Minutes of the Meeting of the Academic Council held in person and via Zoom
Thursday, October 21, 2021

Erika Weinthal (Chair, Academic Council / Nicholas School of the Environment): Welcome everyone and thank you for being here today both in person and on the screen. I have to say, it is great to see so many people in the room and see faces that I haven't seen in months and over a year. President Price regrets his absence today, but he is traveling for Duke and is unable to be here either in person or on Zoom.

As we begin, I have a few reminders. After we hear the Provost's presentation today, we will turn to the Q&A and we will revert to prior protocol. Please be sure to say your name and department or school when you raise your hand. This helps us when we transcribe the minutes. For those of you who are in the room, you should see attendance sheets being circulated. Just initialize, as we once did a year and a half ago. For those of you on Zoom, Mariah or Sandra will take down your name from the screen.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 23 ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

Weinthal: We will begin with the first order of business today, which is the approval of the September 23ʳᵈ meeting minutes. These were posted with today's agenda. Are there any corrections to the minutes?

[Minutes approved by voice vote without dissent]

I'd like to also add, in terms of our last meeting in September, I received a number of emails following the meeting from colleagues across Duke sharing how much they really enjoyed the presentation on Duke's COVID modeling approach. Again, I'd like to thank Doctors Tom Denny and Cam Wolfe -- and Professor Steve Haase and Vice President Kyle Cavanaugh for sharing the background and data that goes into helping us manage the pandemic. For those of you who want to go back and watch the presentation, it is on the Academic Council's YouTube channel or under the Council Corner tab on the website. You can also watch all of last year's presentations as well.

With that, we will move to our sole agenda item for today, which is a presentation from Provost Kornbluth regarding the faculty survey. This is a survey that is conducted every five years and goes out to all regular-rank faculty at Duke. I'd like to turn it over to Provost Kornbluth.

PRESENTATION FROM PROVOST KORNBLUTH REGARDING THE 2020 FACULTY SURVEY

Slides used in presentation

Sally Kornbluth (Provost): Thank you very much. Also, nice to see almost half of you, from the upper nose up, in person. As Erika just said, this is a survey that is given every five years. So, if you've been here awhile and seen the reports a few times. This particular version was administered between October 2nd and November 8th of 2020, just in the height of the pandemic. But, in terms of the questions, they were largely similar to last time, although there were some additions. I really want thank David Jamieson-Drake, who's here, and his team for putting together and administering the survey. Our response rate was quite good. It was 62.5% with a demographic profile that is almost identical to the demographic profile of the population of the faculty. I think the results are robust. One other comment about the data I'm going to be presenting. There is some breakout data in schools, but mostly aggregated across the whole university. Obviously, that can wash out some results or lead to sort of misleading impressions in terms of the results. But, David's team has prepared sort of the equivalent data for the schools. They will be shared with the Deans, who I assume will share it with the faculty. You should be able to see the breakout data for your own units. Once you get down to various small units, like small departments, it becomes difficult because we don't want to have individuals identifiable from the survey data.

The survey had a huge amount of data, but the things I'm going to be presenting today are really an overview of some of the key findings. I'm happy to discuss or answer any questions, as are others here who know about this.

Overall satisfaction – we're going to talk about satisfaction in different areas in the university. You'll see some trends over time. I mentioned that this survey has been given every five years. We do some comparisons from 2010 to 2015 to 2020, so you can see how things are advancing. We got questions and answers around diversity, equity, and inclusion; shared values; and retention. In the last three of these some of these questions are new since the previous surveys. So, we don't always have longitudinal data but I think you'll still get an idea of the status of things at the moment.

Let's start with overall satisfaction. Overall satisfaction remains high across all ranks and schools. In other words, overall satisfaction within the role of faculty in the university. Faculty are most satisfied with the quality of the students, intellectual stimulation, and library resources. Faculty are most dissatisfied with, not very surprising, startup funds; time for scholarly work; and salary. So obviously, time and money, sometimes space are always perennial unfavorites. I'll give you a little bit of granular data around some of this. What you are seeing here, *(Refers to slide)* the bars are the percentage responding in each response category. It's centered on the middle of the range of the middle response category, which is neither dissatisfied or satisfied. And the dot that you see is the mean response. That just gives us an ability to make easy comparisons. You can see a few things, first of all, the overall satisfaction is fairly good. It's been fairly consistent over time. There's actually some drop in 2015 that has recovered, but how significant that is, I don't know. But it basically returned to pretty much historic averages. These averages have been fairly consistent over time with

2

respect to overall satisfaction of the faculty. Now, you can then break that down further, either by divisions in arts and sciences, or by schools. There's some variability with arts and sciences, law, and nursing. Slightly ahead in some cases with Nicholas, and the UICs slightly behind. I will mention that if a faculty member is in a UIC and a school they only answered for one. So, it depends on where their primary affiliation is. We do have regular rank, non tenure track faculty members, whose only academic appointment is in the UIC. This just gives you a general gist. And the question is, what is it faculty found to be good or bad?

(Refers to slide)

This comparison, we broke out nonclinical faculty and clinical faculty because we've seen over time there's some different concerns. Basically, as you can see, the nonclinical faculty were really happy with the quality of undergraduate students, the library resources, as I mentioned, and intellectual stimulation of the work. Obviously, office space can be very variable. And the graduate and professional student quality and teaching responsibilities. The clinical faculty, somewhat variable but about the same, including obviously the ability to give good clinical care. And so, these levels of satisfaction are somewhat or very satisfied. So, what are faculty not as happy about? These are areas where the faculty were either somewhat or very dissatisfied. Again, non-clinical time, space for postdocs and graduate students, salaries, startup, classroom space, committee and administrative responsibilities. I always like that the clinical has the quality of dining options. So, I think the answer there is to eat at the Brodhead and not in the hospital

cafeteria. *(laughter)* But, they also are interested in startup funds, time for work, etc. Again, if you look back over time, these are sort of the perennial favorites. These are the areas. But we'd have to really do a careful point for point comparison to see how much it's moved down.

This is a complicated slide. So, concerns overall with the quality of mentoring of faculty prompted the addition of specific mentoring questions to the survey. This began in 2010. Compared to 2010, the 2020 results show higher satisfaction with mentoring across all of the ranks. But, a significant percentage is still hovering at 50% or lower, really thought they had adequate mentoring. There's one really interesting thing here, that actually got pointed out in ECAC, which is if you look at the not applicable rank column, the percentage of faculty who are full professors who thought it was not applicable was higher in 2010 than in 2020. We've talked a lot about mentoring, but I think now more full professors are even realizing that they can still use various forms of mentoring. And so, I think it's become applicable to more individuals.

Let's look at research support. This really has to do both with financial resources, but also again, time, startup funds, support for securing grants, etc. We are getting better over time, I think, in all of these things. It's slow progress, but it's also likely, I have to say, that an impact on this is our assistant professors are getting better and better startups, so they kind of figure into it. If you compare the sort of magnitude of startups that some of us got like twenty-five years ago, they were competitive, but maybe not super competitive. And I think we've really put a

lot more effort into trying to make those kinds of investments. That's sort of the general infrastructure, nuts and bolts kinds of things. The question then, is if we look really specifically at this, and this really speaks to the environment in which faculty are doing their scholarship and teaching. If we look at diversity, equity, and inclusion - it's kind of interesting and I think we're going to want to discuss this data after I go through the presentation, which is compared to 2015 a larger percentage of faculty reports that the commitment to diversity is demonstrated in their department or unit. So, the institution, the schools, or the departments are committed to this. However, *"minority and female faculty are less likely to agree that the climate and opportunities in their department and units are equal."* There have been push in diversity, but still a perception of inequality. And *"minority and female faculty are more likely to agree that they have to work harder to be perceived as legitimate scholars."* Now one interesting thing here, is you can talk about, and as you'll see in the slides in a minute, the commitment to diversity. There was not a specific question about commitment to inclusion, which is obviously not quite the same thing. So, if you look here, *(Refers to slide)* *"commitment to diversity is demonstrated in my department or unit and somewhat or strongly agree."* I think you can see that we've had an increase between 2015 and 2020. Obviously, there is variability from demographic group to demographic group, but in both minority and majority groups, there has been a perception that there really is a commitment to diversifying the environment.

Now, if you look though, at the climate, which speaks not only to diversity but to inclusion. We look at the statement *"I feel that climate and opportunities for minority or faculty in my department or unit are as at least as good for those of non-minority faculty."* So, despite our efforts to really diversify, and I also think to build a more inclusive environment, there are still clearly issues with belonging and inclusion. Asian females are the only group that showed some gains in perceived employment opportunities being as good as for non-minority faculty. This is most pronounced among Black faculty of both genders and Hispanic females. And I would note, that even white faculty know that minority colleagues have lost ground with respect to climate and opportunities. I think this is a finding that flies in the face of a lot of the efforts we're making, and I really would like to discuss that at the end, if folks are interested.

(Refers to slide)

"I feel that the climate and opportunities for female faculty in my department or unit are at least as good as those for male faculty." There are small differences in perception among groups here over time. Similar to 2015, the males in general perceive more gender equity than females. Again, that's not very shocking, but brushing under 50 percent is not obviously, a robust feeling of equity among the female faculty.

This is really a perception of how people feel as scholars in the department. *"I have to work harder than some of my colleagues to be perceived as a legitimate scholar."* This is particularly problematic for Black and Hispanic faculty members. Again, the biggest

4

discrepancies are for Black and Hispanic female faculty. We've seen a small improvement, or at least not a worsening for Asian faculty and even among Caucasian faculty. We do see a discrepancy between males and females here.

By the way, we can make these slides available on the Academic Council website if people want to get a chance to scrutinize them. I know I'm flipping through them very quickly.

So that's really the slate of questions that were directed towards diversity, equity, and inclusion. There's a slightly different addition that was added this year, which has to do with shared values. Related, obviously, to belonging and inclusion, but a little bit different. Basically, ***"minority and female faculty are less likely to agree that the shared values of trust and inclusion are reflected in their department or unit."*** They're also less likely to agree that the academic leadership in their department effectively addresses unprofessional behavior among faculty. And that perceptions of the effectiveness of the school or academic leadership in defending shared values varies by school. When schools drill into their individual school data that will become more clear.

This is a little bit of a busy slide, but there are a couple of interesting things to note here. We're asking ***"to what extent your departmental culture reflects the following Duke shared values?"*** As I mentioned, we have respect, trust, inclusion, but also discovery and excellence. So, aside from the fact that males consistently seem to better feel that the culture reflects values of respect, trust, and inclusion than do females, you'll

note that the respect, trust, and inclusion questions and responses essentially track together. We do better, overall, with discovery and excellence. But again, this came out when I was discussing with ECAC, these are our bread and butter as an academic institution. If we're not doing well in discovery and excellence, there's a really big problem and to some extent the other values remain aspirational for some portion of our population. I think this is extremely important as we reflect on the results of this survey.

In the next slide, there are statements given and we're asking the percent of someone who strongly agree. You will notice that Black faculty, again, are less likely to believe that the culture reflects Duke shared values. And they were also less likely to believe that ***"academic leadership could effectively address the situation would it be violated."*** So, those who are experiencing a negative environment do not feel that in many cases that these problems are adequately addressed. Here, this, again, is a percentage – ***"I agree somewhat or strongly agree the academic leadership of my school effectively addresses the situations when institutional values are challenged or the academic leadership of my school effectively addresses unprofessional behavior among the faculty."*** Note that unprofessional behavior among the faculty appears to be less effectively address then overall challenges to abstract, if you will, institutional values. The issue though is in the survey there's some underlying variables here that can influence the results in any individual units. Namely the gender or demographic distribution in the schools, the rank distribution in the schools, hiring distribution, etc. So, to some extent there's a reflection of past

5

difficulties too. There were schools, that I won't go into the details here but I will say, if you asked them five years ago you might have gotten a very different answer to what you see now. That's the value of getting a snapshot, but I think in some cases the schools have effectively addressed issues from previous years. And so, we see increases in percentage in some of those schools when we look back. Well, this exact question wasn't asked, but when we look at the sort of general tone in the school, it's improved.

Another question, obviously, is when we look at the survey one of our big interests is when our faculty are happy and whether they're likely to stay here. And if they were going to choose a university to go to again, would they choose Duke? So overall in deciding again, most faculty would choose to come to Duke, and not surprisingly, the percentage increases with rank. Because first of all, they have stayed here and obviously they have more security. In deciding all over again Black and Hispanic faculty are more likely to have second thoughts or choose not to come to Duke. And again, potential reasons for leaving did vary by rank, but salary tops the list for all ranks. And there are places that obviously offer much higher salary and we often see that in our retention bargaining. So, the data that underlies what I just was talking about, *"I would choose to come to Duke, I would have second thoughts, I would choose not to come to Duke."* You know, overall, the percentages of folks who would not come to Duke is sort of gratifyingly low, but again, you see some differences. Higher in Black females, in particular, Asian females and Hispanic males. It would still be good to know more and often we try to do exit interviews with folks who we are not able to retain. And in

some cases, in some units, it does shed light on environments that are less unwelcoming for individuals.

The next slide is *"to what extent have you considered the following is a reason to leave Duke?"* These are faculty that are still here, obviously, so these reasons have not yet been compelling enough for them to go, but you can see that increasing salary, finding a more supportive work environment, sometimes teaching moods can vary quite a bit from institution to institution, reducing stress, etc. There were some responses, a very low number of responses, including retirement, to lower cost of living, to enhance your careers in other ways.

(Refers to slide)

And finally, this is an array that is very nice, which basically, if you have an open-ended question, *"what keeps you at Duke?"* it varies in rank between one and ten from different ranks of the professoriate to colleagues. So, you can all feel good that you all like each other across the board or the number one response. *(laughter)* There's a couple of anomalies, like assistant professors, rank students as number 10. *(laugher)* I'm not sure why that is. But other than that, there's not huge discrepancies or anything very surprising between the ranks.

So, that is like the whirlwind tour overview of all of the data. There was a huge amount of data. As I said, we have school specific data, but I think, David, there's also ways for folks to dig in more deeply to the data and tableau the raw data. We can talk about that further. But I'd like to open up to discussion and the questions I'm happy to answer or others

here, but also just reflections on the data and what you think they mean.

Trina Jones (Law School): Can you define Hispanic for us? Is that an ethnic group or is it a racial category?

David Jamieson-Drake (Assistant Vice Provost and Director of Institutional Research): That's from the HR files. I believe it's an ethnic group for federal guidelines.

Jones: So, does that include people who identify as Asian and Black as well as White in that category for our purposes?

Jamieson-Drake: Correct. If one identifies ethnicity as Hispanic plus anything else, they're categorized as Hispanic.

Jones: I'd like to follow up on the information about diversity, and equity. I saw some of this data on another university committee. In the climate part of the survey, Black faculty reported worse results on every question than any other group and I'm really curious about what the university's strategy is about these kinds of issues. Do we have an overall university strategy not limited to specific schools where we're addressing that particular concern? And the larger concern that these data revealed with regard to women and diversity?

Kornbluth: Absolutely. Let me back up before we talk a little bit about the kinds of things, we might be doing to what's underlying these results. Because I'm thinking about the contrast between people knowing there's a greater commitment to diversity and possibly inclusion that I don't know. But certainly,

I can tell you from the central administration this is something we've been serious about, but not having the impact we would like. And the question is, is it a lagging indicator? And are we going to see some change in the survey? That I don't know. I don't think the pandemic would impact that. Or is it really our measures we're taking are not working? In other words, it's the wrong remedy for the disease. In other words, we're throwing activity at it and is it not the right activity? The other thing is the heterogeneity of the units. Obviously, good things will get washed out as well as bad things. But we really need to see if there are units, looking through these data, are there units that are really doing this right. In other words, folks feel better about the environment or not. And so that's another thing to think about in terms of going forward. To see if there are any model units or not; or we all kind of in the same place. And the other question I have is, because of our rhetoric and aspirations, we've been talking seriously about this and I think we have appropriately raised expectations, the question is, are we in a way falling even shorter of what, because of the expectations and the rhetoric we've given around this topic? So, we have to think about that. But in terms of what we're doing - I think, aside from the climate survey, I feel like there are indicators that we're moving the needle. First of all, our recruitment of Black faculty has been excellent this year and our retention has been much better. So, over the last four years the number of Black faculty, on the campus side at least, has increased from 67 in the fall of 2017 to 90 in the fall of 2021. That's an overall increase in the population from 5.9% to 7%. That's not enough. We're also winning, and I don't have the numbers here, but we're

winning a lot more retention battles with minority faculty. There's some objective data to suggest at least we're increasing the diversity inclusion. The question on inclusion - I'm a little bit stymied on what to do with the units? I honestly think a lot of this is very local. And the question is, and I'd love a discussion of this, how do you move the needle? So unfortunately, one or two, and I will say also in other harassment sort of surveys we did, the perception is that faculty treatment of faculty underlies a lot of the problems in the units. And so, the question is, are there units where one or two individuals who do not belong to an inclusive environment, are not interested in an inclusive environment, whether that's influencing the data? In other words, if you're in a unit that makes you very unhappy because of a number of individuals either targeting or bullying or just not including the minority individuals that are impacting it. We're trying very hard through Abbas's office, through Kim's office, to really expand the educational offerings. And I will say we are seeing a continuous uptake of faculty with interest in these topics and would really wanting to. I don't want to call them training because they're workshops, they're discussions, etc. We are trying to focus energy in the process of the promotion of tenure. We had a discussion yesterday and we will be encouraging people to be able to make statements about, if you will, what the service tax for minorities and women who really end up doing a disproportionate amount of service. We want people to reflect on their intellectual development statement and in their teaching statements on how they're encouraging a more diverse and inclusive environment. So, we're trying to shine an institutional light on these being important for our overall environment.

We've had a lot of success, I will say, and we heard this from recent recruits, this is one of the reasons they want to come to Duke, is support for organic faculty grown activities like the Black Think Tank, like the writing group that's led by Tyson Brown and Sarah Gaither. That one way to compensate for maybe less than ideal environments, for some individuals, is also create a university wide belonging through organizations. I think, Abbas, you're doing another round of these where faculty can propose activities, etc. But we're trying to elevate scholars of color. As you'll see at the next meeting, we've done the first ever survey that addresses staff concerns, which we'll have to develop an action plan for. Abbas, I don't know if I've left anything out that you want to speak to.

Abbas Benmamoun (Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement): Just a few things to share with you. On the faculty side, that's something we launched when we started the office in 2017. So, we had over 27 faculty, 15% of them black faculty. And that has really helped to move the needle on the numbers to 7%. It's still not where we should be, but we are making progress on that. Now, that program is a complimented with training for search committees. I was just looking at the numbers the other day. When we started this over three years ago, we had like, you know, small uptake, 20 or 30 per year. So far this fall, we are at 130 and we're expecting another 50 people. By the end of the year we have added 60 members of the search committees to go into training. Now, in terms of building community, because I think a lot of these things that you see in terms of climate are because of what's happening at the unit level, at the department level. That's where the challenges are. We are working with some

8

groups to create some affinity groups at the campus level to create a sense of community for faculty. But that cannot be the only one. For example, Sarah Gaither and Tyson Brown have one that is a really successful group. We are working with the Latinx faculty now on setting up a group for Latinx faculty this year. But it really depends on the training for APT have started doing that every year because I sit on the APT committee. So, every year at the beginning before we start discussing dossiers. Over biases that we see in dossiers. For example, how would you evaluate scholarship biases that you see in the letters in terms of language or perception of particular fields? We know that there is research, for example, on research on minority communities, that research sometimes in some disciplines is seen as niche or peripheral. It's provided perspective, not advancing theoretical debates and things of that nature. So, these are the conversations we have in APT committees before we start discussing the process. And we have seen really, to give credit, to the APT committee, they have been very intentional about this. We have seen situations where colleagues at the unit level, are not really as appreciative of the work of their colleagues, particularly underrepresented faculty. And then APT committee takes a different kind of look at it and say that's probably not a fair assessment of the faculty research. So, these are some of the things that we are doing. And there are other things, such as deep dives, for example, Sherilynn Black has been offering a course, on cultural awareness - how to work with students from different backgrounds. We are moving beyond that kind of workshop, but it's more like into deep dives into the issues. But frankly, the only thing that is going to move the needle in a significant

way is work at the ground level where we need to help our Chairs and we need to help the faculty, you, all of us as faculty here, because a lot of the issues that we see, it's really faculty not treating other faculty well. It is how they evaluate the scholarship when it comes to promotion and tenure, how they treat them, whether the faculty feel that they have a voice. A lot of these things that you see here, I can guarantee you when you dig deeper into the unit you are going to see too many of them are not tenure system faculty. They don't have a voice in their departments, that they are not treated well by the tenure system faculty. But, we have a role to play in how we conduct ourselves with each other, how we govern our units, how we treat each other. But I think this, for us to make progress on this it has to be a multifaceted approach. It is a role for us. We need to own this problem. I am, as head of faculty advancement, that I share some of this responsibility here, but Sally, the leadership, but also deans and chairs and us here, faculty.

Dalia Patino-Echeverri (Nicholas School of the Environment): I wonder if there is any ongoing efforts attempting to find correlations between the results of this survey and some objective metrics of departments? I'm thinking, for example, correlations between faculty satisfaction and the number of the students from different levels or faculty satisfaction and school administrative structure, number of supportive personnel, budget, etc.

Kornbluth: That's a really interesting idea. It's not something that we take on, but I think it would be a really good idea because if I had to wager, I would say that those correlations are real, maybe not with budget, but faculty satisfaction and student participation. I mean, I've seen,

you know, we often have a review of graduate programs, have private interviews with students as well. And there is actually a remarkable correlation between how the graduate students are perceiving their experience and how the faculty treat each other and the students. I would be very surprised, you know students vote with their feet and some of the other, you know, the other parameters that you mentioned. So, I think that's a great idea.

Victoria Szabo (Art, Art History, and Visual Studies): I was wondering if there was any analysis done on the tenure track versus non tenure track faculty. And this also addresses a little bit what Abbas was just saying, how can we parse out some of these differences that we're seeing?

Kornbluth: The data exists. I don't know that we've had that plotted out. David, has that been actually generated as a separate report?

Jamieson-Drake: Not as a separate report, but within reports we have shown tenure track versus non-tenure track results.

Kornbluth: So, we do have those results and they'll be available through the schools. We can provide that.

Monaj Mohanan (Sanford School of Public Policy): The last slide you showed us that was really insightful. I know we laughed at the humor of the assistant professors complaining, but it made me really think, do we have information about how many of our assistant professors are required to teach core courses that are likely to be much more difficult and frankly, would leave them with that kind of a negative opinion

versus senior faculty members who are able to negotiate their way out of teaching some of those?

Kornbluth: So, we don't have those data centrally. Those would definitely be something that would be variable from school to school and actually different schools and indeed even different majors or departments have different practices in that regard. In other words, some really give the starting assistant professors a pretty big break on having to teach those either core courses or large courses. And some actually that's where they put, you know, assistant professors into the field. And I know, for example, in Sanford, you know, everyone has to participate in these core. You're like everyone, unless there's a negotiation. Everyone "asterisk" has to participate in these courses. So, it really does vary from school to school a lot. What we haven't done and, you know, this would be a massive thing, but is really look at the impact on scholarly productivity of the different requirements. But it's going to be very hard to do across fields because it's very difficult to compare what productivity means in different settings.

Mohanan: But even get a summary from the schools might be helpful to understanding what's right.

Cam Harvey (Fuqua): Can I ask Dalia's question in a different context, about correlation with objective measures? I fully understand that when you do a survey of faculty salaries, most people want more. So, there's some inherent bias. But I was struck by the 67.7% of the assistant professors listing salary as the number one factor for retention. So, the objective data, for example, would be a comparison to the peers that we aspire to

10

be with to see if there is a problem. Given that this is noisy data and maybe something that I was curious about, which is objective, what is the proportion of faculty that got a raise that covered the cost of living increase that was 5.4%?

Kornbluth: I told Erica before we started that because neither Daniel nor Jennifer could be here, we would take any financial questions and send them to them to reply to. That's the first thing. The second thing is we obviously do salary equity study within the university, but President Price has raised this issue, just this year, to really start taking a look at whether our salaries are competitive in the open market with other institutions. And that is something that we really need to take a careful look at. You know, it's a little bit different in most fields at the very entry assistant professor level. We know when we're negotiating with people that we're basically in the market or we would never get those people. But, how that falls apart over time as people advance through the ranks or doesn't fall apart over time is something we just have never really taken a careful look at and we need to.

Steffen Bass (Physics): I have three comments, one directly to what you said, salary and equity directly tracks with time at Duke, and I see those numbers as a department chair. I see that for my faculty. And the longer they have been at Duke, the worse they are compared to peers that are recently hired at the same level.

Item number two was the quality about the assistant professors. I think their lack of appreciation for students may track with the fact that assistant professors have a much harder time attracting grad

students compared to their senior colleagues in their early years at Duke. So, they may not value or be kept at the place here as tightly by students that they have, frankly, haven't had a chance of attracting.

The last comment I wanted to make as one of the slides where you showed such a disparity between the perception and how we do in climate and the perception on how we do with addressing individual behavior by faculty. This could be a real issue, but I think it could also be somewhat of a perception issue. Speaking now in my role as department chair, more than half of the interventions I do for poor behavior never see the light of day because I'm not allowed to talk about them. The general population in my department doesn't realize that I try to do something.

Kornbluth: I think that's a good point. To your other points, a couple of comments. Aside from tracking time, honestly, I remember this very clearly when I first became vice dean in the medical school and I actually saw all the basic sciences salaries. It was like a menu, a littered menu of past retentions. In other words, it's not just time that you've been here, it's willingness to look at other jobs, to come back and ask for - and that's a problem as an institution. As we say, if you start threatening to leave, you'd better be ready to go. And we don't want to lose our best people because there are other salary opportunities. But, it's very clear there's like a kind of vast gulf, even within some schools. There're obviously field discrepancies as well, but that's a different issue.

The other graduate student thing - it's interesting that you said that because it

really is different from area to area. I remember when I started as an assistant professor in the med school, like all the graduate students, only wanted senior faculty. So, it's really hard to know. But, certainly there is a difference from field to field. It's often kind of not very heterogeneous within the department.

Bass: Availability of funding plays a role too.

Kornbluth: That's exactly right. When you're starting fresh out as an assistant professor and you have a startup and you now have a six-year-old, and one on the way. Students feel pretty comfortable that you're not going to leave while they're here and there's funding. Some departments have imposed you can't take graduate students if you don't have a certain level of external funding and they'll count startup dollars. So, there's a lot of dynamics at play here.

Carolyn Barnes (Sanford School of Public Policy): I was curious about communicating the insights about diversity and inclusion to the units. How are you going to protect the faculty of color that are within those units, considering there's so few of us? In terms of having identifiable information. I'm sure when you communicate to whatever the Sanford School, low morale among black women, there's only two! *(laughter)* Am I going to get called into the Deans office? Maybe I'm communicating my own insecurity.

Kornbluth: That's a real problem. We tend not to want to communicate any results where there is less than five.

Barnes: Okay, but then you might be overlooking some problems.

Kornbluth: Yeah, I know. That is a question. I hadn't really thought about that in terms of your school, for example, because, you know, in the larger schools we're not communicating it at the department level directly. Except, the dean is going to get an overall summary. And that's a little bit different, obviously, in a smaller school, which is essentially a department. So, thank you for raising that. Let me just give that a little bit more thought.

Barnes: The other question I had was, are the response rates different by racial group?

Kornbluth: I think, as I mentioned, they actually reflect the percentage in the population. There's not some huge skew with respect to response.

Sina Farsiu (Pratt School of Engineering): I understand that the comparison between the salary of different institutes is a difficult issue. But, shouldn't the increase in the cost of living in Durham, especially when Duke itself, increases the cost, for example, for child care, associated child care services, multiple times more than the amount that Duke has increased the salary of its faculty -- shouldn't they be at least at the same level? That when Duke increases its cost for people who live and work here, shouldn't that increase with the salary be at the same level?

Kornbluth: As I indicated, I think we're going to be taking a really careful look at salary structure over the next year. I hear what you say. I certainly will convey this and discuss this with the President, with EVP Ennis, and etc. But, I definitely hear what you're saying.

Kathy Andolsek (School of Medicine): I want to go back to a couple of comments around objective measures that we have holding us accountable.

Given potential differences with data with underrepresented faculty, especially since unfortunately there are very few of them as a group, have we done work to see if their salary is on target with others and better on promotion--if they're getting promoted compared to others over the last five years. Have we moved the needle at all on any of these other measures institutionally or national benchmarks? And maybe it's too short a time but what we're hoping is improvement over the past five years beyond efforts to recruit.

Second question, is the last slide I found really interesting and somewhat sad. The one thing I note is a low sense of value and meaning.

Kornbluth: Let me just answer your first question, we look every other year internally at a salary equity study. We do well in terms of equity across racial groups and gender within units. Now, the issue is in some areas there's gender inequity, mainly because in some of the higher paid fields, there's actually fewer women. But, within units we do see equity. And honestly, when we see an outlier, we address those individual salaries with the dean, when they seem to be inexplicably off the equity line.

So, you were talking about feeling value and making a contribution. *(Refers to slide)* Yeah, I see what you're saying in a rank of 10. We kind of would wish that would be number one or two, you know.

Betsy Albright (Nicholas School of the Environment): Thank you for the presentation. I'm not remembering the survey. Did it have any questions about LGBTQ identity? And I was wondering if that was included, how inclusion panned out across LGBTQ groups?

Kornbluth: No, I don't recall specifically. David?

Jamieson-Drake: Yes, that was one of the demographic factors that we ask about. But there are so far, and in all the years we've done a survey, been too few in the group.

Joshua Socolar (Physics): I have a very general question and maybe it's more of a comment, but I'd like to hear your take on it. When we look at the answers to these survey questions and we see that some of them, the good answer is only coming up 50% of the time. And, you know, we obviously see that as cause for concern because in other cases we see answers *"75% of faculty are somewhat satisfied or very satisfied."* The question is, or my comment is, 75% is not that high, right? To think that 25% of the faculty won't even say that they're somewhat satisfied is concerning to me. That number showed up, I forget which slide it was. In the context of presenting data like this, where you see other cases where there are more obvious problems, it makes 75% look like a good response. So, I guess my question is, how do you interpret the absolute numbers as opposed to just the relative ones? And can we compare those to, say, other institutions?

Kornbluth: A couple of things. One is, I must confess that the newer questions do pose a problem to me. I'm much more interested in the relative progress over

time. I'm not sure the absolute numbers are incredibly meaningful. That's the first thing. The second thing is we don't really have a control experiment here. In other words, if you were to put something down do you like beautiful, sunshiny days? We might get 75%. *(laughter)* I just don't know. Not to be too flippant about it. I don't know what that 75% means in terms of satisfaction. So, I think we can best continue the survey and compare. Our survey is somewhat idiosyncratic. There are questions, I think and again, I'm going to look to David to talk about what happens at other institutions. But, I don't know that we have a head to head means of direct comparison in terms of that satisfaction. Am I incorrect in that?

Jamieson-Drake: A little bit. *(laugher)* This is a faculty survey conducted by other AAU institutions. We do it on a five-year cycle. And each time we're able to find four or five other institutions who within plus or minus two years who administer the survey to their faculty. And we haven't done the comparative result yet, which is why you didn't recognize it. But, we do have comparative results for each prior to each survey.

Kornbluth: Well, that would be really interesting to put forward on this. Also, my sense is also we do add idiosyncratic questions as well.

Jamieson-Drake: Yes, we do.

Anathea Portier-Young (Divinity School, ECAC): Can I ask the question of how do we compare?

Jamieson-Drake: The AAU institutions include the 20 private universities and we generally select our peer groups from those schools like M.I.T., Harvard,

Princeton. We try to make a robust comparison group each time. And so far, we've been able to. We compare very well. We're very similar. We look like the faculty are in the same world. A lot of the same problems, similar concerns, similar concerns expressed at a similar level. It doesn't look remarkably different from other elite private institutions.

Kornbluth: The good news about that is we don't look remarkably different from other elite institutions. The bad news is that the issues where we feel like we're making such intense efforts to move the needle, which is true to some extent at our peer schools, but in different ways. This comes back to Trina's original question; how do we move the needle? And Abbas's comment about the local culture from the ground. We would hope that with intentional effort we can compare favorably to our peers in some of these measures.

Marta Mulawa (School of Nursing): I recognize there's a number of ways to slice this data, but one thing that I think would be potentially interesting to look at is the improvements among the faculty that were in multiple cohorts of assessments. So those restricting it to just looking at those that did 2020 and 2015. Rather than seeing how much the change is accounting for all the new faculty that have joined within the last 15 years to see if there's been an improvement or change among those that have been multiple times assessed.

Kornbluth: That's interesting. I mean, obviously, the surveys are deidentified, but you could have a check box that says, did you take the survey in the following years?

Jamieson-Drake: We've never done that, but it's a neat idea.

Jones: We did another survey in the spring. Are we going to get feedback on that survey at some point?

Kornbluth: At the next [AC] meeting.

Jones: The second question is, Abbas talked about, and by the way the Academic Council recommended the establishment of your office. So, I think we can pat ourselves on the back for that. *(laugher)* So, Abbas talked about the increase in the number of African-American professors or Black professors who have been hired. Can we keep data and get comparative data across groups about retention of faculty? Because, I think that would be really interesting to line up with this data. Maybe this is a question for David. Do we have the ability to go back and look at groups and make a determination about whether there were disparities in terms of our rates of retention and promotion?

Jamieson-Drake: Yes, and we do. Sally and Abbas have that data.

Kornbluth: That's what I was going to say. Basically, we're seeing, we don't want a treadmill, every time we hire, somebody leaves. So, we're actually making real progress when you compare hiring and retention.

Benmamoun: That is true, slow progress, but we are making progress on retention. For example, the affinity groups working in this space, they have been really instrumental in recruiting faculty, but also in retaining faculty. We can certainly get you the data and share it with you.

Weinthal: It's good to be back and I'm glad we allocated the full session today. We were thinking we're going to have additional items, but clearly these are important issues that we need to continue discussing and we will continue to discuss issues such as faculty retention, and salary issues. The agenda will get fuller as we move on. With that, I want to thank everyone for coming out today, both in person and online. This meeting is adjourned and we will see everyone on November 18th.