

Duke University

DURHAM
NORTH CAROLINA
27708-0928

ACADEMIC COUNCIL
012 ALLEN
BOX 90928

phone (919) 684-6447
e-mail acouncil@Duke.edu
fax (919) 684-9171

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Academic Council

Thursday, January 16, 2014

Joshua Socolar (Chair of Academic Council/Physics): Welcome, everybody, to our first meeting of 2014. I hope you all had an enjoyable and perhaps even a relaxing holiday break. As you can see from our setup here, today we have a special opportunity for discussion, and we'll get to that shortly. But I'd like to begin with a few words to honor the memory of a faculty colleague who passed away last month. Ben Ward, Professor of Philosophy, was a devoted member of our faculty, whose passion for academic life and faculty-student interaction, along with his prodigious musical talents, inspired so many students and faculty. Ben was highly invested in the Duke and Durham communities. And one small facet of his engagement was his long and exemplary service to this body as chair of our Faculty Scholars Committee, which selects the recipients of the highest award given by the faculty to undergraduates. We'll miss Ben. A memorial service will be held for him on Saturday at 3:00 PM in Duke Chapel.

Now I'd like to make some brief remarks about our agenda for the year. Last semester we handled a number of items that needed timely attention. We started in September by sharing our views about priorities for the next provost. Actually several faculty members have asked me recently about how that search is going. And I'm pleased to report that I have no idea (laughter); the Search Committee has done an excellent job of re-

specting the confidentiality of the process, or maybe I am just the last to know (laughter). In October and November, we heard proposals for five new master's degrees, one PhD, and a department name change. And in December, we discussed online education issues and heard from the Provost and Chair of the China Faculty Council about progress toward the opening of DKU. This semester we should have more time to discuss broader policy issues. There are indeed more new degree programs in the pipeline, and we will deal with them in a manner that respects the efforts of our colleagues in putting them together, but we'll also take some time to discuss the broader implications of the growth in the number of master's degrees that Duke offers. We also have an opportunity in February to hear from DKU Executive Vice Chancellor Mary Brown-Bullock about policy matters at DKU. The meeting in March will be our annual faculty meeting, which will include an address from President Brodhead. And later in the semester we will hear reports on the work done this year in UPC, APC, and GPC. If anybody has a suggestion for a topic that we should be taken up at a Council meeting, please let me know. And let me know soon because we have to plan quite a bit in advance for our agendas.

Now hopefully, our agenda for this semester will have all of you wanting more, so I need to remind you that the Council election will be held later this month and to be on the ballot

you need to opt in. So you'll get an email asking whether you are willing to stand for election, and I do hope that you'll respond positively.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES AND CANDIDATES FOR EARNED DEGREES

Now before we move to today's main event, we need to approve the minutes of our December meeting and approve degrees earned by students for the fall semester. Actually those students may view that as the main event (laughter).

May I have a motion to approve the minutes from the December 5th Council meeting?

(approved by voice vote with no dissent)

The next item is the approval of candidates for earned degrees from the fall semester. In accordance with the University Bylaws, I will call on representatives from the various schools and Trinity College for recommendations of approved candidates for various degrees. These lists will be forwarded by the Provost for approval by the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees at their meeting tomorrow.

Diplomas dated December 30, 2013
Summary by Schools and Degree

Graduate School

Dean Paula D. McClain

Doctor of Philosophy	82
Master of Science	50
Master of Arts	66
Master of Arts in German Studies	1

School of Medicine

Dean Nancy C. Andrews

Master of Health Sciences in Clinical Research	8
--	---

Doctor of Physical Therapy	1
----------------------------	---

School of Law

Dean David F. Levi

Juris Doctor	1
Master of Laws	1

Divinity School

Dean Richard Hays

Doctor of Theology	2
Master of Theology	4
Master of Divinity	5
Master of Theological Studies	1
Master of Arts in Christian Studies	1

School of Nursing

Dean Catherine Gilliss

Bachelor of Science in Nursing	63
Doctor of Nursing Practice	7
Master of Science in Nursing	45

Fuqua School of Business

Dean William Boulding

Master of Business Administration	238
-----------------------------------	-----

Nicholas School of the Environment

Dean William L. Chameides

Master of Environmental Management	7
Master of Forestry	3

Sanford School of Public Policy

Dean Kelly D. Brownell

Master of International Development Policy	9
Master of Public Policy	1

Pratt School of Engineering

Dean Thomas Katsouleas

Master of Engineering Management	65
Master of Engineering	24

Bachelor of Science in Engineering	6
------------------------------------	---

Trinity College of Arts and Sciences

Dean Laurie Patton

Bachelor of Science	35
---------------------	----

Bachelor of Arts	39
------------------	----

TOTAL	765
-------	-----

Thanks very much and congratulations to all the graduates.

COUNCIL CONVERSATION

We now have a chance to begin, or perhaps I should say re-energize, a conversation that speaks to the core of our identity as a research and educational institution. In her remarks last May to this Council, my predecessor, Susan Lozier, suggested diversity as a topic for a Council Conversation, and the present ECAC agrees wholeheartedly that now is the right time for it. We speak often at Duke of excelling in all our endeavors and of our outrageous ambition. The diversity of our community and inclusiveness of our campus culture determine our ability to excel, and also our sense of what directions are worthy of our ambition. This idea is reflected in our Mission Statement, which speaks of “promot[ing] a deep appreciation for the range of human difference and potential.” While our mission may remain relatively constant, our vision of how to fulfill it can and does change over time. 50 years ago, Martin Luther King Jr. inspired our country with his dream -- his vision for America and the world -- and that same year, the first black students were admitted to Duke. 25 years ago, this Council resolved to support a Provost’s 5-year initiative to increase the number of black faculty at Duke. The Black Faculty Initiative was followed up by a 10-year initiative, again sup-

ported by a Council resolution, that modified our approach. And that was followed, 10 years ago now, by the Faculty Diversity Initiative, which was based on two reports by faculty task forces charged by Provost Lange, and focused on the hiring and retention of women and under-represented minorities. All of these efforts have been important in moving us along, and we should pause to acknowledge and appreciate the hard work that has gone into them. But the completion of the Faculty Diversity Initiative and the imminent transition in the provost’s office make this a particularly good time for the faculty to take ownership of the continuing process. And it seems particularly appropriate to hold this Council Conversation on the eve of a Martin Luther King Day weekend. I’ve use the word “conversation” several times. We are not here to listen to a report or to parse numerical data. We are here to initiate a process that ECAC expects will result in a vision statement that can guide our routine practices as well as the development of new strategic initiatives. Whether that process should involve a Council committee and resolution, a task force appointed by the new Provost (or perhaps the President), or some other mechanism, is up for discussion. Whatever process we settle on, however, I believe that substantial input should be sought from students and staff as well as the full range of faculty across all our schools. I look forward to hearing your ideas and opinions. ECAC has invited four colleagues to speak today -- and perhaps you could come on down now. We picked them on the basis of their sustained interest in the value of diversity in academic institutions and their representation of distinct academic communities. We also considered a number of other factors, and we are keenly aware of the fact that we could not represent all of the groups and interests worthy of our collective attention, but we are delighted that they accepted our invitation to participate. We will be even

happier if their remarks lead to an extended discussion in this meeting, during the reception afterwards, and beyond. So let me just tell you who these people are. **Karla F.C. Holloway** is James B. Duke Professor of English and Professor of Law and holds a secondary faculty appointment in African & African-American Studies, a department that she has chaired. She has also served as Dean of the Humanities and Social Sciences Faculty. Professor Holloway's research and teaching focus on African American literary and cultural studies, biocultural studies, ethics, and law. She is co-founder of Duke's John Hope Franklin Center for International and Interdisciplinary Studies and was a founding co-director of the John Hope Franklin Humanities Institute. **Bill Boulding** is the Dean and J.B. Fuqua Professor of Business Administration at Duke's Fuqua School of Business. His research interests lie at the intersection of management, marketing and strategy; more specifically in evaluating how managers make decisions and how consumers respond to those decisions. In addition to his work in the dean's office, Professor Boulding has been the Area Coordinator for the Marketing faculty, Co-director of the Teradata Center for Customer Relationship Management, and the executive education Academic Program Director for both the Marketing Leadership Forum and the Advanced Management Program. **Jennifer West** recently joined the Duke faculty as the Fitzpatrick Family University Professor of Engineering in the Departments of Biomedical Engineering, Mechanical Engineering and Materials Science, Chemistry, and Cell Biology. Her research focuses on nanoparticle-based approaches to biophotonic methods of diagnosing and treating cancers, and she has founded a company to commercialize a technology developed in her lab. Professor West is also the Chair of the Pratt School of Engineering Diversity Committee. And **Kerry Haynie** is Associate Professor of Political Science and African &

African American Studies, and the Director of the Center for the Study of Race, Ethnicity, and Gender in the Social Sciences. His research focuses on the openness of political institutions to the inclusion and influence of those who previously were disenfranchised and excluded. Professor Haynie is the faculty coordinator for the Mellon Mays Undergraduate Fellowship Program, whose fundamental objective is to reduce the underrepresentation of certain minority groups on academic faculties. Thanks all of you for your willingness to step forward and get us started here. I'll pose a question to each of you, and when we've all spoken, I'll open the floor to everybody for comments and questions. So let's begin with Karla. Given the changes you have seen at Duke over the past two decades -- or more, perhaps (laughter) -- how have your own conceptions of diversity and its value evolved since the time of the first Black Faculty Initiative? What should we be aiming for now?

Karla FC Holloway (English): Thank you, Josh. And thank you for inviting me and giving me this opportunity to be in conversation with my colleagues and with you. I want to emphasize that in my long, long history (laughter) at Duke, there has never been a moment regarding an issue of diversity when there hasn't been an audience eager and interested in figuring out how to make this work. Have we made some mis-steps?--can somebody say each department go out and find one black person?--yes, certainly we have. That was the first black faculty initiative. Have we declared some equivalent of "mission accomplished" before we should have? You might review how the focus on the women's initiative so easily took the place of a focused attention on underrepresented minorities. Notice how we have sculpted such compelling narratives around complex diversities -- sexualities, politics, even our global focus -- and in some sense these have become

displacements for a focused attention on underrepresented minorities. Now none of this was done with anything other than a genuine interest in making us a better Duke. But sometimes, something like, for example, the myth of the pool problem -- and it's a myth because, as an elite institution, we should own whatever pools there are that exist -- or the difficulty in maintaining the marketplace of stars that have become our playground -- a mistake in strategy, in my judgment, and also a mistake in thinking that a contemporary fix will augur well for the long term. What I think we have not done well, on a number of fronts, faculty diversity is one of them, is to ask what impact a current policy or program or effort will have on the next Duke. I became an administrator for a short five year term. I know the motto can be "longer, Peter," but what can I say, you're the man (laughter). But I was impressed during that time how many times our choices solved the problems facing us, but was not forward facing. Frankly, we'll do just about anything to get one of you to say yes to being a chair (laughter). But we don't always look to what commitment that chair might have to the principles we say guide us -- like faculty diversity. Sometimes we don't even ask the question, we just say, "what else do you want? Please sign here." And I don't think administrators exercise the full authority they might when it comes to matters of diversity. I understand this too. It's hard out there when you talk about race. It's even easier these days to talk maybe about changes to healthcare policies -- arguably even Kunshan -- than to talk about the lingering issues regarding a structural attention to underrepresented minorities, and let me be clear, I mean black folk, First Americans, Latino and Latina populations. We are really good at integrating these populations into other diversities. But there is precedent for how we approach new policies on race and ethnicity and immutable identities -- underrepresented minorities -- in the academy

and precedent lingers. So what I've noticed the past few weeks in scrolling through Duke websites, news notes, and yes, twitter, is the one consistency in our policies is that they have come from the administration to the faculty. With appropriate acknowledgment that it is the faculty who do the substantive work in hiring, but still somebody tells us there's a new policy and we get busy trying to accommodate it. Even when it's a fiction. And now this is the moment I'm going to plug my new book, "Legal Fictions," (laughter) because it's got a great cover and a title that covers the moment -- legal fictions. Every time we were told the faculty plan for diversity was free it was a legal fiction. It was a fiction, and like law, it regulated our conduct. And in the early days, it didn't even seem that the repo man -- you all know what the repo man is, okay? -- that the repo man would catch up with us. But about ten, maybe eight years ago, somebody started counting faculty and said, "we sure have a lot of faculty at Duke, any of you folk want to retire?" And if we were of a certain age -- which in my community means you can wear purple and get some respect (laughter) -- but here means we start getting letters from our deans telling us retirement is an option for you (laughter). That is a really sweet holiday present. There were those wise faculty back in the day who warned us nothing is really free. And eventually the fiction did catch up to the fact, and it came with the requisite explanations of what a walk-down really was. They're different than a walk-about where they let you lose in the Australian outback, but it might feel the same (laughter). In consequence of the walk-downs and the mortgaged appointments almost every time that Duke faculty hired somebody like me, it meant that a few years later somebody could look at somebody like me and say, "I really like you, you've done really well here, but your being here means I can't get that position in fill-in-the-blank that the department needs now." Black faculty were never free.

The early administrations used that language, knowing then full well there was a walk-down or mortgaged retirement in the mix and eventually did share that knowledge with us on the faculty, around the same in my memory, that we attenuated the diversities that mattered to our outreach. It is absolutely true that we might not have been able to make the strides that we have without the various iterations of the plans that have come along the years. But either because we now have the experience, because we know better, or because it's a different era, or because we don't want to stigmatize faculty who have helped Duke make its way towards excellence -- in the words of at least one of my ancestors down the line, "we need our freedom." I think it is time for the Academic Council to develop a plan. One that argues for a certain number of slots that are absolutely and fully without consequence to a total faculty count, and yes, I'm calling for some boldness here. One that focuses on senior assistant and new associate professors only. Leave the stars to gravitational lensing -- I learned that word from Arlie Petters (laughter). Focus on the Duke that will be. Ask the administration to guarantee a cluster of hires -- maybe focused on fellows, Mellons or Fords or Woodrow Wilson, Presidential Fellows, Rockefellers -- we can find a way to specify. And let departments loose -- departments, thou art loosed! (laughter) to take advantage of our own intelligence in seeking out the best and the brightest. What we have are critically interested, critical knowledges and, yes my friends and colleagues, other friends and colleagues who will tell us who is moveable. And then getting up out of Duke and going visit them where they are. One of the best recruitments I made during my dean years was when I left my office and went to theirs -- it was also a warmer climate (laughter). Give us the resources and time, let us discover a cluster and then monitor and support us as we nurture these faculty, help them get grants

and tenure and establish them as faculty citizens -- put them on committees. Then maybe five or six years later, do it again. Stir, mix and repeat -- the same recipe that I used for fruitcake this year. Seriously, the Academic Council is leading this conversation because we are interested and we know how and we have the talent. It's time for the administration perhaps to receive an idea that comes from consulting the faculty, and just as we have committed ourselves to the various ideas that have come from the administration, perhaps it's time to shift the responsibility to this principle of diversity that I think we all agree -- there is data -- has made Duke better. I think we can do this. Certainly the refined narratives, sometimes with powerpoint, about diversities and cultural climates and respect and flags and the world is our oyster -- I made that one up -- these are important indices of the ways in which we have learned to accommodate and incorporate the language of diversity. Let's have a plan. Because this language has also distanced us from the goal and the focus on underrepresented minorities. Sometimes I wanted to just get folks to say those words after me -- like in the Beyonce song, Say my Name -- underrepresented minorities. They drift away too easily. Let's pull them back to the center. And then acknowledge that we are Duke. We create the pool problem for other folk. We have outrageous ambitions and the plans to match. We believe in the principles we advocate and are willing to go the distance, again and again if necessary, to achieve them. We learn from the process; we recommit to the principle. And I think it's time for that recentering, recommitment and time for the leadership to come from the faculty, and the wherewithal -- that would be the money -- to come from the administrators. Shift the paradigm; let's do this thing (applause).

Socolar: So Bill is here because he has a different perspective as dean of Fuqua and we

invited him largely on the basis of a presentation that he gave to the Board of Trustees in which he emphasized -- this was at the Academic Affairs meeting in October -- in which he emphasized the importance of establishing a culture within the institution that explicitly acknowledges the importance of what he called "collective diversity," and which I understand was a term generated by students in Fuqua. And so Bill, could you tell us about that concept and give us your perspective on it?

Bill Boulding (Dean of Fuqua School of Business): Thank you, Josh. So, it's a privilege to be a part of this conversation, which is such an important conversation. I'm still puzzling over how I got to be part of it, and all I can come up with is that when Josh heard me talk to the Board of Trustees his expectations were so low (laughter) that he gave unmerited and unwarranted weight to my comments. So what I talked about to the Board is that within the universe of business schools that Fuqua's culture is very different. And in terms of the couple of general comments that I want to make sure we get on the table during this conversation, the first one is that I firmly believe that culture is critically important in creating a positive climate of diversity and actually creating an environment where you can realize the gains from diversity. And on top of that I want to be sure that people know that if you look at research that's coming out of business schools and other academic domains that research is absolutely compelling that the highest quality and most creative ideas emerge from diverse teams of organizations. And so because of all of that Fuqua has been different. We've had a firm belief in the importance of collaboration. So we frequently say, or I say -- I should be careful about what I attribute to others -- that collaboration is the key to innovation. What is true is that the Team Fuqua concept, which is behind this concept of collaboration, has

been around for over twenty-five years within the business school. The label Team Fuqua came from Dean Tom Keller many, many years ago. He put it out there. He gave us all hats (laughter) that said "Team Fuqua." I believe that I have the only remaining hat in existence (laughter); everyone else threw them away. So that may explain why I'm here today that I buy this team stuff. And then what was so important is that the students picked it up, and they've brought real meaning to the concept of Team Fuqua and what it meant to have a collaborative team-based environment where you could in fact bring different people together to tackle challenges. What is interesting for us is that in the past few years every business school has discovered the value of collaboration, and in fact, in our world we get a formal review from our accrediting body. So last year we had three deans come in to evaluate us, and one of the explicit things that they told us was "you're not so special, you may think that you're different because of your emphasis on collaboration and this whole Team Fuqua idea, but in fact every other business school talks about collaboration and engages in collaboration in the same ways that you do." And I think that the other business schools have missed two fundamental points where we really are different. The first one is that when you have collaboration and the collaboration is across homogeneous individuals, it's not genuine collaboration. It's just having other people say the same things that you already thought. And so what's the point of that kind of collaboration? The second thing that I think they missed is that if you simply throw together diverse people it's highly unlikely that you're going to get great results just by throwing those diverse people together. And in fact, if you again look at the research and you look at where you see the big gains in productivity and performance and innovation, those big gains only emerge when you have a culture of respect for all people in

your community and good communication, a sense of belonging, and a sense of shared identity around you're all on the same team. And so what I told the Board of Trustees was look at what some of our peers have done and the Harvard Business School is typically held up as one of the very best business schools in the world. Back in October there was an article in the New York Times -- and I don't know if any of you remember seeing this -- but it was an article about the Harvard Business School and essentially highlighting the issues that they were facing around gender diversity. And that was the original focus of the article, but what the reporter discovered in exploring all the problems that Harvard was having around gender diversity was that they also had very serious issues around social class diversity as well. And so this was a very unhappy story, particularly unhappy for Harvard because it invited this reporter to write a glowing article (laughter) about how wonderful they are and how much they had accomplished in the domain in diversity. But I think that the Harvard example is a great example of, they just threw people together, they didn't actually think about the underlying culture that allows you to work together in an effective way. And so in contrast, this Team Fuqua thing has been an extremely rewarding part of being in our community, but also in all honesty, a bit frustrating. Because it turns out if you line up a hundred people from our community and you ask them, what does Team Fuqua mean? You will probably get instead of a hundred answers that all say the same thing, you will get a hundred different stories about "this is what Team Fuqua means." And so that frustration is problematic in terms of my basic thesis that you need a strong culture that supports diversity because if you don't have well-known and well-understood shared principles about what your values are that constitute your culture, it's very difficult to create the discipline around celebrating the examples of behavior

that are consistent with that culture and extinguishing the behaviors that are inconsistent with the values that you hold so dear. And so what's interesting is that we had a group of student leaders who felt like we had an opportunity to take this thing that everyone has so much pride in and make it better by actually formally articulating some principles about what Team Fuqua means. And what they did was they came up with six word pairs, and I'm not going to go through all six word pairs, but these word pairs were meant to give people a roadmap around this is what we stand for, these are our values. And now we can hold up that lens as we look at the behaviors that we see within our community. And one of those word pairs was collective diversity. And this is an incredibly important combination because it highlights the fact that we do need to work together, it's a collective effort, but that we're going to be more effective in that collective effort if we are diverse in our perspective, in our views, our experiences, and our backgrounds. And there's a lot behind this concept of collective diversity in terms of the stories that you can tell about what are the behaviors that are consistent with this notion or this principle of collective diversity. And so it means things like because you are bringing people who are different together, you have an obligation to actually represent yourself honestly and to share who you are and share your experiences. And you have an obligation to dissent if you believe something that's different from someone else. But at the same time, no matter what you're saying that may be different in terms of what other people believe, you also have an obligation to build bridges, that ultimately you have an obligation to figure out how do you find that common ground to build something that is better than what any individual could produce on their own or what twelve like-minded individuals could produce all thinking the same thing together. And so just to give you a simple example, one

of the things that we've done is -- and again, I'm going to give the credit when I say we, the students have done this -- they're now trying to celebrate examples of collective diversity and some of these other paired principles. So in the fall, they highlighted a group of people who they felt exhibited these values of collective diversity. The particular group they acknowledged was two women who were the co-leaders of a group that's called the Association of Women in Business and two men. And what had happened was these women felt like, if you're going to talk about gender issues in terms of what it means for women to be in a business school, for women to be in the workforce, you need to have men involved in that conversation. And so they created a male ambassador program, and the winners of the award were the two women who came up with the idea and the two men who stepped forward and said I want to play that role. And they've done astonishing things. They went on to articulate all the things that they had done to promote the dialogue around gender issues in the business environment within a business school. It's been a very powerful thing as a way to highlight what good behavior means and to celebrate good behavior. I also want to mention just one other paired principle before I cede the floor, which is supportive ambition. And here what's so important to me about this is supporting the culture of acknowledging that it's not all about you as an individual, it's about supporting the ambitions of others in your community. And the reason why I think this notion of supportive ambition is so important in the context of diversity is that you need to make people understand, that every member of that community understand, that they in fact do have a role on the team that you've put together. Because it turns out that when you look at the research that shows the returns to diversity that when people share the identity that they are on this team that the performance level of all members of that

community goes up in an extraordinary fashion. And so this notion of supportive ambition to my mind is an important paired principle that goes hand in hand with this notion of collective diversity. And so the last thing that I will say is that at the end of my Board presentation, a Board member asked me, "so you've talked about how Fuqua is this that and the other, what if we brought some of your students in here, some of the female students, what would they say about how women are valued or viewed within the context of the business school?" And my answer to them was, I'm not going to speak for them. They have to have their own voice in this matter. But I will tell you that the timing couldn't be better. Yesterday one of our students posted a blog, and I will just leave you with the title of the blog posting, which is "Being a Woman at Fuqua is a Beautiful Thing." And so it gives me unbelievable pride to be a part of a community where someone would say that. So, thank you (applause).

Socolar: Maybe we should invite her here sometime (laughter) to hear more about it. So Jennifer, I wonder if you could share your responses to Karla and Bill's comments in light of your understanding and observations of implicit bias in hiring and admissions processes and the particular issues that arise in the STEM fields?

Jennifer West (Pratt School of Engineering): So, I've been here at Duke for about a year and had been at Rice University for sixteen years before that and had been department chair there and had also been very involved in two initiatives there funded through NSF, one an AGEP program, which is the Alliance for Graduate Education and the Professoriate, which is focused on increasing the participation of underrepresented minorities in graduate education and the faculty ranks, and then the NSF ADVANCE program, which is focused on increasing participation

of women in the faculty ranks in STEM disciplines. And in both of those we focused a lot, not only in increasing numbers but in improving the campus climate. And it was interesting to see how much a campus climate really can change through campus leadership, through making it clear what behaviors and values are appropriate and valued by the institution and the leadership, by providing some training. So there was a lot of training, for search committees on things like implicit bias and that's something that we're all going to suffer from. For instance, when we look at implicit bias against women, women have been shown to be equally subject to these implicit biases as men are. It's not something that anyone is immune from. There were recent publications looking at how people looked at CVs where they were changing the names just between Jennifer and John, and they showed that women were just as guilty of downgrading the CV when it was with a woman's name as the men were when they were assessing the CVs. And the CV was drastically lower ranked when it came with the name Jennifer than with the name John (laughter). Same exact CV, only changed the name. And so, you know, with some training, also with training about how to interpret recommendation letters because there are a lot of issues that come up with how recommendation letters get written for female candidates and minority candidates, and some of the things that may or may not be said. And so how one can interpret some of these letters and how strongly we should look at them and not look at them. So there was a lot of training for the search committees in how to really go about narrowing down lists and getting down to the list of people you would interview and how much to put into the things that you're looking at in paper before you go and really meet these people in person. And it was amazing how much some of this relatively minor training could really change the dynamics of what was happening on campus.

And the culture on campus shifted over a ten year period very dramatically. And it was very impressive to see that. And I think that diversity isn't just something where we want to bean count and look at what the numbers are. Numbers are important for several reasons, one being when the numbers are incredibly low the sense of isolation for those individuals can profoundly impact the climate that they experience. So for the first seven years of my faculty career, I was the only woman in my department. At the time I didn't think it was such a horrible thing because I had nothing to compare it to, but then over the next ten years through hiring -- mainly search committees that I led (laughter) -- we adjusted to where we were about thirty percent women. And looking back on it, that climate changed pretty dramatically. And I became much happier with it by the end than really how it was at the beginning. And five people from my lab who have gone on to faculty positions are African American women, and talking to them about the experiences that they're having now -- all at very good institutions, like Yale, Georgia Tech, great places -- their sense of isolation is even more profound than what I experienced. Not only are they one of a very low number of women in an engineering department, but they're a minority woman. So I think that you do want to bring numbers up, not just because you want to say, "oh, we've hit some target," but because you want to make sure that people feel that they're in a place where they're not profoundly isolated and where our students feel that they have an array of potential role models and mentors. So I think that numbers are important, not just for some bean counting stake, but because of the way that they do impact the climate. So I think that we do want to pay attention to the numbers and we want to add on to that things that we can do to more broadly change the way the climate is for our faculty, for our staff, and for our students (applause).

Socolar: Thank you, Jennifer. And finally, Kerry, I wonder if you could expand a bit on the themes that have been raised from the perspective of Duke's history and relationships to the city of Durham, the state of North Carolina, our global presence, and the implications of how things have changed.

Kerry Haynie (Political Science and African & African American Studies): Thank you, Josh, and I'll try. I'm very happy that we're having this conversation, and I hope that a week from now, a month from now, and a year from now that we will look back to this conversation as a conversation about changing the conversation about diversity. And reflecting on the comments by my colleagues, Bill and Karla, in terms of the change in conversation we might insert change in climate, change in culture in the place of conversation. When we talk about diversity, conversations today generally begin with something like, what will it cost us? Karla raised this in her comments. So you start a search process and you end up with a couple of candidates and you want to be aware of and faithful to the University's stated goal of diversity and you put forth today, "what will it cost us?" even before you structure the search to think about diversity. And the walk-down money is a good example of that. And let me make one suggestion is that some of the diversity structures and institutions, well intentioned, that we've had for the last decade may have unintended negative consequences for our goals of diversity. I think the walk-down money is a good example of that. Having that money that would then walk down to deans and departments always say our budget at some point in time, has given rise to these conversations about what would it cost? And I don't think we want a conversation and a culture of diversity that begins with that, "what would that cost us?" as opposed to "how might this help us, how might

this improve us, what might we benefit from by doing this?" So paying attention to our institutional structures and the consequences of those structures on how we behave I think is extremely important. And I also speak to the administrative structure of the University as well as setting a tone or creating or contributing to the conversation, to structuring the conversation and the culture. And I will highlight two offices -- and let me be clear that I'm talking about the offices and not the individuals who occupy those offices or who have occupied them -- and that's Institutional Equity and Faculty Development and Faculty Diversity. Those are two offices that, it's unclear to me as someone who pays attention to this issue of diversity, as to how they are organized to help us achieve the goals that we have stated as our goals. It seems to me that they are seemingly designed to be reactive rather than proactive, and again, I'm talking structurally. And Karla raised a point about the faculty having a role, and I think this is a good place for the faculty to get involved in this issue. One thing that comes along with tenure is the ability to question, to challenge and to disagree and to do so with some employment security. And we need to think about the way we organize some of the administrative structure of the University as regards to the difficult issue to deal with and have these conversations, thinking about some of those structures. In terms of Duke's relationship to the city of Durham, the state of North Carolina, and more broadly to the region of the South, as we continue to globalize and we're a world class university and I'm glad that we are, but we can't forget or we shouldn't forget -- let me phrase it this way -- about where we are and how we came to be in this particular place. You know, to be at least from a state, to be from the outset as being in Durham but not of Durham or being in the South and not of the South, to ignore that history I think it dangerous. To help others see us as an institution who is in that place is

dangerous, especially given the demographic shifts that we see in the country. I was at a Mellon conference a few months ago, and if I remember the data, by 2040 forty-three percent of college-age students or some thereabouts will be black and Hispanic. And so the pool from which we will draw will be a different pool from what we're drawing from now. And so how we are viewed -- there's a story some of you have heard me tell, when I was applying for college back in 'eighty-one, my mother and father--I grew up in North Carolina down in Kannapolis--the only place that was off limits was Duke University. My mother and father explicitly said, "you're not applying to Duke." My mother said, "I'm not sending my baby to an old racist place." This is in nineteen eighty-one. It was a reputation and legacy that Duke had had. Now when I was hired here about ten years ago (laughter), my mother celebrated and rejoiced (laughter). She's a Carolina fan, so she did ask about that (laughter), but she was happy that I was here. So we have to acknowledge the good things and the positive changes that have come about, but I think we can, as Trustee [Dan] Blue said in his Founder's Day address that to recognize that it didn't just happen. These changes came about through hard work and it will take additional hard work to continue and to even improve where we are. (applause).

Socolar: Thank you. So the floor is now open for comments, questions, discussion.

Dan Gauthier (Physics): I'm interested in what you suggested about starting an initiative that we hire so many and then five years later doing it again. I always have the concern at the back of my mind that people who are hired under that initiative will feel that they were somehow set aside. Whereas what Jennifer is suggesting, really trying to change the culture of search committees, then people are brought in, diversity is changed, that's just

part of the natural process--you're not special in anyway. I'd be curious to hear both of your thoughts on the pluses and minuses of going with either approach.

Holloway: I appreciate that, Dan. I think it's a good question, and it's sort of like I am with cookies--I want both *and*. So I would not think that any initiative that we might come up with would stop an ordinary departmental hiring from including diverse populations and successfully including those populations at the same time. This is like additive, over and above. And I also appreciate the sensitivity to what does it mean to be that person who was so hired? And I think with full disclosure, folks end up figuring out whether or not they want to be that person. We actually lost a MacArthur award winner at Duke when this person found out that--it was when we used to send those forms to faculty about where your effort came from--and her effort was listed as partially coming from a then very early BFSI, Black Faculty Strategic Initiative. And rightfully she said, "I just won a genius award, why am I being hired under this?" I think there were certainly other issues there, but she didn't stay. So people make those kinds of decisions, our job is to be clear that this is our ethic; we want to support it in as many ways as we can. One of them is by a strategic initiative of whatever name and the other is by consistently monitoring good outcomes from the search process. So I'd like both *and*.

West: And along those lines, there was been some research through Howard Hughes Medical Institute that showed that if you can bring in people as a cohort, that you actually end up with better ultimate success because of the lack of the isolation.

Holloway: Yes, one of the things in that idea I had, which is very unformulated, is cluster. That nobody comes by themselves.

West: Yes, so I think that if you hired them and you scattered them so widely across campus that they weren't effectively a cluster, it wouldn't necessarily have that benefit. But if you could really have a cluster...

Holloway: That could be a rule, you get to use this source if you bring in people who will continue the interaction...

West: ...then you will see a benefit in the ultimate success of the people you brought in. So there could be a reason to do it that way.

Haynie: Josh, let me comment, and I know that Dan didn't say this at all, but I think that one should state upfront that what Karla is suggesting -- because I know Karla well -- that it doesn't mean that you lower any standard, right? So that you bring in people that Duke might hire, but you especially help to go find those people and bring them in, as opposed to...so I mean, implicit bias is often how these things are framed, you slip into thinking that you're doing something other than the standard that Duke normally would have. I don't think that's what you're suggesting. She hired me and I walked into her office, before I sat down, she said, "we don't..."

Holloway: I don't remember this. He says that I said, "we don't reduce teaching" (laughter) when he walked into the office. I know that was sort of in my head for hiring, but....(laughter)

West: One of the things we did with our advance in AGEP awards at Rice was we held an annual conference where we invited top post-docs and very senior graduate students who were minorities and women in STEM and invited them to campus for a little conference for a couple of days...

Holloway: And then you stole them? (laughter)

ter)

West: Yeah, and we did it basically a couple months before faculty hiring started so that we could kind of pre-screen them, see who we liked and show them a good time, and then start recruiting them for our faculty positions.

Peter Feaver (Political Science): I have a question with my UPC hat on, University Priorities Committee. So accepting your point that it's not helpful to frame the discussion at the outset from how are we going to pay for it, but at some point we will have to pay for it (laughter). And rather than delegating that to the administration, I wonder if there was thought from the faculty on how we would pay for it. What are the ways to pay for an initiative like you're talking about?

Socolar: Anybody?

Gauthier: I'm not sure that I'm a very good money manager, but either you've got to cut costs somewhere or bring money in. And we could consider dropping a department at the school and that'd free up thirty to forty faculty slots (laughter) across the University. That would be very painful.

Holloway: There's somebody who really feels badly about this conversation going in that direction (laughter).

Gauthier: Or the other is Duke traditionally has a relatively small number of endowed positions, and I've been pushing for years to try to see how we can increase that. And even when a full professorship is endowed here, it's really only fifty to seventy percent of the cost of that faculty member, so I would like to see more fully funded full professorships. And then they're there permanently, so then that takes on a life of its own.

Haynie: I answer this question this way, when Dick started the undergraduate financial aid initiative, I mean, that's a tough nut to crack, but he did it. I think, you know, like the saying--growing up my mother made me go to church, and one of the things that the pastor would say was, and I'll paraphrase-- where a person stores their treasure, there too you find their heart. So if this is something that we treasure, we'll find our heart and our money. It's a matter of aligning, as Peter always says, aligning our resources with our objectives. I think that's not the easiest thing, but I think it's not impossible if we think in those terms.

Lee Baker (Dean of Academic Affairs & Associate Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education): I wasn't sure, Karla, when you said we are an elite institution and we should own the pool and have cascading effects or whatever, and I think that's actually true. But Kerry, your role as the director of the Mellon Mays program, we also kind of have to create the pool too. Can you talk about our responsibility, I mean that dynamic of bringing in folks but also then turning around and creating PhDs and undergraduates who go on to other graduate programs, and it's challenging because they get sucked into businesses or the law school or medical, I mean creating faculty.

Holloway: I'll just give one example. I remember this vaguely. For some reason I was at a Ford Foundation meeting years ago, I'm sure I was representing someone who could not be there, and the heads of the various foundations that were in there would say, "we'll each create this pool of extraordinary minority and women PhDs and then we'll share them amongst the institutions." You know, Rice can hire Duke's, Duke can hire Yale's... And I don't know whatever happened to that idea because I was a one-timer at that meeting. But we do create those pools and

our offices in the grad school, Jackie Looney follows all the Mellon folks. We know who they are, where they are, and what they're doing. Those are available to us. And we know they've been vetted. And so, I don't know...

Haynie: And it's all easier said than done. I mean it's very difficult to interest students who come as undergraduates -- they often come in as pre-something: med, business -- into a career as a university professor. We all know what that means. And so part of the work that we do with this program is to introduce them to that. But it's difficult. But as Karla said, the Mellon Foundation celebrates the differences that it has made in this enterprise, and they maintain a long directory of successes of who have gone on to get their PhD, mostly in the humanities and the interpretive social sciences, and who are now on the job market. So it is, I think you raise a good point, that the focus should be not just on the hiring of faculty but the teaching of the faculty and that starts when freshman walk in the front door on campus.

Laurie Patton (Dean of the Trinity College of Arts & Sciences): I really appreciated all of your comments. Some of you know the challenges and have engaged in a long and good conversation around this question of cultural tax, which is that with underrepresented minorities and women particularly there is more asked of them, there is a constant engagement and exhaustion that sometimes results. And it's a big concern for everybody in terms of faculty resources and energy. And I was particularly struck and I would love to hear from all four of you briefly about it. Jennifer, your story, one woman in that department was a lot of cultural tax. And Bill, thinking about the Harvard article, there's a lot of effort that those women who began the critique at Harvard took on, and I think the question that we've been talking

about with certain African American faculty is how do we get everybody to own the labor in a way that doesn't, on the one hand then exclude folks who need to be part of it, on the other hand overburden folks who've already been part of it for years and years. So it'd just be really interesting to hear whether there's a generational shift, are we at a new place around that? Are there creative ideas that we can work on together that will be clumsy solutions to that really tough problem?

West: I think the problem is probably far from solved. So when you want virtually every committee to have a least one woman on it and you can count all the women in the School of Engineering on your fingers, it can be a problem. And there's a facebook group for BME women faculty nation-wide, and it's interesting there's been this debate going back and forth about committee service. And there's a group who get upset because they're asked too often to be on committees and then there's this other group who've been upset because a certain set of committees didn't have women on them. It's like, well you all can't have it both ways. You know, you either have to step up and always do them or live with it when a committee is composed of all men. It's something that just can't go both ways. But the year that I got tenure and you put your dossier together, I realized I was on seventeen university committees. As soon as my tenure letter arrived, I resigned from about twelve of them (laughter). And you know, I hadn't even really stopped to fully appreciate how out of control they'd gotten until I had to sit down and write it all down on the dossier. But it does spiral out of control sometimes. And then on top of it there are the burdens that you can't even write down, which is that when you're the only woman in the department every woman student with a problem comes to your office to cry on your shoulder. The female staff tend to come to you with their problems. You're just

the one that everyone is turning to, and none of that is something that you can put on your CV. And then, as wonderful as my husband may be, I still have a higher burden at home just because kids still want their mommies most of the time. So there are things that just are going to be inequitable, and I don't know that all of them are solvable. They get better, but they're not completely solvable.

Haynie: Laurie, one thing that I would say is that my earlier comment that how we align our resources that you reward for the work. That this work is seen to be valuable in terms of diversity and understanding whose doing it and who needs to do it. And something Jennifer said that I jotted down when she said it was that out of your lab that you invested in a number of minority women who have gone it alone. And an important part of that was that you were in the room, right? I don't know that had it been me in the room we would have gotten the same result. So it's important that presence is there sometimes. I think there's no escaping the tax sometimes. But again the University can realign its resources to line up with the actual labor that's being done. And there's financial and other kinds of resources, a whole range of resources that we have at the University that can be easily aligned to meet that labor. Because it is important who's sitting in those rooms when decisions are made or applications are being reviewed and the like. And another thing about it too, it's work that many of us are passionate about doing. Sometimes we're taken advantage of because administrators know that we're passionate about doing it, and that we won't say no for fear that there will be nobody in the room when that discussion is taking place. So they have you over a barrel so that you have to say yes if you care about the issue. There are ways that the institution can recognize something.

Socolar: For the record Kerry, you could

have turned me down (laughter).

Boulding: There's no question that there is an explicit tax that is imposed, and I agree with Kerry that you have to have administrators and deans and so on and so forth who are very sensitive to the importance of those resources, so it doesn't end up being an added burden on top of a bunch of other expectations. The other thing that you started to touch on some of the hidden taxes, and I've been unfairly briefed by one of our faculty members; Gráinne Fitzsimons knows all this stuff here. There's a notion of threat in the air for minorities and women in terms of this notion that they're worrying about the threat of confirming expectations that are associated with stereotypes and that managing those expectations is just an extra burden that people are thinking about that is a tax on your time, and your effort, and your cognitive capacity. And so that's a more insidious tax, which comes back to, I think, the importance of the cultural environment where you have a much more open environment so that that kind of hidden threat in the air is something that can be more openly discussed and dispersed.

Kathy Franz (Chemistry/ECAC member): I wanted to get back to Laurie's point and these responses were excellent and very, very on point. And part of the answer, I think, to getting there is very tied into the implicit bias that Jennifer talked about and changing the culture. Because we can represent constituencies that we don't look like if we start having that empathy and knowing where it comes from. And it does hit every core principle that we have from writing letters of recommendation for our students who become the pool, to nominating our faculty colleagues for accolades and awards, to assembling the committees in our departments and programs and at the whole university level to do the work. And we shouldn't have to have a

representative from every constituency to make sure that their points are heard if we start to really embrace and understand and own and admit implicit bias. And the other point I'll say about that is so I've been here for about ten years, and I have seen some changes and certainly the work from Ben Reese's office with doing some training for search committees about implicit bias is a step in that direction. But I really do feel like it's time, and I think you will all agree, that as the faculty we need to own it and do it at every level, not just the faculty search level. And that when that attitude changes, the culture around a search committee, for example, is not top down we need to fill the numbers for the dean, but this is why it's important for our excellence, and that's what builds talking about collective diversity, and supportive ambition is tied to that. And I've seen that happen in our own department, and it absolutely gets us to excellence whereas it really didn't work when it's the other way around. So understanding and training and taking that, I think, is a part to get to what you're talking about at minimizing that tax.

Holloway: That tax gets reduced when it's shared. And one of the changes I've noticed at Duke as well is that this conversation no longer needs to be owned by someone who looks like the constituency we're talking about. It's slow, but it makes more sense now that it did five, ten, fifteen years ago. And to continually emphasize that, I think gets us to this place of supporting each other's ambitions as well as the kind of collective diversity where I don't need to worry what's being said in the room because somebody who looks like me is not in there. And that's where I take collective diversity to mean owning each other's identities as well or the things that come up around identity politics.

Franz: It is slow, but we love scholarship here. And the scholarship and the research

are strong, I mean, it's done. So, it's slow, but now we can look at that scholarship and say "oh, we need to get up to speed quickly because the data is out there." We know the results, so it doesn't have to be that slow.

Holloway: I agree with you.

Dennis Clements (Pediatrics & Global Health/ECAC member): I do think that there are generational differences. I find the younger students I work with now have much less problems because there's, I think it's the implicit part that they have less issues with. But I don't think we have thirty years to wait for them to take over (laughter). So the real question to me is how we move from where they are to where we can be helping move this along. And like you say, I think very few people would do anything on purpose, it's just that you can't know what you don't know. And so it's a matter of somehow getting the message across in what you're talking about.

Gráinne Fitzsimons (Fuqua): So to me pairing is huge and so important, so I don't want this to come across as a "but," it's definitely an "and." But I'd also like to see discussion of an initiative to support the incredible talent that we do have. There's a lot of work in my field on the difficulty of being a lone member of a group and the extra challenge that Bill was talking about. And, you know, we have some of these brilliant people around the University who are feeling isolated, and I don't know if such a thing already exists, but I'd like to see an initiative about what can we do to increase a sense of belonging, to get people --because we have a lot of motivated people around the University -- to get people involved in reaching out and making connections and making sure that people feel that they really belong at Duke and that we really value them at Duke and that we don't lose people, right? I'm sure there are lots of rea-

sons why that person left, but we don't want to lose people who are winning MacArthur genius awards for cultural reasons, you know? We want the culture here to do everything we can to keep them and help them thrive and make sure they get tenure. And so I'd like to see a two-pronged approach. We've got to bring people in, more of them clearly, but then we've got to make sure that we're doing everything we can to support them.

Holloway: I think that's so important. One of the things I got to say as dean was that, unlike other institutions, we don't bring people in as assistant professors and only have a certain number of you that we're going to keep around. Our job is to nurture your development and your success so that you do get tenure. And I do think that we can work much more visibly in that regard. I think it happens, and I think that there are some folk who just don't know or believe it happens because the academic culture around tenure is so disabling, especially for women and minorities. If we are doing something differently at Duke, we'd better claim it loudly and visibly so that people can depend that this is a place where our administrative job is to get you to the next step.

Haynie: That was my point about being proactive too. And the few who are being reflexive and reactive all the time make it hard to, again, be proactive.

West: And as far as the cost of any initiative, if you have to keep hiring people, but then you just lose them, the cost is going to be astronomical. You can make an investment and you have those people then for decades, it starts being cost effective.

Boulding: So I think that in terms of talking about your culture, it's not just having the principles that establish guidelines for behavior, it's also being able to talk about your cul-

ture in a way that lets people know that it is an inviting, warm, inclusive environment. And so, it's both your ability to attract people in and then create an environment that supports all the individuals who have been welcomed into that community. It comes back to, you really have to know how to describe the place that you're in.

Tolly Boatwright (Classical Studies): Your last remark, Bill, was very much what I was going to say. I really welcome having this Council Conversation because we've been speaking about initiatives, but really it behooves each and every one of us here at Duke to have trust in our colleagues, to support them in their diversity, but to build something that is collaborative. So, as you said, we can hire people and they can go. I think that, I just like very much having the Academic Council thinking about it as coming from the faculty and us working with one another, whether we're on a committee or heading a committee or just in the trenches.

Holloway: That could be the critical difference, coming from the faculty.

Socolar: So I would like before we close here, I'd like to come back to Karla's suggestion that the Council is perhaps the right place for this conversation to be carried forward and for something to emerge that would propel the process towards whatever initiative is going to come next. I don't remember your exact words Karla, I think you said that we should call for a plan of some sort. And I am wondering what people here think about how to do that, whether ECAC should appoint a committee of this Council, whether there would be people willing to serve on that committee and develop some kind of vision statement or resolution that we'd like to bring forward. Or whether people think there are other ideas. I would like people to be thinking about that and communicating with

me and with ECAC about it. If anybody has ideas about that right now, I'd love to hear them. (pause) Okay, well thanks. My email inbox is open (laughter). Well thanks to all four of you very much (applause). And now I would like to invite everybody to stay for the reception and continue the conversation.