

# Duke University

DURHAM  
NORTH CAROLINA  
27708-0928

ACADEMIC COUNCIL  
012 ALLEN  
BOX 90928

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

## Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Academic Council

Thursday, February 20, 2014

**Joshua Socolar (Physics and Academic Council Chair):** Hi everybody and welcome. I'm really pleased today that we have some time to delve into two topics that have been identified by a number of faculty as important topics for consideration by this Council. DKU Executive Vice Chancellor Mary Brown-Bullock is here to help us understand the development of DKU and, in particular, the relation of DKU to Duke at the faculty level. And Paula McClain, Dean of the Graduate School, is here to give us her perspective on the questions that have arisen, here and elsewhere, regarding the establishment and review of master's programs at Duke. We should have a reasonable amount of time for questions and discussions in both cases. I'll also reserve some time at the end of this meeting for presentation and discussion, and hopefully approval, of a motion that ECAC is putting forward regarding the establishment of a Council Task Force on Diversity. This idea arose from ECAC's deliberations following the Council Conversation held at our last meeting, and I hope everyone will stay to the end to register an opinion. I think I can speak for Mary, Paula, and ECAC when I say that the projects up for discussion today involve substantive decisions that are yet to be made, and guidance from this Council would be welcomed. Before we launch into the discussions though, we do need to approve the minutes from the January 16th Council meeting. Can I have a motion to approve the minutes?

*(approved by voice vote with no dissent)*

*UPDATE AND PLANS FOR DUKE-KUNSHAN UNIVERSITY – MARY BROWN-BULLOCK, EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLOR, DKU*

Executive Vice Chancellor for DKU, Mary Bullock, last addressed the Academic Council in November of 2012, and we're happy to welcome her back today. Dr. Bullock is the former president of Agnes Scott College and a scholar of Chinese history who has written extensively on China and Chinese-American relations. I have to tell you that through my participation in a number of committees--that would be China Faculty Council, Liberal Arts in China Committee, Global Priorities Committee, the University Priorities Committee, Academic Priorities Committee, Board of Trustees Academic Affairs Committee--I've now had glimpses of the incredible variety of issues that Dr. Bullock is having to attend to this year, from the construction of buildings to the development of academic infrastructure and the recruitment of students. I have asked her on this occasion to speak primarily about the roles that Duke faculty might play in the development of the academic programs at DKU and about her perspective on how DKU faculty will be connected to Duke in two years, five years, and maybe ten years if she dares project that far. I asked for this focus because I have the sense that these are fundamental issues that are particularly rele-

vant for this Council, but I've also asked Mary to limit her prepared remarks so that there is time for you to raise whatever questions are really on your mind.

**Mary Brown-Bullock (Executive Vice Chancellor for DKU):** Thanks, Josh. I'm delighted to be back to address this group and to begin with good news. I'll then turn to some of the questions that Josh has asked for us to explore and really look forward to a continuing dialogue. But first let me say that DKU has completed all the approvals and is now a fully accredited independent joint venture university in China. With an enviable location on the high speed railroad minutes from Suzhou and Shanghai, it is sponsored by Duke University and Wuhan University and substantially funded and supported by Kunshan City. The governing process is similar to an American university: the independent board of trustees had its first meeting in November and will meet again in April. Second, we're very excited to open this fall with three MA programs in Global Health, Medical Physics, and Management Studies. We will also begin with an undergraduate Global Learning Semester. In both Durham and in Kunshan, we are engaged in intensive student recruiting efforts in a narrow recruitment season. Three, I've just come from Kunshan. I can report that our five campus buildings are stunning. They now reveal the contemporary lines and aesthetic adaptation to the Chinese landscape that is the design intent. We expect that the first five buildings will be finished by early fall. Students and faculty may initially be housed in the rather elegant conference center. Fourth, the curriculum and faculty for 2014-2015 are in place. We only have a few faculty searches in medical physics and global health, which are nearing completion at this time. In addition, Provost Lange has appointed a Duke Faculty Nominating Committee which is recruiting for five ongoing positions at DKU: in economics, environmental

policy, Chinese history, American studies and Chinese language. Each of these topics is seen as a key building block for the future of DKU. There are many other initiatives in research and in graduate study planning going on here in Durham, and many of you are involved in those programs. So with this growing momentum it really is time to address the policy issues and to engage in a discussion about the longer term planning of the role of faculty and faculty relationships at DKU. Let me begin with the relationship with Wuhan University. Wuhan University's partnership with Duke has been essential, both legally and perhaps more important, symbolically, in the establishment of DKU. DKU's institutional legitimacy depends upon its association with a distinguished university like Duke, but also with a high-quality Chinese university such as Wuhan, which is currently ranked number five in China. This protects us from being perceived as neo-colonialists, only intent on bringing an American presence to China. In contrast to earlier concerns, Wuhan has not been intrusive nor has it insisted on an exclusionary role. Its location in a different province gives us much more independence than our counterpart institution, NYU Shanghai, which is still located on its partner university campus. I've been to Wuhan a couple of times this fall, and I must say that Wuhan has proven to be a worthy and respectful intellectual partner. For example, their recent faculty nominations to both the DKU Faculty Selection Committee and the Board of Trustees are of the highest international quality. One is an economist with a Ph.D. from the University of Chicago and another is a bio-chemist with a Ph.D. from Emory who is in his early forties, one of the very youngest members of the Chinese Academy of Science, which is their highest scientific body. You know, as a participant in this process and as an historian who has worked on the study of the first American graduate university in China, I've become ever more convinced that this "joint"

in joint university that we talk about is absolutely essential. We need to respect it, and it needs to be comprised of real collaboration. Peking Union Medical College was founded by the Rockefeller Foundation almost a hundred years ago. It went through many trials and tribulations. Many of these were focused on the issue of how it addressed the needs of China and issues of nationalism, which really prevailed across the twentieth century. Today that hospital is ranked number one in China. The medical university is ranked number three. It stands as an enduring model of world-class Sino-American intellectual collaboration. That must certainly be one of our long term, really long term, goals for DKU. Second let me say a little bit about the relationship between DKU and Duke faculty, which is of course just beginning. This is an evolving process in an evolving university. Duke faculty have been assigned the primary role in shaping the academic program at DKU. All the opening programs carry Duke degrees or Duke credit and have been fully vetted by the Duke faculty. Fifty Duke faculty will be teaching at DKU during the first two years. The nominating committee for the DKU faculty searches is chaired by Edna Andrews, and it is all Duke faculty. And five of the nine members of the DKU faculty appointment committee are Duke faculty. So you can see the formative role of Duke faculty in creating the academic program and in defining the quality of academic teaching at DKU. As time goes on, there will continue to be a role for Duke faculty at DKU, but they will be joined by individuals from other international universities as well as individuals appointed to DKU itself. It is certainly our hope that ten years out--and my hope that earlier than that--there would be a regular flow of faculty between DKU and Duke, that there would be a number of joint appointments and joint research centers. Opportunities for Duke faculty to do research, to teach, to have graduate students and to develop col-

laborative projects with China and in China will only be enhanced by this relationship. I am confident that questions we're all asking now about institutional identity will be replaced by pride that Duke and DKU led the way in successfully internationalizing higher education.

Faculty governance--certainly a topic of keen interest to the Academic Council -- Faculty governance at DKU will be modeled on the best American university practices. In the beginning we're going to be small with a rotating faculty from Duke and few longer term appointments. Beginning this fall, we will convene a Faculty Meeting every month of all faculty who are residents on the campus. And I will also appoint right at the beginning a smaller Faculty Advisory Council to begin to identify the issues of governance and the topics which this faculty group should address. Faculty rights at DKU have been addressed in all of the founding documents for DKU. Let me just give you a few examples: there are provisions for "review based on merit, capability and performance" and provisions to "file grievances on welfare, evaluations and awards." And DKU faculty rights are also especially protected in one of the most important documents, The Fundamental Principles of Academic Quality. Among many things it says "Freedom of inquiry, instruction and expression are essential commitments ...and thus must be animating features of DKU." We plan that DKU faculty will be appointed on renewable contracts which will include criteria upon which their renewal will be based. And the Faculty Appointments Committee is responsible, not just for recommending faculty, but also for the faculty review process. Obviously this faculty governance process in the first couple of years is going to be a work in progress. The Liberal Arts in China Committee has a subcommittee, which Josh and I are both on, in which faculty governance is the topic for that committee. And I look for-

ward to recommendations coming from that committee on how from the very beginning to lay the foundations that will institutionalize a strong faculty governance. This is especially important for DKU because China does not have a strong system of faculty governance, and yet this is what Chinese universities themselves are trying to do. We can really set a model here, and I think we will be watched closely for very effective faculty governance. Longer term vision for DKU -- you know my vision--I think all of our vision will be that DKU becomes an outstanding international liberal arts research university that happens to be located in China that's closely linked in faculty, education and research with Duke University. Funding sources are already beginning to become more diversified. I am learning--it's actually rather amazing, and Peter and I talked about this a little bit--almost each week we hear of some Chinese government funding sources for which we should be applying. We are trying to ramp up our ability to take advantage of those opportunities. But I'm also pleased to say that you may look forward to an announcement of generous donations to DKU. It's clear that DKU's path to greatness, just as any university, will be incremental and experimental. I keep telling my Chinese colleagues who are so impatient for this university to be formed, to be there, to be ready to stand as a shining light, I keep telling them we must be patient. During the first five years we will grow slowly. We hope to increase the number of graduate programs by perhaps three or four. To add two or three research institutes, maybe more as we are now realizing that research funding and research opportunities are growing. We hope to both start and continue the undergraduate liberal arts semester as an experimental program in liberal arts education. At the end of that time--at the end of this first phase in five years--DKU and Duke will consider whether and how to establish an undergraduate liberal

arts degree program. This is the overall role that the LACC--the Liberal Arts in China Committee-- is looking at. In addition to governance, it's looking at plans for curriculum, pedagogy, etc.

I'd like to conclude with just a few comments on a topic that is on everyone's mind when they deal with China --the current political and intellectual context. We see two contradictory trends: greater emphasis on economic and educational reforms but a tighter ideological climate, especially for Chinese who publicly advocate and try to organize for political change and also greater constraints on the foreign media and the Chinese media. I have checked with colleagues in other American institutions that have educational programs in the last several weeks and have been told that there's been absolutely no interference in teaching or student activities --including classroom discussions about the three T's: Taiwan, Tibet and Tiananmen. On the reform side, educational reforms include two very interesting developments. One is reducing the role of the state in university decision-making. And when Chinese colleagues talk about academic freedom, they are often talking about freeing the university to become more independent in its own decision-making. But there's also a push--and you can detect this from many of the Chinese government announcements--to reduce the bureaucratic decision-making. Having gone through this process, this couldn't happen sooner from our viewpoint. State policy documents continue to emphasize the importance of liberal arts education, innovation and creativity. And very interestingly we've been encouraged by the Ministry of Education to establish a center for research on higher education, to organize workshops on liberal arts curriculum and so on. And so I think we continue to believe that DKU is recognized for what it is and it is valued as a new experimental model, with academic freedom for

faculty and students, for a wide exploration of ideas. You know, in China models are watched carefully. If successful, they are often taken to national scale. We are being watched, friends. We want to put our absolute best foot forward. This is our challenge and this is our opportunity: you may be assured we are attentive to these issues. Thank you. (applause)

**Socolar:** Thank you very much, Mary. We have time for some questions and discussion.

**Robert Wolpert (Statistical Science):** You described what we're doing in a way in isolation. I would have expected that NYU and perhaps universities of other European and American colleagues would be facing similar issues about independence, similar issues about academic freedom and there would be at least some kind of a network of us there. Is there such a network or are we pretty much on our own?

**Brown-Bullock:** You know, it's a small network. So we're not just on our own. There are currently five joint venture universities--two British and three American. I don't know whether Keene College has gotten its final approval yet. In the process of planning for DKU, many of your colleagues were involved in visits to these universities to understand how they are operating. I've gone to conferences with some of these people. We don't have a formal network, but we do have communication. But in addition to those rather formal, real universities, there are many university educational programs in China that are program-specific at Chinese universities with western faculty teaching Chinese or back and forth. In fact, I got a list the other day that there are about a hundred such programs. And so there is a mailing list that is always going out. There's a grapevine that is communicating back and forth. But I think it's important that we see ourselves not just as

part of that network, but as part of a network of Chinese universities as well. As I said, the reform impulse in Chinese universities is very strong. We need our students to come from these universities. Chancellor Liu and I called together or separately on twelve of the key universities to establish a real MOU with those universities. Duke has some agreements with them, but this was to really try to solidify our relationship with places like Fudan University and Beijing University.

**Paul Baker (Earth & Ocean Sciences):** Thank you; that was a really thoughtful and interesting introduction. I have sort of a narrow question. I'm kind of curious if when Duke faculty go to DKU to teach are they going to be favored in any way for getting things like travel permits, research permits, and is there a process whereby that is going to happen? Are we going to be some kind of favored status in China, as if we are real partners?

**Brown-Bullock:** Well, let me say two things. One, Duke faculty should never think that DKU is your only channel in China. You should be going everywhere in China. But we also should definitely be helping you, and we'll be able to issue visa approval letters, invitations directly from DKU. As we establish research centers, we certainly will be able to facilitate research. And my hope is that we will be able to dedicate some space, so that if a Duke faculty wants to come and explore something and be based with us, we can then facilitate some meetings at Nanjing University or Shanghai Jiao Tong or Fudan. So I'm very hopeful that in multiple ways DKU will help facilitate the academic work of the faculty. But we don't have those systems in place yet, let me say. We haven't moved in yet.

**Pate Skene (Neurobiology):** Maybe along something of that same line for Duke faculty and also research for DKU faculty, what's the

status with regard to what they call an investigator-initiated funding? The Ministry of Science and Technology, I believe, requires a Chinese faculty appointment if I have that right. Will individual research projects that don't necessarily fall under any particular program of DKU, is that funding that the university will do?

**Brown-Bullock:** Certainly. One of the things we're working on this year is to get our recognition by the National Science Foundation of China as an institution that has been cleared to receive research grants. We also need to get that from the Jiangsu province and from Kunshan and Suzhou. All of these places have research funds. This is what we're learning. I think that once we have that, it would certainly be possible to use those channels for individuals as well as centers for Chinese funding. One thing that Chinese funding does require is that the person is in China, planning to be in China, for three years. Now one way that is quite easy to manage is with a collaborator in China. That is if you have a Chinese partner that is at a Chinese university or that is at DKU, even though you come and go, you're going to be eligible for that funding. But I think it's also important that Duke faculty turn to traditional funding sources in the United States. Certainly if you get a grant from NEH to come and study literature in the Jiangnan region, we would be a wonderful place for a base for that, and we could also facilitate that in terms of introducing you to some of your collaborators. Although--I do want to emphasize this--it's like working in the United States, if a Chinese scholar just arrived here and didn't have a colleague, it would be hard to dig in. So the collaboration is important. But I've been so impressed by the receptivity of Shanghai Jiao Tong, of Fudan, and Nanjing. They've asked me for a list of the faculty that are coming to teach, they want to invite them to lecture. They're interested in joint appointments. So I

think we're going to end up with multiple channels for individuals as well as major research projects.

**Garnett Kelsoe (Immunology):** Thank you also for the discussion. I'm curious--as I understand it, you see a future in which DKU becomes increasingly independent and an individual institution, and I guess my question is what is the ratio between the "D" and the "K" (laughter) over time? And I'm just curious because I'm reminded of these commuter airlines--Delta is painted on the tail but the door says "owned and operated by Comair Wisconsin" or something (laughter). So where are we now and where will we be with our name on an institution in the future if it is truly independent?

**Brown-Bullock:** Well, you can see where we are now, all the faculty are going to be from Duke, so we start with that. In some of the planning documents we guess that it might evolve into thirds. So that there would be a third from other international universities, from Chinese universities, and from Duke faculty. There is no formula, there is no plan. And in fact, this is something that Duke faculty is going to help to create. You're already helping to create that by the decision of fifty of you to go to DKU. My colleagues in places like University of Michigan, or Columbia, or even Stanford that has a center in China, are so envious of this. I was a reviewer of the John Hopkins Nanjing program, which for whatever reason they've never been able to--it's a thriving twenty-five year program in international studies--they've always hired adjunct faculty. They have never had a SAIS or a John Hopkins faculty on the John Hopkins Nanjing faculty. So the institution was in a bit of a crisis because what was its relationship to John Hopkins? I don't think that's going to happen here because I think we're beginning with much closer ties. And I think it's going to be up to the Duke faculty. I'm hoping people

who go this year will want to return and will want to set up collaborative relationships. So those relationships, and the more productive they are, the stronger Duke's on-going role will be. As I said, there is no formula for exactly how this is going to evolve. The Chinese like to call it, you know, giving birth to a baby. And the analogy really works in a way. We have two sponsors, we have the baby DKU--they joke about this all the time--totally dependent on its sponsors, not even able to walk. I mean, we couldn't go anywhere without Jim Roberts and Nora Bynum and the huge back office. I tell people, Duke University is my back office. We're not totally dependent; we now have twenty-five staff in DKU. So this is going to change over time. We will begin to get some of our own funding, we will have more of an institutional presence, and that's something that parents celebrate. When the child begins to grow up there may be some growing pains in terms of that growing independence, but you never lose that connection. So my guess, I don't know what President Brodhead thinks, twenty years from now these institutions will still be tightly drawn. But again this is a decision for Duke faculty. The Chinese will welcome this. There's no obstacle in China for continuing a significant Duke presence in the faculty at DKU coming and going. We are working hard to try to make this a good place to live and to work, and we know that we have to provide that. I went to a presentation this morning on the ITM library for DKU that was given for the faculty going out there. It's really reassuring. DKU is going to be a great place for faculty to work. We don't yet have labs and some other things, but in time we will. Also, it's an English language institution. Chinese scholars and scientists increasingly function in English, many of them. As an institution we will also be able to facilitate the collaboration between people whose native tongue or even whose acquired tongue is not Chinese or people for whom China has not been a central

research topic. That's the exciting intellectual thing--to really give sociologists and physicist and others chances to bring China into their curriculum or to benefit from the increasingly sophisticated Chinese research.

**Francis Lethem (Public Policy):** This is a time of the year when I think in terms of taxation. Could you tell us something of taxation of faculty?

**Socolar:** That was not on my list of things for Mary to research (laughter).

**Brown-Bullock:** If you work in China longer than a certain number of days -- I think it's a hundred and eighty-three, anyway it's something like that -- you're subject to Chinese taxes. And so that will apply to anybody that lives in China that long or longer. Duke has been very good in understanding that this is going to be a concern for people like me working in China, and so they are providing tax advice to us and will be providing tax advice to expats who are in China. I haven't gotten to April fifteenth yet, so I'm not quite sure. My husband said that he has all the tax records on the table. So I'm not sure what this involves yet.

**George Truskey (Biomedical Engineering):** I wonder if you could speak to the opposite perspective of how DKU is going to be more integrated into the Chinese academic community, particularly at the faculty level and so forth in terms of making it seem as if it is truly a Chinese institution, not simply a western output.

**Brown-Bullock:** Well I think we begin with our Wuhan, Fudan, and Nanjing partners in a sense. These are the institutions we know quite well. Wuhan, for example, in this coming year will send us some faculty, not to teach a class but they want to observe classes. They know their pedagogy is behind, and

so they want to send faculty to just be observers. They also believe they do have faculty who have specific expertise in some areas who would be willing to join a class and give a special lecture. They've also offered to serve as mentors to students. These partnerships are definitely not token because the idea is that this could grow. That is that you would in time have greater collaboration. So we look forward to the time -- if it be recruiting committees, let's just say, Edna's committee, I don't see Edna here but in her multiple committees they are advertising in China as well as in the United States. I've heard they have some very strong applicants from China who are based in Chinese universities. So that's going to be part of how this takes place. It is fundamentally important, and I think you really hit the nail on it, unless DKU is able to intellectually engage with the best of Chinese scholars it will be always perceived as a foreign institution. The great example of this historically is Yenching University, which is where Peking University is now on that campus. Yenching University was an American college in the nineteen-twenties. It was able to establish this extraordinary collaboration with the leading Chinese historians, literature people, and linguists working on China. It became a center, not just for the introduction of western sociology and economics into the curriculum, it did that. But it also became perceived as a very strong center for the study of China. Now this is a century later. We're going to do something different. But I think you're absolutely right to say that we need to think creatively about how we bring and create this community.

**Socolar:** Thanks very much, Mary.

**Brown-Bullock:** Thank you (applause).

**Socolar:** We don't have time to discuss every question that we might have, so I hope everybody here will feel free to pose questions to

Mary through Nora's office here. We have lots of faculty colleagues on campus who are very much involved in the committees that are doing the work to get DKU up and running. If you don't know whom to ask, you can ask me and I'll find the right person. And I hope also that people here who feel like you're beginning to understand better what this project is about will help other faculty who still may have questions about it. So let's try to get everybody educated about this project.

*PRESENTATION REGARDING MASTER'S PROGRAMS AT DUKE – PAULA MCCLAIN, DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL*

I want to welcome Dean of the Graduate School Paula McClain. She's going to tell us about how she's approaching concerns that she and other faculty have raised about the impacts of the increased numbers of master's programs and master's students on various aspects of academic and campus life. The reason for doing this now is for this Council to have a chance to offer some thoughts about the direction that the studies she's doing might take. Don't expect Paula to have all the answers yet. We pushed her to come here early. So the idea here is just to get some useful information to help us think about the relevant questions. So Paula, can you tell us what you're up to?

**Paula McClain (Dean of the Graduate School):** Not much I guess (laughter). Yes, thanks.

**Reed Criswell (Multimedia Specialist):** And the water you're hearing is from some plumbing problems. We're aware of it (laughter).

**Peter Lange (Provost):** Not in the ceiling, I assume? (laughter).

**Criswell:** We fixed that!

**McClain:** Thank you very much. As Josh said, this is kind of early in our process about looking at master's degrees, but we do have some information, not that we have a lot of answers. But I do want to give you some background, some current statistics, the approval and review process, the things that the Graduate School is currently doing, and the study that we have on-going at the moment. For me, one of the things that was important as we ventured down this road of increasing master's degrees was to get a sense of the role master's degrees have played at Duke. I spent a little time yesterday -- I'm not sure why we have these in the Graduate School, but we have a whole series of bulletins from Trinity College to Duke University. The last annual bulletin from Trinity College, which was 1922-23, listed that Trinity had basically two degrees: a bachelor of arts and a master of arts. And then in the '25-26 bulletin when we were Duke University, Duke had three degrees: a bachelor of arts, a master of arts, and a master of education. And in the '27-28 bulletin we now have four degrees: bachelor of arts, master of arts, master of education, and doctor of philosophy. Now the master of arts is still around, the master of education is now the master of arts in teaching, and we have the doctor of philosophy. So master's degrees were not uncommon, they were actually kind of foundational for the University. So this gave us a sense that we really were not in new territory in the sense of these degrees but new in the sense of the number that we might have. So these are current enrollments (refers to slide). The first box you see is the Graduate School, and so we've got about 3,100 Graduate School master's and PhD's, but when you add in the graduate and professional students, you've got 8,105 graduate and professional students and 6,495 undergraduates. What you can see is that the graduate and professional students are a lot larger proportion of our student body already

than are the undergraduates. In the Graduate School -- and I know 2008 with the downturn and there was the concern that people were kind of pushing through master's degrees for financial reasons -- we did have an increase. But these were basically increases in the already existing, admitting master's programs and the four that were approved in 2008. And you can see that we have had some changes, the addition is about two hundred and forty-eight new graduate students from 2007-2008 to 2013-2014. One of the trends that we've seen -- and this is something that we're dealing with in the Graduate School -- is the significant increase in the number of international students. And they're really kind of dispersed across programs. One would think that they would be concentrated and some programs do have more international students, but we're seeing an increase in international students across all of our degrees. Now these are all of the master's students. I forgot my chart in terms of the number of master's degrees, but what you can see is that across all of the schools we have seen an increase in the number of master's and professional students from 2008. We don't have the 2013-2014 figures; we just were able to pull 2012-2013. Fuqua's actually gone down in their number of students lately, at least last year. But all the rest of our schools, all of us have basically increased our graduate and professional students in our master's degree programs. Now, these are the Graduate School degrees that have been approved since 2008, and these are 2008 to 2012. You'll see a couple of them were actually PhD programs, but you see that it's not a large number of master's programs. And each one of these you see has particular intellectual content that faculty were in fact interested in. And as you know our Carolina joint German program is now like the number three program in the country. These are the degrees that were approved this last go-round. And with this number of degrees coming

through of course there was concern raised about what kind of trend this might be setting. Let me tell you that those of us in the Graduate School were concerned as well. But these new degrees if they meet their enrollment targets by year three will only add sixty-five new graduate students, this is in the Graduate School, okay? Now, the approval process -- I'm not going to read these charts for you, but we actually pulled these off of the Academic Council website but we modified them a bit because the Master's Advisory Council, which came about as a result of the degrees that came through in 2008, had a slight shift in its charge. It now looks at master's degrees with an interdisciplinary or non-departmental basis, whereas before all of those just went through the Graduate School. So basically this is the Graduate School approval process with MAC coming in at a particular point. And these are for degrees without global content. Master's degrees with global content have a different set of approval processes, and you can see that here. In this instance, the Master's Advisory Council is in the entire process for these degrees. So the Medical Physics for DKU came through this process with the Master's Advisory Council weighing in on that. For the professional degrees without global content this is the approval process, once again with the Master's Advisory Council. For professional degrees with a global component, a much more complicated process and the Master's Advisory Council is more actively involved. Now all of the master's degrees that were approved this year, well in the fall, have a requirement for an external review. And this is just the process for the external review of research master's. If the master's degree is in a PhD program it gets reviewed along with the PhD. If it's sitting out there as a non-departmental or interdisciplinary it will be reviewed along the same lines as we do the other graduate programs. And these reviews go through the academic unit, the Executive

Committee of the Graduate Faculty, the Academic Programs Committee, the relevant academic administrators, and then it culminates in an MOU back to the unit. For professional master's programs MAC developed a review procedure, which was approved this fall. The procedure is listed on the Graduate School website even though the Graduate School doesn't have oversight of these programs. But all of the review documents for the Graduate School programs and the professional programs are listed on our website. And in this instance, the Graduate School will serve as the trigger, meaning we will have a list of the professional degree programs, we will then notify the Provost's office that it's time for X degree to be reviewed. The Provost will then notify the dean of that school who will then kick in that same review process that the Graduate School has. These reviews, since they don't come to the Graduate School, will go through the Master's Advisory Council, the Academic Program Committee, the relevant administrators, and then will result again in an MOU back to the unit. Now, I read the minutes from the November meeting, I was not here, but these were some of the concerns that were raised in the minutes that I read about the master's degrees that had come through before. And there was concern about Duke's philosophy on master's degrees, what it means for doctoral education and undergraduate education, whether or not there was just strictly a financial motive for the creation of these degrees, and one comment was "well, what's the tipping point?" Do we reach a point where the master's degrees begin to overwhelm the doctoral education? The Graduate School had already been thinking about these things. In early October we started talking about what we need to think about relative to these degrees. We had these proposals in front of us, which means we had to really move them forward. But as a process of moving them forward we started thinking about a lot of different things. So,

one of the things that Arts & Sciences has done -- which has been really beneficial and we are very appreciative of them recognizing -- they have put in place an internal review process where they are vetting the master's proposals coming from Arts & Sciences units. In the past the procedure was units just sent these proposals to the Graduate School without any committee review or yes, we like this or no, we don't or we've got one of these already or, you know, this is stupid (laughter). So now Arts & Sciences has its own internal process, which means proposals are no longer just coming to us. They're going to Arts & Sciences, and Arts & Sciences is taking a great deal of time. And I think, of the ones that are in the queue, the first one just came over yesterday I believe to start its way through the process. And there are others. So they are taking time. And as a result of what Arts & Sciences has done in terms of doing their internal vetting, we are now going to require that the sponsoring school or unit to approve the business model and the academic plan before that proposal is moved forward to the Graduate School. This saves a lot of time, and it lets us know that someone also thinks this is something important that needs to happen. What we've done at the Graduate School is we have always managed PhD enrollment. That's because with each slot there's money attached in terms of the fellowships, so we have been able to really tell "Chemistry, you have X number of slots this year." We are now doing that for master's degrees. Even though master's degree student are self-funded we want to make sure that the number of master's students don't begin to overwhelm the number of doctoral students. So we're just doing for the master's programs exactly what we've done for the PhD. We've also changed, or we're in the process of changing, the guidelines for proposals for master's programs coming forward. And you can see the questions that we are asking units to address now: is the degree really neces-

sary? Or based on what you already have if you just add another track can you accomplish the same thing that you want to do? The last thing that we're doing -- and this is ongoing -- when we started thinking about these questions in October at an October twenty-nine meeting of the Master's Advisory Council we decided that we would undertake a broad survey of master's education, research and professional, at Duke. Where it fits, what's its role. And so we have a number of data sources that we are developing. The first was we did a survey of DGS's. And the result of the survey of DGS's really solidified our notion that we needed to start talking about slots in master's programs as opposed to kind of a free for all on master's students. We just got IRB approval -- you will be receiving, please fill it out -- a faculty survey where we're going to ask you your view about research master's, professional master's, where you see their role, do they have a role in your unit, what's the relationship between your master's program and your doctoral students, do you involve master's students in research, what kind of career planning -- now this is important. If we're going to have larger numbers of master's programs we cannot make the assumption that we're just going to dump all these people on career services to help them find a job, which is why on the proposals now we're asking you to think about what you're going to do to help these students who are self-funded find a job or a career after they've been here. We have another survey, which is a targeted survey at IRB waiting for that approval, where we are trying to get data on our peer institutions from their publically available data as well as direct contact in terms of what they are doing in master's education, what their particular views are, and what their issues might be. The University of Chicago did a study last year on one of their master's programs where they identified that there is a lot of stress and strain on the faculty who are try-

ing to keep this going. So we just want to get a sense of where we are relative to our peers, and the Graduate School uses the Ivy Plus as our peer group. We're getting data from CAPS; I've had discussions with them. 2009 was the date where there was a flip. There are now more professional and graduate students using CAPS than undergraduates, so we just want to see that as we're adding these students what kind of stress and strain might there be on this service. Career services, I talked to you about that. Some of you know and many of you might not know that international students who come to Duke have to have their language tested, and that testing is done through the English for International Students Program, EIS. Every student. We've already raised the TOEFL scores this year for incoming graduate students. We're going to raise it again next year. But this unit we're restructuring because as more international students come in that kind of puts a little stress and strain on these individuals who have got to certify and deal with people in terms of language and being able to write. We have a housing report that was done -- we don't have to do it, it was done by Student Affairs in 2012 -- that tells us are there places for people to live when they come here. Things we haven't started on yet are Library and OIT, so we're trying to be pretty comprehensive. If we're going to talk about these issues, we want to make sure that we're addressing all the areas. I'm sure there are areas that we have left out that an increase in master's degrees and master's students will have on us overall. So that's where we are at this point. Like I said, I think I've raised more questions; I don't think I have a lot of answers. But that's what we're doing (ap-  
plause).

**Socolar:** Thank you. Are there any questions?

**Harvey Cohen (Clinical Sciences):** You said several times that you're talking only about

master's programs in the, quote, Graduate School. So what's the other?

**McClain:** The others are the professional master's in the schools. Now the faculty survey is going to cover both of those. The faculty that will get the survey are the west campus faculty, biomedical, and we are developing a list of the clinical faculty who are involved in graduate education so that those individuals are surveyed as well.

**Cohen:** And what's the relationship, if any, between your program and those other master's programs?

**McClain:** We don't oversee those, okay? But graduate students tend to see themselves as graduate students, and so many students at other schools and professional master's programs find their way to the Graduate School looking for things. Now we do the best that we can, but we are trying to get a sense through this survey. We don't oversee the professional master's degrees, but we do think that because some of these students show up at the door step of the Graduate School that it's helpful in this study for us to have a sense of where the professional master's degrees are going to be going.

**Tolly Boatwright (Classical Studies):**

Thank you, that was very informative. I don't remember seeing whether you also are going to be canvassing staff because a real problem for increased numbers of students is thinking about staff who have to work with getting the payments for things, particularly with students who are non-national there are a lot of headaches. So I don't know whether you are looking into that, but that...

**McClain:** No, that would be a survey of the DGSA's, and that's a good -- I mean that would be easy for us to do because we've already done the DGS's, and we have the list of

the DGSA's, so we can do this. Thank you.

**Kerry Haynie (Political Science):** A follow-up to all of these questions in terms of staff is just the financial arrangements, the financial split between departments and the Graduate School. It's fifty-fifty now as I understand it.

**McClain:** No, no. Well, it depends. It's sixty-forty. If it's an Arts & Sciences program, it's sixty-forty. Now one thing you have to understand is that the Graduate School, we have an overhead charge per semester per PhD and per master's student, but basically every bit of tuition that we take is after the overhead goes back to the schools. So what we take in from Arts & Sciences programs goes back to Arts & Sciences' bottom line to kind of help on those instances. And so for professional, like engineering, basically most of that or all of that tuition will flow back.

**Haynie:** So as these programs ratchet up and there's an increased cost in terms of the additional staff to deal with career planning services, would that financial arrangement change?

**McClain:** Well, that's why the financial models in the proposals coming forward become important. And then our financial people run an analysis as to whether or not the program can actually support these, you know? And with new programs a lot of them really don't hit their targets, and so you've got to re-do the financial model and tell them you've got to scale this back until you can actually afford it. These programs really need to be kind of self-supporting even if they're given a loan from the upper level administration -- really from the Provost's office -- to start up they've got to pay that money back, okay? So you've got to get to zero essentially on these.

**Jerry Reiter (Statistical Science):** Following up on Kerry's question, so I can imagine with

a lot of master's programs growing or PhD programs growing those students are wanting courses outside their department, and I can also imagine that some departments might share that burden more than others (laughter).

**McClain:** Statistics for example, yes (laughter).

**Reiter:** Are there any discussions in the Graduate School or in other schools about mechanisms to compensate or remunerate those departments that are sort of teaching these other students and not getting really -- as far as I can tell, there's no accounting for it.

**McClain:** The answer is yes. We've been having serious discussions. There are two departments that are basically affected by this more than others, and that's Statistics and Computer Science. Where students in literature or whatever will say, well I want to get my master's because they want to get a master's in these programs, and so they end up in the classes. And so yes, we have been talking about that and trying to figure out what is the best way to kind of control this particular process, so that the units that do have these students in their classes don't become overwhelmed. Now, one of the things that I think is nice for Statistics is that the new master's degree is going to take some of the pressure off of your PhD program because now you can focus on the PhD students; you're not going to have these kind of mixed classes where the PhD students really can't get what they need. And I think that you're also having some discussions about the MSC, which is the concurrent master's. So yes we are aware, and yes we're discussing, and we hope to have a resolution.

**Paul Baker (Earth & Ocean Sciences):** I think it's a big problem that we've identified here. The twenty percent increase in master's

programs in four years, and there was a five percent increase in undergraduates in four years. It's a huge explosion, and it has a lot of ramifications in my opinion. I'd like to go on record as saying I don't think it's a good thing. But I'm curious about what your opinion is in terms -- just your personal opinion -- what motivates this explosion of master's programs? What do you think is the real motivation?

**McClain:** I think it's a combination. There's no Pollyanna in the Graduate School about some of the motivations behind some programs. But I can tell you that for most of the programs that are coming through there's really an intellectual interest on the part of the faculty to offer this particular degree, and in some areas offering a master's degree for students actually can be a very good thing for their careers. They're not going to go on to graduate school but having a master's in X will help them do a lot of different things. And for other programs this can actually be a feeder. Now in Political Science, you know, sometimes it's possible for students not to be sure about whether or not they want to go on to a doctoral program, and so they'll do a master's. And based on how they do in the master's and whether or not they like it, then they'll go on to the doctoral program. So, for some programs that can actually be a feeder. A third point is that for underrepresented students in some areas, a master's degree can actually be the ticket into a PhD program, and so some of these programs provide opportunities for students who wouldn't have been there without these degrees. Now, do I think we need to have a million of these? No. Okay? Because we have to be concerned about our doctoral education. But do I think our position needs to be no? No, I don't. I don't think that. I think we need to achieve a balance among our three populations: doctoral, master's, and undergraduate. And I think that balance is going to be the tricky part for us.

**Fritz Mayer (Sanford School of Public Policy):** I was one of the people who raised some concerns so I appreciate very much the presentation and the thought that's going into this. The conversation I thought we should have had before, but it's great to have it now. My question though is in some sense Paul (Baker)'s only pause, which is -- and you may or may not know the answer to this question -- what is your sense of the trend? So we have twenty percent in four years, you alluded to one other program that's out there, one of the concerns that some of us had was we just didn't know where this was going. Are we looking at another twenty percent in the next four years? What do you see coming in the pipeline and where do you think this is going?

**McClain:** I don't know. And maybe that's a dodge, but it's true. I don't know. But I do think and I do know that the processes that have been put in place are going to assure that the proposals that come forward will in fact be ones that have intellectual content, and that the people perceive that there is in fact a market for this degree and that there are students who will want it and that they'll be able to get these students jobs at the end of the master's. And I think that's going to be a higher hurdle to cross than what has been in place in the past. And so the questions that were raised in the minutes I think were legitimate questions and ones that we need to take seriously, and that's what we're doing.

**Mayer:** If I could just follow up to that, I think that's terrific and I thought the kinds of questions you're raising with each program sounded great. But I think the thrust of the concern was not with the quality of any one of the proposals but with the extended effects of all of them. And so I still haven't quite heard that.

**McClain:** Well, I think that's what we're still grappling with, okay? Because we're not getting all twenty-five or thirty proposals at the same time, so we can say, okay these five but not these. But I think that as this process goes forward and someone sends up a proposal and ECAC says, well listen this is just duplicative of what already exists in History in their regular degree. So I think we're going to be much more conscious about the areas of these degrees, so that we're not getting into just well one or two people have this area but it's already being done over here or in one of the professional degrees. So I wish I had a concrete answer, Fritz, but that's what we're trying to do.

**Jane Richardson (Biochemistry):** I just wondered why this is happening now? Maybe there is no way to answer this, but do we have any feel for whether we were doing it wrong before, or just that once people see a few new ones they say, well gee I hadn't thought of that but we could do this, or what. I mean, none of the things that you brought up have actually changed as motivators.

**McClain:** I'm not sure that I have the exact answer. If you look at the public universities - - I mean Michigan is far larger than we are -- but they have far more master's degrees than they have doctoral degrees. And in many instances because they're self-funded and there's no financial aid, these degrees can in fact be money makers. That's the not the prime motivation for what we're seeing in the degrees that are coming forward, not that's not to say that during the downturn there wasn't some talk that we can kind of fix our budgets if we send forward these master's degrees. But there were people who were concerned that that should not be the motivations for these degrees. So the proposals that you saw were the ones that ECGF and others thought really had some intellectual content. And quite frankly some of them

are not going to make any money at all. In fact, someone else may have to cover -- well no, I'm not going to say that because we're not going to cover it (laughter), the provost isn't going to cover it. But let me say, we don't have this, but the Council of Graduate Schools has a number of studies and there is this big thing out there called the professional science master's, which a lot of public institutions have glommed onto. So this push for master's degrees has really been out there, and I think in some ways we've been affected by that just a little bit. But I think we're actually far more careful with what we're doing than some of our colleagues at public institutions.

**Warren Grill (Biomedical Engineering):** Could you put the table back up that shows growth? So I think Paula, this is a really important step that you're taking by looking at the impact of growth in master's programs. But I want to raise the point that we lose sight of the institution. I'm less concerned with the number of new degrees, which I think is something we're able to as a group collectively titrate, than the number of new students that are getting master's in an existing degree programs. So in my own home school, Pratt School of Engineering, we had an eighty-six percent growth, not a twenty percent growth in master's degrees. So I think we need to somehow as an institution pay attention, not just to new degrees, but how many students are coming from existing degrees. And how can we integrate what you're looking at, which is really focused on the first line, the Graduate School, and the vast majority of students who are not getting a master's degree through that but through some other faculty institution. I don't know how to do that collectively, but I think it's important because it's impacting -- every student there in the 2012-2013 column could take a class in Statistics, not just those who are getting master's degrees from the Gradu-

ate School. So it impacts us institutionally.

**McClain:** Right. Warren, I think this may be a discussion that might have to take place among the deans after we finish the study to kind of talk about what this may mean. Because you're right, students don't just stay in their programs. They are everywhere, and they can take classes because of our tuition structure. Basically you pay your tuition and you can kind of go -- depending on what your departmental requirements are -- any place else. So I think this is a conversation that I hope that the deans can have after we get a sense of what's going on.

**Grill:** And I think Tallman left, but someone should tell him that everyone needs a parking place (laughter).

**Alex Hartemink (Computer Science and chair of APC):** Two things -- one is a guess and the other is an observation that leads to a request. The guess is in response to Jane's question, and I think part of the reason this might be happening is that there's just been an explosion in the uptake of college in our society. It used to be that not as many people went to college and then when people found out that college was correlated with better income they thought, oh if I go to college I'll get better income. So we have a lot more people who are going to college, and now they're finding that doesn't necessarily do it so the master's degree is sort of the new bachelor's degree. That's my guess as to why there's a secular change in the demand and interest in this. The second thing is if we do want to reach some sort of equilibrium either in number of programs or number of students through the programs; to be at equilibrium is to have as many losses as gains. And right now we hear a lot about how to propose new programs and how they're evaluated, but I'm not hearing so much about how to sunset programs and kill them off (laughter).

Or to reduce the size of certain programs. So the suggestion or the request would be that in the process of your data discovery and discussion that you're about to embark on if you could think a little bit about how do we determine which programs are not effective or not providing students jobs or things like that, so that we can achieve balances. We're always going to want to create and grow new things, and we also have to find ways to offset that.

**McClain:** In the questions directed to our peers one of the questions that we have is what is their sort of decertification process for degrees that are no longer working or whatever. Now I must tell you that we have some undergraduate school admitting master's programs that are on the books, but the department has just decided that they don't want to admit, maybe every now and then they'll admit a student, you know. But they don't really want to take the degree off the books because they may find a student in any given year who they want to admit. So yes, we are thinking about that. I didn't have time, but I need to find out what our internal process is for getting rid of degrees. Now we did get rid of a school, right? Education in the seventies.

**Lange:** You don't want to repeat that (laughter).

**McClain:** So obviously there may have been some process there.

**Hartemink:** I mean, to some extent the challenge is not to eliminate the programs that are only bringing in one student every few years but rather to manage the ones that are maybe too big. Not to eliminate them but to -- as you're saying -- have some pressure on the number that they can reasonably admit.

**Wolpert:** But you have a new mechanism

that allows you to do that. You said that you're now going to be counting the bodies in...

**McClain:** For the ones under the Graduate School.

**Wolpert:** So at least on that one trade road she's got the tool now.

**Socolar:** Peter, did you want to say something?

**Lange:** Yeah, I just want to make a couple observations. First of all, I think this table is extremely important for another reason. So this fall for instance, you counted things, you said there's been a twenty percent growth, and that's true. But I would note that there's been an increase of a hundred and sixty students, okay? And when we increased the size of the Pratt School of Engineering we increased it by two hundred students, and in 2008 we increased the undergraduate student body by another two hundred students. So the focus on programs -- which really created this sense, I think, of a pressure in the Fall because we had all these programs coming through -- but as Paula noted, if you took all five of those programs and put them together they're only going to add sixty-five students. In three years it only adds sixty-five students to the master's student body. That's the first observation I have. So we need to be careful not to just use the programs, which really just reflect faculty initiative with the number of students, which reflects some balance between the supply we're willing to offer in terms of teaching and the demand, as Alex was saying, that's out there for those programs. The other observation I would make is for the other column -- and I think Warren raises a very important issue -- for the other columns this is a function of the structure that we generally, I think you generally as faculty and we as an administration admire,

which is that we leave a lot of decision making about professional education to the schools where the professional education goes on. So if there's a breakdown here, to some extent it's a failure of the faculty within the schools to exercise whatever issues they want around what size the professional master's programs should be in their schools. Are you really sure that you want to ask the Graduate School to start overseeing and making decisions about the size of master's degree programs in individual schools? I will tell you, you might think that the power of the provost's office has expanded mammothly over the past fifteen years, but I can assure you that we never wanted to touch the master's programs in the schools. So I would just say in observing the conversation it's important to remember that it's a very articulated structure. Paula made a very distinct difference between the master's programs in the Graduate School, of which we had a lot of new pretty small, not all of them, master's come up in the fall and the number of students who are being added and what's in professional schools. And the only observation I would make, the question of the burden, quote close quote, or the demand being created on the teaching and departments outside of the fields in which the master's program, is a very important question. But again, one of the real strengths of Duke has been that we have avoided counting enrollments essentially as a token -- saying, if you push up the enrollment you get more revenue, if you push down the enrollment -- that's something that goes on in the public. We've tended to avoid that. We don't allocate a lot based on enrollments. So again, we're going to want to take some care if we start counting too much because I don't think we generally think of our departments as being unique silos -- certainly not a Duke -- unique silos where they only provide services, in this case teaching, to their own students. Now that doesn't mean that when the demand gets too

big there might not be some revenue that gets shared out, but I think a narrow counting approach is likely not to be very conducive to the broader intellectual climate we're trying to create. Sorry I took so long.

**Socolar:** Thanks very much, Paula (ap-  
plause).

#### *CREATION OF AN ACADEMIC COUNCIL DI- VERSITY TASK FORCE*

So we don't have a lot of time left, but for a change ECAC actually has something that it wants to push through really fast (laughter). Following the Council Conversation at our January meeting -- and I want to thank the panelists again -- ECAC members have spent some time batting around ideas about how the faculty can help move Duke towards its goals of a diverse and inclusive campus culture. Around our own table, there is a clear consensus that these are critical issues and that we are at a juncture where faculty input would be especially helpful. We're therefore proposing that the Council create a Task Force charged with envisioning institutional structures and practices that reflect our commitment to a diverse and inclusive academic environment. As we see it, the charge to the Task Force would have three broad components. First, would be to articulate a vision of institutional diversity that can serve as a platform for the development of strategic plans -- a vision that covers desired outcomes and also the nature of the processes that would sustain them. Second, would be to study the recent demographics of the Duke faculty along with the hiring processes at Duke and elsewhere to identify structural elements that may limit our chances of realizing the vision. And third, to recommend actions that administrators and faculty should take to improve our hiring and retention processes and the inclusiveness of the Duke campus culture. Now before introducing our

formal motion, which asks you to authorize ECAC to form the Task Force, I just want to say just a few words about ECAC's intent so that you have some idea of what you might be voting for. The first thing to note is that a lot of good work has been done at Duke in these areas over the past ten years or more, most notably by Ben Reese and others in OIE, by Provost Lange, Vice Provost Nancy Allen, the Faculty Diversity Committee, and by President Brodhead and even our Board of Trustees. Our intent is to amplify those efforts by adding a distinct faculty voice to the discussion, and we would expect the Task Force to work in partnership with these and other offices or committees on campus who work on related issues. In terms of the timeline, ECAC suggests that the Task Force be formed as soon as possible, that it submit an interim report to this Council in the Fall of 2014 and a final report in the Spring of 2015. And finally, ECAC has not yet decided on the precise size or composition of the committee. We are imagining something on the order of 12 faculty members, with the chair of the Academic Council, that would be me, or a designated member of ECAC serving ex officio. Twelve happens to be the number of units represented at the Council. We would begin by soliciting nominations -- including self-nominations -- from all faculty, and we would aim to put together a group with a broad range of perspectives. I can't resist pointing out here that there is a logical paradox of course -- we want to enlist a diverse group, but we're relying on that group itself to tell us what "diverse" means and how to achieve it. But we'll do our best, and we will take seriously whatever feedback you can give us.

So ECAC is putting forward the following motion. The motion reads:

*On behalf of the Academic Council, ECAC will establish a faculty Task Force on Diversity charged with articulating a vision of a diverse*

*and inclusive Duke University for the next decade and beyond, examining our current position in relation to that vision, and recommending actions that will move us toward it.*

The floor is open for discussion.

**Richardson:** Just a clarification question, you say just a vision of a diverse and inclusive Duke University, but it sounded from some of the earlier things that the main emphasis was on faculty hiring...

**Socolar:** So this is intentionally vague. We've realized in our conversations that the scope of the committee has to be somewhat limited. It can't encompass all possible aspects of diversity on campus. For example, I'm not sure it would make sense for this committee to look at undergraduate admissions. On the other hand, we recognize that part of the reason that we need a diverse faculty is to serve the students that we have, and we won't be able to answer these questions without understanding who those students are and what kinds of barriers they perceive to feeling like this is an inclusive environment. So we're leaving it to the Task Force to define the precise way in which it wants to approach these questions.

**Cohen:** I think the proposal is fine, but it does seem a little bit like *déjà vu* all over again. Having served on what I think was the first of these committees in the early eighties, it seems like about every seven years, maybe it's, you know, instead of sabbaticals (laughter) we decide to re-look at this issue. What do you see is going to be different about this than the previous various iterations?

**Socolar:** Well, I don't want to jump the gun. I'm not sure what this committee will find or come up with, but we do think that there's a reason that every seven years or really it's kind of every ten years the issue needs to be

revisited. Things are changing on campus, we're expanding into regions around the globe that we weren't in before, our student demographics look very different. What we understood to be the goal of the first diversity initiative might have been an increase in the number of black faculty. We recognize now that there needs to be a broader understanding of the goal and we also are at a stage right now where ten years of one initiative is coming to an end, a new provost is coming in, and this just seems like the right time for faculty to step up and say what we think. Now it could be that we say the same thing we said ten years ago. I would not bet on it. But if that's true, then we need to say it and reaffirm it.

**Haynie:** Josh, I'll just add to what you said. Something that I think is new about this is that it's a faculty driven task force, and in the past it's been from the top down initiatives with some faculty input. But this now is coming from the faculty and presumably will go up from the faculty.

**Roxanne Springer (Physics):** Maybe it'll work this time (laughter).

**Socolar:** Well the hope is that by involving faculty in it and making it a faculty owned process that it does get better penetration all the way down to the level of faculty doing searches with a committee of three people that they get more messages about the faculty feeling the importance of paying attention to these issues. We'll see. You know, this task force is going to have some real work to do, and I look forward to working with whoever steps up or gets drafted to step up and we'll see where it goes.

*(motion approved by voice vote with no dissent)*

Okay, we will have the task force, and ECAC

will get back to you on it. I want to say one more thing before you leave. For those of you who have a little time and curiosity about how the earth and moon were formed, a good place to go from here would be the Hertha Sponer Presidential Lecture in Von Canon, which starts at 5:15. The speaker is Robin Canup, Trinity class of '90. The lecture series is named for Hertha Sponer, the first female full professor in the natural sciences at Duke. Our next meeting will be on March 27th and will be in conjunction with the Annual Faculty Meeting. And we'll have President Brodhead here and a reception following. Thanks everybody.