of the draft reports and we're commenting and redrafting each of those reports. A lot of what we're going to spend March and April doing is formulating our recommendations and we will make a final report to this Council at the May meeting. That concludes our presentation. We would really like to thank everyone, the faculty, administrators and staff who have given so generously of their time. As I said, David Jamieson-Drake and his staff and the folks at the Office of Institutional Equity. Ben, your staff have given a lot of time and have helped us with the data and we really appreciate that. We're much stronger for having had that report. So we'd like to ask you if you have any other questions or comments. And just because I know we flashed past it pretty fast, this is our organizational structure. So if you look at this and have any questions or comments related to any of these subcommittees, Trina and I and the rest of our committee members

here would love to hear them. Thank you very much.

Kathryn Andolsek (School of Medicine): I'm curious about two benchmarks. One being the student population we have and the other being Durham as a community with the richness of diversity there. So those are two possible benchmarks. In terms of other possible diverse groups, have you looked at age or ability? Particularly wheelchair-enabled individuals or others with different access. And finally looking at faculty attrition. Can we learn anything from people who leave?

Jokerst: Very good points. We do not have demographic data and trend data on many of these populations but we have tried to seek out resources based on age, physical ability, veteran status or military status, religious status. The data for many of these groups is fairly limited. But we have tried to understand the demographic trends associated with these. We do have the Health System's patient population data broken down. We do not at this point have very good data for just Durham. We have State of North Carolina data and we have US population data. The Durham data has been a little bit harder to tease out specifically. But if you have access to that data, please send me an email and I would really like to be able to access that. We have a number of people in Family and Community Medicine who have helped us a lot in trying to get some more localized data and some of them are here today.

Andolsek: And attrition?

Jokerst: We are actually really interested in attrition and retention. That data has been a little bit more difficult for us. We've been so busy that that's on our "Yes we want this" list and I don't know if that's something that

we'll be able to tease out or not. From the ten-year demographic data, we're making inferences when we see the assistant professors go down and the associate professors go up. We're making gross assumptions. We are going back to faculty in those various departments and schools and if we see some kind of big change we say, "Do you know what was going on here?" Tenure, attrition, and promotion are a little bit harder to get our hands on. I think that may be one of the things that we propose that a subsequent committee address and look at but it's something that's very high on our list.

Balleisen: This sort of piggybacks on Kathryn's question. Are you thinking about career trajectories and the pipeline that involves intake and then not just whether people stay but how they move through a career trajectory? Is that a part of what you're talking about?

Jokerst: That's part of what we're trying to get a handle on. For example there is an AAUW, American Association of University Women, 2010 report, "Why So Few?" looking at women in a leaky pipeline in STEM disciplines. So we're using some National Science Foundation data to look at that. To tell you the truth, the data is kind of sparse in some areas. For the National Science Foundation, we have pretty solid data for women and minorities in STEM, but for many of the other groups, LGBTQ, there just isn't a lot of data, period. So if anyone has any access to basically attrition of faculty as a function of time from student all the way up through more senior faculty, please send us those. For certain schools, we do have pockets of data that we're accessing but for some schools we really don't have very much data. Sandy Darity (Public Policy) was able to pull up some data that was from a research paper that was about

faculty attrition for minorities in the Social Sciences, for example. It was a 2011 paper and it was a little bit obscure but we're looking for any sources we can get. So please help us if you have sources relating to your discipline. It's something that we're really interested in but we're finding that data very limited.

Josh Sosin (Classical Studies/Libraries): I have a meta-question that piggybacks on that, I think. Does the AAUDE just serve as a broker to exchange the information or is it a potential venue for making recommendations about things that might well be collected by its members with a view to being able to say in the future, being able to speak with real knowledge to the kinds of things around which there are just gaps?

Jokerst: I think that's a very interesting idea. And I think you may have just formulated a recommendation for us.

Sosin: Other places are in the same boat as we are, just collecting data.

Jokerst: Completely. No question about that. But right now we are receivers of AAUDE and Nancy would know more.

Allen: I think there is an iterant of exchange among the schools that participate and David Jamieson-Drake and his team here have been leaders in establishing the particular survey that we use. We had originally adapted it and then expanded it into the AAUDE group. The first one we did was in 2005. We had a few comparators that came in then. In 2010, there were a number of other schools that took our survey. We were able to compare to Harvard, MIT, Northwestern and Stanford. Other schools are administering a similar basic survey that we customize with our own questions and

then David and his team go back to their annual or national meetings and talk about what might be tweaked or added or changed or deleted.

Jokerst: And that's the Faculty Satisfaction Survey.

Allen: That's the survey.

Jokerst: So if I step back and take a broader AAUDE standpoint, there may be some feedback into the type of data we gather in a broader sense in terms of demographics, LGBTQ, and some of the other aspects we're looking at: age, veteran status. We do have the data according to age as well. At this point we're really not using that but we don't have it by any other status. So were you asking about both the Faculty Satisfaction Survey and the broader question?

Sosin: Yes.

Jokerst: And did Nancy and I answer your question?

Sosin: Yes.

Mike Munger (Political Science): I'm a member of Subcommittee 4. The questions are good ones about collecting these other data but they run directly into the conflict that we face of not being able to follow individuals in any kind of panel or longitudinal data set. We can only look at aggregates. And we're trying very hard to make sure that the individuals cannot be matched or identified. There's no way to follow individual career trajectories unless we collect panel data. So there would be a whole different set of confidentiality and anonymity requirements that would have to be proposed. We would have to take an entirely different approach. It's a fine idea

but it's not because we're lazy or didn't think of it, it's because it's literally impossible and intentionally so given the data and the approach that we try to take which is to protect people's confidentiality.

Jokerst: Yes. Mike makes a really good point. The data that we do have about leaky pipeline is NSF data that NSF has collected, de-identified, and aggregated. So from a Duke standpoint, it's not clear we'll be able to do that.

Cohen: I missed the answer to the question earlier. Do we collect data on whether people are native-born or English is their second language among the faculty?

Jokerst: I'm going to say no, that is not data that we have requested. I don't know if we collect it or not. I don't remember when I signed on as a faculty member, albeit that was many ages ago, I don't remember saying if English was my first language or if I was native-born. I remember there was a US citizen category to fill out. But we have not asked for that data.

Constance Johnson (School of Nursing): Do you have access to or have you considered collecting data on salary disparities between male and female faculty members?

Jokerst: So there is going to be a salary equity survey that is being performed now through Academic Council and I think Merlise Clyde in Statistics is going to be involved in that again. It was done two years ago. So we decided to step away from the salary equity since that's being covered by another committee. But if there is a question or input that you have and you can give it to us in any of those formats, that you think we aren't looking at with that salary equity

survey, then that could be a recommendation of the Task Force.

Allen: That does not include School of Medicine or School of Nursing.

Jokerst: I didn't know that. Okay, so let's write that down.

Deb Brandon (School of Nursing): Have you gotten access to the American Colleges of Nursing Database? Because that data, of which we are a member, comes as aggregate data from all of the Schools of Nursing. That data provides pretty much a lot of what you talked about today.

Jokerst: Perfect. Do you know if that is a publically available database? Or is Duke a member?

Brandon: You have to be a member and we are a member. We as the School of Nursing have that data. You have to go through the dean.

Jokerst: Okay, we'll ask the dean. We've met with Marion Broome so we will ask her if we can access that database. Thank you. That will be a big help.

Jones: We probably should tell them about Subcommittee 8.

Jokerst: Okay. So there is the invisible 8 that is the entire Diversity Task Force. We will be making recommendations. So it's Subcommittee 8 that everybody is a member of. And don't worry, as Trina said very early on in our presentation, we do plan on making specific, actionable recommendations. Thank you so much (applause).

Socolar: Thanks very much and remember we will be hearing the final report of the

task force, this was just the preamble. We'll be hearing the report in May. So now I'm going to give you a half hour off but I'm going to get it back in April or May (laughter). But before anybody leaves, I thought, as a group, if there's anything anybody wants to bring to the attention of the Council, we rarely have a few minutes to just talk to each other and for ideas to come from the floor. So if anybody has anything on any topic that you'd like to raise, now might be a good time.

Portier-Young: I have a question that is totally unrelated to any of this. I had heard from my academic team that in the past we did a trial of Turnitin for checking papers for plagiarism and decided not to purchase the service. So I promised to raise this to you or somebody. Can we explore something along those lines again because we, at least at the Divinity School, feel like that could be a really helpful resource for us.

Socolar: That's an interesting question. I guess different schools might handle it differently but when asked in that way it becomes a question that crosses school boundaries and maybe it's for the Provost.

Sally Kornbluth (Provost): I think that's a really interesting question. I've looked at a whole bunch of these different programs and I actually routinely use one in my lab called Assignmentproof.com which is a little bit different from Turnitin. And there are institutional rates. We talked about that in vague ways but it would be interesting to know if people would really find that useful, not only for undergraduate papers but just in general where you could then have a membership, plug anything in, and run it through the system. I don't know how much it would cost for the whole university. It's worth looking into. As an individual, you pay like four bucks a paper or something

and as an individual, that volume, unless you publish really prolifically or have huge classes, it doesn't wind up to be that expensive. I think it's worth it. John (Klingensmith), you also looked at comparators for this at the Graduate School, right? Do you want to say something about it?

John Klingensmith (Cell Biology / Associate Dean, Graduate School): I would mention that what we're trying to do at DKU and the graduate programs there is that all the graduate students there would use this not as a punitive tool but as a teaching tool to help people, especially students who might not be use to the American academic system and standards, to get an idea of what we mean by plagiarism and originality and things like that. So the idea is that students would run their papers through these kinds of programs themselves, but then when they turn in the final paper, the professor would do that and then they would be expected to have a paper that's free of any indications of suspicious passages. But it actually hasn't been implemented at DKU. We're working on that this semester.

Kornbluth: And we should think about it. I mean, you looked at Assignmentproof.com as well and one thing I like about that is that it picks up paraphrasing too so a student can't run it through and just change a few words and then have it not picked up again. If it's the general sense, it tends to flag it. I think it's something worth exploring a little bit more and thinking about what the best thing to do is.

Emily Klein (Nicholas School of the Environment): Nicholas School, for its MPs, requires iThenticate, which is yet another program. And I know it's expensive.

Rochelle Schwartz-Bloom (Pharmacology): Since we're on the subject, I've been teaching my course for 30 years and over the time period I have seen things evolve in the classroom with more sophisticated forms of cheating. I have to work pretty hard to keep up and figure it out. They're getting really clever. So I know there was a survey done a few years ago by students on cheating and most of them would admit that they do it. So I just wonder if there's anything in place for training, for especially new faculty, where we could all come together. Here I am, teaching all these years and I still struggle with it. But I've never seen anything from maybe the Center for Instruction and Technology or any other kind of workshop for faculty to deal with this issue because it's always going to be there.

Socolar: Do we have anybody in the room who knows anything about that? This issue of the prevalence and forms of cheating and ways of checking into it seems to be something that we should look into and ECAC will put it on our list of things to look into. We'll try to find the right people to ask about it.

Noah Pickus (Kenan Institute / Public Policy): Josh, we have two things. Every five years Duke does a survey about cheating. The last one we did was about two years ago. It doesn't ask about those kinds of questions regarding mechanisms for checking but the last survey, for instance, showed that there was a reduction in some of the traditional kinds of cheating and an increase in cheating related to all the collaborative assignments that we give. There's a lot of confusion about that. So we have some data on that and we'll do another survey, presumably, in a couple of years that's pretty in depth. Stephen Bryan, in Student Affairs, is the person who, along

with the Honor Council, does a lot of the training, provides a lot of materials. I think it's probably fair to say part of their frustration is that some of the departments and people say, "Thanks, we care about that, but it's not really high on our agenda." So I think if folks wanted to take that on, they would embrace trying to do more training.

Socolar: My understanding is that Stephen's office is an undergraduate Student Affairs office. That it's really Trinity and Pratt students, whereas the questions that are coming up span the Divinity School, the Medical School, Masters Programs, and others.

Pickus: That's right. All this data is very undergraduate-focused. There is some graduate data but not on the same level.

Cohen: On the flip side of that, given the recent scandals at UNC, has our institution reviewed the types of issues that arose there to be sure we're not somehow slipping in……

Socolar: I'm going to defer to the Provost on that one also (laughter).

Kornbluth: I honestly can't give an in-depth answer to that at this point except what I can say is my initial reaction obviously with the UNC stuff was to call Lee Baker's office, talk to folks and I will say this. The Athletics advising and the high touch nature of the academic counseling that our Athletics department provides to the athletes make it unlikely. Having been in situations which struck me as "never say never," I will say that if we had 300-some students taking a given independent study, I am sure that would be flagged. I think that there is a lot of care given to helping our athletes excel academically and making sure that the value of the Duke education is what

we would want it to be across the board. I can't say categorically "never, never, never," but I really highly doubt it.

Cohen: It's not simply about athletes; a lot of those courses were taken by lots of non-athletes as well and were just sliding by. I'm not suggesting it's a problem here, I'm just saying you never want to find out about it afterwards.

Schwartz-Bloom: I'm on that committee, the Tutoring Committee, and we look at those data. So we're tracking how many people are taking certain courses, we know which ones are athletes, etc. David Jamieson-Drake is involved in giving us a lot of information.

Kornbluth: Let's just say there's a lot of care looking at these data and so it would have to be a very strange circumstance that something would slip through. Particularly after UNC. I can say that the heightened awareness is there.

Dennis Clements (Pediatrics/ Global Health): I would just say that I'm on the Audit Committee for the university and we get reports on that. There's a pretty thorough investigation for a number of people of a certain type in any class that they look at, particularly for the athletes. They actually get counseling every three months on all this. So it's pretty thorough, at least on the athletics side. It maybe could be enhanced on the university side.

Ben Reese (Vice President, Office of Institutional Equity): I just wanted to circle back to your opening comments about the Muslim Call to Prayer. This is an issue that potentially could have lots of leg and impact. Given social media, it could die down in a day or two or could be something really significant and go beyond all of us

endorsing freedom of religion and practice to more complex issues. So I think it's just an opportunity for us to think about how those conversations get engaged in our classes and certainly students will be talking about it. This potentially could be something that has some real national attention.

Socolar: Okay, thanks everyone. We will adjourn this meeting and I'll see you in February.