

# Duke University

DURHAM  
NORTH CAROLINA  
27708-0928

ACADEMIC COUNCIL  
304 UNION WEST  
BOX 90928

phone (919) 684-6447  
e-mail [acouncil@Duke.edu](mailto:acouncil@Duke.edu)  
fax (919) 681-8606

## Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Academic Council

Thursday February 24, 2011

Craig Henriquez (Chair, Academic Council and Professor of Biomedical Engineering and Computer Science): Welcome everyone. I think we'll get started. I'd like to move on relatively quickly because Dean Sheppard is here and will answer any questions you might have regarding the MMS proposal – he has to leave in the next twenty



minutes. I want to remind you to sign the attendance list that should be making its way around the room. Also, if you have a question or comment please indicate who you are for the record. Let's move to the approval of the January 20 minutes? Are there any corrections? (collective no...) Well this was a test, because apparently there is a mistake (laughter). I noticed in my reading of the minutes, since I was trying to remember what MMS actually stood for, I believe it stands for Master of Management Studies, but in the minutes it says Master of Management Sciences. So I think we should strike that from the record and correct it appropriately. I think I must have misspoken that time, so with that correction may I have a motion to approve?  
[passed by voice vote with no dissent.]

I also want to remind you that at this meeting, we will be electing the next chair of the Council. As you saw with the agenda, the nominees' bios and statements of

interest were posted. If you need one, I believe there are a few copies down on the table here. I'd like to ask Susan Lozier and Tom Metzloff to stand so you can see who you're voting for today. In addition to the candidates who have been presented by the nominating committee, nominations from the floor are open at this time – with the one caveat that the prospective candidate has to have agreed in advance to serve. Are there any nominations? Hearing none, I declare the nominations closed and the election process to begin. The ballots are being distributed and our counters today are Kathy Nightingale from the Pratt School and Julie Barroso from Nursing. Also a reminder that only Council members may vote and only once, this is not Chicago (laughter), only once, and if you are an alternate here in the role of substituting for a Council member our bylaws prevent you from voting.

### *Master of Management Studies*

Our first agenda item is consideration of the MMS – Master of Management Studies – proposal. At the last meeting, Fuqua presented a proposal for the MMS degree, which is currently in a pilot stage, and also presented a proposal for a *template* for the MMS Global degree. As was noted at the meeting, the Council has never really been asked to vote for a template. ECAC thought about this some more, and felt that it was better to consider the MMS degree as a single Duke degree, but one that possibly could have different concentrations as indicated in the MMS Global proposal. Note that the new concentrations, if they are generated, may require a separate approval process as determined by ECAC. The general philosophy is: if a new concentration means additional students at Duke, so more students would come as a consequence of a new concentration, then this should be reviewed by a set of appropriate committees, particularly the MAC (the Masters Advisory Council), which was established last year, and then MAC would then make a recommendation to the Academic Programs

Committee that then could forward it up the chain if they needed to or it could end at ECAC.

So, ECAC has the liberty to decide what the process is for such concentrations. If a new concentration does not involve new students and is basically providing existing or future students new options in their degree, then this approval could be local to the Fuqua School. I just wanted to clarify the nature of the process or the nature of the approval process. I sent an email to all of you last night. I don't know if you saw it, but the idea is that we do not want to consider the MMS global at this time as there are details that still need to be worked out in terms of approval of sites and potential foreign partners. So this process has not been fully worked out by ECAC. We believe this is going to be done in the new Global Priorities Committee, which has already been established and will meet sometime in the middle of March. So we are asking that any global component of the MMS degree be postponed until there is a concrete proposal from Fuqua.

As they have indicated, a future proposal will likely involve the MMS degree, assuming it is approved today, with a particular concentration that may be tailored to the site and one that could be formed with a partnership with other schools or institutes at Duke like Nicholas or Global Health. Dean Sheppard is here to answer any questions you might have, so I will open the floor for questions regarding the MMS proposal and its future.

### Questions

Blair Sheppard (Dean of the Fuqua School of



Business): Can I just add one point of clarification as well which is any concentration that includes another school I assume also goes through MAC?

Henriquez: That is correct, any concentration that involves another school will go through MAC, potentially up the chain yes.

Kerry Haynie (Political Science): My question's mainly for you, Craig, so does the language for the resolution preclude a global MMS?

Henriquez: No, it doesn't preclude it, it doesn't approve at this time any site or they're offering this degree at any other site than Duke. This is a Duke degree at this moment. So the idea is to create this degree, allow the options for concentrations to be created just like what was

described in the global MMS proposal, but this is a Duke degree at this time, and if a future degree comes forward that has some other component like another site or a partnership with another university, then that would come to us or go through the appropriate governance bodies.

Sheppard: I just have something to add, what we are telling our faculty is that any degree in another location first goes to them, gets reviewed, and then gets brought into the university process for approval, which would start with MAC and the APC as well.

Pat Wolf (Pratt): I was wondering, you piloted the program and I'm wondering what the admissions statistics were like?

Sheppard: We are in our second year. The applications doubled for the first year to second year. If you take a look at the students, their profile essentially matches a young MBA student. If you take a look at GPA, GMED, essentially our MBA student quality five years early. They are incredibly great kids because we are the only one of our kind and we are getting written up a lot on this new degree.

They are from about 71 different schools and 50 different concentrations as undergraduates and from a ton of different countries. Their job success last year was the same as a full time MBA. What happens on the career piece with them is that they tend to get them later – remember they are only in a one year program. Five of them just presented the program to the people in the community two days ago and they just blew it out of the water, they are smart. Our sense is that given that the applicant pool is growing, it's just going to get better. Our assumption is that we were making sections in Durham so that the issue of us growing students, you might grow a few students, but we aren't getting much bigger.

Karla Holloway (English): Your last point is foundations in management, is that correct?

Henriquez: Foundations and Business concentration.

Holloway: So is that included in all of the other whereas too?

Henriquez: This is a good question. Yes. It's assuming that we are approving the Foundations and Business concentration which is the existing concentration for the MMS that is the only thing that has been brought forward.

I have a question regarding the ranking of the Fuqua Business School which I know is important, at least to the students who are looking at business schools. Does the MMS degree factor into that in some way? Or if it does could you explain how you think it might affect the ranking?

Sheppard: So there are two cases for that. First is that every degree that we do gets ranked in some way or another And so MMS will get ranked. What will happen is we will get ranked against the other master in management programs, predominantly European. As of now it's the third best in the world, which isn't bad even though our daytime program is nowhere near that by the same ranking. It doesn't contribute to what people think of as the primary ranking which is the daytime MBA.

The benefit of an MMS is that it allows us to actually stabilize the revenue streams at the school which is much

needed – and not harm the rankings. The last time we actually tried to grow a student body we really hurt the rankings because we grew the daytime program. And so the benefit of the MMS is that it doesn't harm the most important rankings, so yes and no.

Henriquez: Any other questions? Okay, so let's move on to the resolution which I sent to you last night – I can read it, it sounds very fancy because it has lots of whereases in it (laughter) or I can allow you to accept as it was given – do you want me to read it? (collective yes) Okay, I will read it! (laughter)

**WHEREAS, the Fuqua School of Business has proposed the creation of a Master of Management Studies (MMS) degree, a one-year business degree program designed to complement a general liberal arts, science, or technical undergraduate degree,**

**WHEREAS, the degree consists of eight core courses, which constitute the breadth expected in a master's-level business education, complemented by four elective courses that create the concentration of the degree,**

**WHEREAS, each concentration shall require separate approval by all the appropriate University committees as determined by ECAC before implementation,**

**WHEREAS, the appropriate committees of the University and the Provost have reviewed and endorsed the Masters of Management Studies degree program with a Foundation in Business concentration,**

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Academic Council endorses the creation of a Masters of Management Studies (MMS) degree and forwards the endorsement to the Board of Trustees.**

[Passed by voice vote with no dissent.]

### *Academic Council Election Process*

Henriquez: Before moving to our next agenda item, I want to make you aware of a few issues related to the Academic Council election process. As you know, we closed, yesterday in fact, this process of the annual election of Council members. We just missed setting a new record for electronic voting – by four votes – but we are nothing if not consistent. We'll be sharing the results in a few weeks, after we have the Election Committee review the results. As you know, this year we changed the nomination process by first asking faculty if they were interested in serving and then using those names to create the nomination ballot. This actually led to something good – a tripling of the number of people who participated in the nomination process, which we thought was a good outcome. But there was an unintended consequence of this. Because so few people participated in the nomination process in the past, last year I think we had about 200 or so people participate in the nomination process, it only took a few votes to make it onto the election ballot. This year

that was not the case and one of the unintended consequences of this was that two of our current ECAC members who would have served another year on ECAC, had they been re-elected, did not receive enough votes to make it onto the election ballot.

For those of you who are not familiar with the ECAC process, the Council elects every April typically three representatives to serve on ECAC. The total number serving on ECAC is eight, with one member being the Chair of the Council and the other the Faculty Secretary – John Staddon, currently.

According to our bylaws, for a member of ECAC to remain a member of ECAC, they need to be an active member of Academic Council or they need to be reelected in order to fulfill their term. As a result, instead of electing three new reps. to ECAC in April, the Council will be electing five, who will join a new Chair. Larry Zelenak, is the lone remaining ECAC member (laughter), along with John Staddon, so the institutional memory resides with them.

We've discussed this situation with the Election Committee and in ECAC, and they both suggested that the Council consider first a bylaw change that would in effect grant an ECAC member an automatic two-year Council term regardless of re-election to the Council. So, if they are elected in the middle of their Academic Council term, they would be granted another year extension on their Academic Council term. The number of Council reps for each ECAC's member's respective school or division would be adjusted by one to ensure that the Council distribution remains as our bylaws stipulate. We think it's very important to maintain continuity from one Council to the next, and for one Chair to the next to have members of ECAC who continue on and hopefully that number is roughly around three. It's not always the case, people leave for a variety of reasons, but we think it's ideal if we have this situation that three people maintain continuity on ECAC. But, there is still a problem, though, if we do this bylaw change, as suggested by ECAC and the Election Committee, and we elect five new members in April, then in two years those five members will be off and we'll have to elect another five new members. So, again, the new Chair will have a brand new ECAC to accompany them.

We have a couple of options. We can either grant a one-year extension to the terms of those who are already on ECAC – and I think because there is nothing in our bylaws which preclude this that the Council can vote to do it – or we can elect two of the five new ECAC members next time to serve a one year term so then we can return to the rotating of three every year.

So the idea is to have a bylaw change that would allow Council members to extend their term to an additional year if they are elected to ECAC so they do not have to go through the process of re-election. The other question is whether or not we grant a one-year extension to those already on ECAC who did not make it onto the election ballot and thus remain on ECAC; or, of the five people that we nominated next year, two of them would only serve a one year ECAC term. So that is out there now and I leave it up to you to ponder. If there are any other questions or thoughts I would like to hear them. Kerry?

Haynie: So do we have to vote today?

Henriquez: No, we do not have to vote today.

Haynie: Can we get them in writing?

Henriquez: We can get them in writing. The bylaw change needs to be sent to you ten days in advance and I can send these and let you mull them over at your leisure. Any other comments? Tom?

Tom Metzloff (Law): The bylaw change in your belief could apply to a current ECAC member?

Henriquez: If there is a bylaw change, if we do it early enough, then I guess in principle they would get their term extended and we would grant an extension of that term.

Metzloff: I guess my question: is that the intent?

Henriquez: That wasn't the intent. The intent would be for the next group, so first of all, what to do in the future, and what to do in this current situation. Any thoughts? Karla?

Holloway: It's just a thought that if we are voting on a policy issue it seems to me...an ideal situation is we



could attach it to a current vote. So seeing it retroactively gives a little discomfort. Attaching personnel policy on this I can see forecasting, but it seems like voting for your own raise (laughter).

Henriquez: Paula, do you have any comments?

Paula McClain (Political Science & former

Chair of AC): I was going to ask what is the easiest? It's a problem right now and so is it the easiest to just extend the current people on ECAC and not worry about a bylaw change?

Henriquez: So that is an interesting question. We do this, solve this immediate problem which is just extend and go back to the original bylaw, and it does require that the members of ECAC get on the nomination ballot and get onto the election ballot. That's the process and as I said before the challenge is really getting onto the election ballot and since we have increased the number of participants through this change, which is a good thing, it makes getting onto the election ballot that much more challenging for a current ECAC member. So before, the ECAC member would have to do a little lobbying to get a few people to vote for them and they would make it onto the election ballot, but we can continue with the current policy.

It's just that this likelihood of people not returning, or maybe we need to make it more explicit to the Council of who the continuing ECAC members are so they can consider them explicitly which we have not done in the

past. We can let them know these are the ECAC members, they need to be voted on for them to continue. So, that is an option.

Peter Lange (Provost): If we can extend between two people, you can extend those two terms even today and then the bylaw change, but you are also creating ...

Voice: Could you speak up?

Lange: Never mind.

Henriquez: You can tell me.

Richard Brodhead (President): He was willing to mumble it but not to tell you (laughter).

Henriquez: But I do want to hear it.

Garnett Kelsoe (Immunology): We are evidently doing this to prevent the absence of institutional memory, and can you explain exactly what we are trying to avoid? What kind of loss is this for ECAC?

Henriquez: I think it's valuable to the Chair to have members of ECAC who have some memory of what happened the previous year. In this case we have one ECAC member who can provide that memory, but having multiple views on a particular topic is sometimes valuable, so having the continuity...

I think when the Council was created there was this sense that ECAC members will be elected for a two year term, but it's also provided that they get elected to the Academic Council so that is sort of established and I see the reasons for doing that, but the idea, the hope, was to maintain some sort of continuity from year to year and Chair to Chair. I think that was the idea. But the point is that as long as you have one ECAC member, perhaps you have some memory.

Kelsoe: Are there minutes of the ECAC meetings?

Henriquez: There are minutes, but those minutes require some interpretation.

Marie Lynn Miranda (ECAC and NSOE): I'll just respond to your question as well. I'm a second-year on my ECAC service so I don't have a vested interest in this change, but I have certainly found that there are any number of issues that first arose during the first year of my ECAC service and have continued on into this year and the knowledge that I gained at the very beginning of this process that you couldn't really gain in the same way if you read all of the minutes. That has been very valuable. I feel like my ability to contribute as a meaningful member of ECAC this year is deeply enhanced by my experience last year.

Wolf: It just seems like this is a democratic process, maybe they are voted off for good reasons (laughter). I don't see why you should mess with that, I just think it's kind of like the presidency. Changes are changes and you deal with what you've got.

Otis Jennings (Fuqua): What about the possibility of not allowing people to get on ECAC but the possibility that they get voted off? Why not just change the eligibility?

Henriquez: Well that's a possibility, to pick only those members who have a potential two-year term, and that is a possibility because it is a constraint that may not lead to the ideal distribution but perhaps that is a possibility to solve the problem.

Warren Grill (Pratt): I'm wondering if perhaps rather than guaranteeing the election of the ECAC member to the Academic Council, we rather guarantee their nomination. That way we have an explicit up or down vote as Professor Wolf indicated, people would then be able to express positively or negatively how they felt about that individual rather than being denied any kind of decision because they were not nominated.

Henriquez: Yes, that's another option of course.

John Staddon (Faculty Secretary, Psychology and Neuroscience): I think the continuity argument is actually very good. But there is endless debate about this issue and the simplest thing might be...which would satisfy that also, is just to vote on continuing the two people who are now left out and worry about the larger issue later.

Sara Beale (Law): Before I did that, I would actually like to see those names and who they are and have a chance to think about it, so the same way we have the names of the candidates for Chair who are here and being asked to vote on certain individuals. That's number one. Number two: I do think that either requiring people who have an eligibility to serve or some mechanism that matches things up or a star on the ballot, that that is a person who is continuing so that the unit does have a choice, occasionally there could be disagreements in your unit about some important issue and I would hate to choke that off in a long-term mechanism.

Henriquez: This is all very good, so I think what we will do is we will wait until the next meeting, we will get information out to everybody, we will get the language and options out, including ones that have been offered here, and let people talk about it at the next meeting. So thank you very much.

### *DukeEngage*

Our next item is a presentation about DukeEngage from the director Eric Mlyn. If you were at our October meeting, you recall that this was scheduled for then but we had to ask Eric to come back because we were going over our allotted time.

As many of you know, DukeEngage was launched in 2007 through the establishment of a \$30 million gift from the Duke Endowment and The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. DukeEngage provides funding for Duke undergraduates who wish to pursue an immersive (minimum of eight weeks) service experience by meeting a community need either locally or internationally. And the question is why bring this to this Council? Well, DukeEngage is viewed as a University priority and while there is a substantial endowment behind DukeEngage, it is also a very recent endowment. One of the consequences of the financial dislocation that we experienced a couple of years ago is that many of the new endowments went under water so they could not provide a payout. As a result, DukeEngage needed to be funded by central resources until the endowment is now again above water. The change in funding also affected the numbers of students that could be supported by the program. By many metrics that Eric will talk about today, DukeEngage has been

viewed as very successful and is clearly a draw for high-school students applying to Duke. It is increasingly seen as a distinctive feature of the Duke experience. While it is distinctive, it is also expensive – particularly, as it is not yet entirely endowment supported.

So ECAC thought it might be helpful to have Eric talk today about DukeEngage and efforts to assess the program and perhaps this may lead to further discussion of how it fits within the overall priorities and how best to improve the experience for the student and, more importantly, those with whom the student engages, and how to make it more cost effective.

Eric Mlyn ( Executive Director of DukeEngage): Thank you Craig. I am very pleased to have the opportunity to talk to the Academic Council about DukeEngage. And one of the things that I am very pleased to be able to talk to you about today is some of the results of an ongoing evaluation and assessment of the program and the kind of results that we see that we are getting in the



mention of the program.

DukeEngage has now completed three full summers of service. We have placed over 1,000 Duke students in domestic and international placements. Note that over 100 of those students have served in Durham, North Carolina which is our largest program and DukeEngage remains committed to serving locally, nationally, and internationally.

This coming summer, DukeEngage will place 425 students in 35 different programs that we have as well as allowing 45 students to pursue individual projects. So how did we get to this point? One of the most rewarding things about building DukeEngage has been the response of Duke faculty and staff. We put out a call for proposals each year to faculty and staff to propose programs to us, to take a group of students somewhere in the world to pursue a service project. That process of faculty and staff proposals has become a very competitive process. We have more faculty and staff who have good ideas for leading projects than we have room to take on new projects.

One of our goals from the very beginning of DukeEngage has been to build projects and to keep those projects going, that is good civic engagement to work in a community and go back to that community each and every year. And most of the programs that we are pursuing this coming summer, are programs that we now have a long-

term relationship with, so faculty and staff have been a central part in building DukeEngage. It has fallen on very fertile ground here at the university through units like the Center of Documentary Studies, through the Pratt School of Engineering, through the Nicholas School, where we have a new program where we will be sending students working on oil cleanup in Louisiana. That's been a very rewarding part of building this program.

We also have about five programs that we contract with volunteer 'sending' organizations. These are organizations that are in a sense in the business of placing not only students but citizens in volunteer placements around the world and they often have very deep relationships with their communities. As I mentioned a moment ago, we have about 50 students who will do individual projects with DukeEngage. All of those individual students have a faculty or staff mentor and apply to DukeEngage. This year we are wrapping up our applications for the summer. For the 425 slots that we have, we had nearly 900 applications, so DukeEngage has become a selective program and depending on which program you apply to, it can be very selective. Some for example, have 60 applications for 8 spots and so these are very difficult decisions, these are students that have already been accepted to Duke and many of whom would be qualified to do this.

When we created the programs we created a mission statement in consultation with our Faculty Advisory Board. And that mission statement which is right on the first page of this small CD sized handout is very important. It is something we refer to a lot because it really talks about the three goals of the program. DukeEngage empowers students to address critical human needs through immersive service, in the process transforming students, advancing the University's educational mission, and providing meaningful assistance to the communities in the US and abroad.

So what is important about that is we really want to have three goals. We are seeking to impact students, we are seeking to impact the communities that our students are working with, and we are seeking in a more general way to impact the University. And I can give you a little bit on each one of those in the time that I have remaining. First and foremost is student development. We are an educational institution and we are looking to foster in students a deep cross-cultural respect, appreciation and understanding, an act of commitment to society, an appreciation for education and the transferrable skills that come from taking part in these kinds of projects, the ability to apply knowledge creatively across boundaries.

What we are finding... we do evaluation and assessment in two ways. We have our own internal DukeEngage evaluation and assessment program and we also work very closely with David Jamison-Drake and the Institutional Research Office in tracking Duke students in the Duke system. So we have a lot of information about where the students are coming from. Five years out we'll have information about where our DukeEngage students are going, but some of our preliminary data is very exciting.

Of particular interest is the relationship between DukeEngage and our participant's academic experience and their relationship to faculty, an issue that I think would be of interest to the Academic Council. The data suggests that DukeEngage program participants are more satisfied with opportunities to do research with faculty, are more likely to participate in independent and faculty research, and have more relationships with faculty who for example can write letters of reference, and this is from the senior survey of students who are doing DukeEngage.

We have some preliminary data to suggest that DukeEngage participation predicts graduation with distinction.

Together I think that this is very powerfully suggestive that DukeEngage may indeed foster the kinds of faculty-student interaction that we know are the hallmarks of what we want a Duke undergraduate education to be.

In looking at the impact on community, something much harder to measure, a lot of the impact that we have, intangible, they're long-term, but we do surveys, we do focus groups with our community partners, both at home and abroad, and we know that, for example, a couple of questions that we have asked of our community partners is what do DukeEngage students bring to you when they come work in your community? The most common answer, 67% of our community partners reported that our students bring time, energy, and skills. Time, energy, and skills that they wouldn't have without our Duke students. Over 60% reported that something was done that would not have been done without the Duke students there. Other things are that our Duke students bring a positive attitude, a different perspective, and new knowledge and this varies from whether a Duke student is working in the self-help credit union in Durham, North Carolina or whether they are working for a very small NGO in Kakamega Kenya, and we are now disaggregating our community impact assessment so that we can be more responsive to the particular kinds of circumstances our DukeEngage students are working in.

In general, the most common goals of the projects for DukeEngage students are educational, about a quarter of them are focused on education in some way. The second is health outcomes and we partner very closely with the Global Health Institute, community development outcomes are third, and non-profit capacity building, environmental outcomes, and immigrant and refugee community outreach are also major goals working with communities.

The third part of our mission is to impact the University in some way. In that way we are talking about who applies to Duke, who matriculates at Duke, and most importantly, what Duke students are talking about on the East-West bus, in their dorm rooms, in their dining halls, and of course, in the classroom. We know, and Craig alluded to this, that last year in their applications to Duke University, high school seniors mentioned DukeEngage as the most important reason for why they were applying to Duke. That was mentioned more than anything else, closely followed by basketball (laughter), about 100 more students mentioned DukeEngage than mentioned basketball, we don't know the results after the National

Championship, but in my preliminary conversation with our admissions staff, high school students are increasingly applying to Duke because they know of this program.

We had a large percentage of the Duke students as I reported earlier, apply, look at our application, deeply involved in thinking about coming to our fall information sessions talking about the kinds of projects that we do. More generally, the University has been recognized by the federal government, the Corporation for National Community Service with its presidential honor roll, we coordinated two years ago an application to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching for a new classification that Carnegie has. Certain campuses are classified as Engaged Campuses and Duke is indeed a deeply engaged campus that has received that from the Carnegie Foundation.

We are making some very good progress in the short period of time that DukeEngage has been here; we are looking forward to our fourth summer where we will have 425 students; we have increased the number of domestic placements, we'll be over 25% where our students are working in the United States with a new program as I mentioned, in Bayou Grace, working on middle school literacy in Spring Creek, North Carolina, and of course our Durham program.

Looking toward the future, one of the things we are focusing on now, as was alluded to earlier, is raising additional resources for DukeEngage – this is not an inexpensive program to run. I am working very closely with the Development Office, we have parents of DukeEngage students, alumni who are very excited about this, we are making very good progress in attracting new resources to the program. Now that we have programs running, in some cases we have a pilot year, so in some cases we have programs going into their fourth summer and we want to focus this summer on the quality of our programs, improving the quality – that is the impact that the programs are having on the students and on the communities – and to make some decisions about which programs will repeat and whether we need to bring new programs into the DukeEngage experience.

We also want to, in addition to new resources and the quality of the program, we want to deepen the DukeEngage experience. What do students do when they get back to campus? And so we are working very closely with the Career Center so that students can sometimes apply to internships to go back to the community that they came from. You can only get DukeEngage funding once and so we have a lot of students coming back who either want to go back or who want to pursue what they are doing in Durham and so there is a variety of programs on campus who allow students to do that. We are working with the Dean's grants, with the RIT program to get students additional funding opportunities for their civic engagement. Finally, we want to connect DukeEngage deeply to the curriculum, we offered five new courses last fall for DukeEngage students who want to continue thinking about their DukeEngage experience. I am very excited about this coming fall, I'll be leading a new focus program called Knowledge in the Service of Society which will focus on civic engagement and actually give students

a service learning opportunity in the Durham public schools.

So we are making good progress on connecting it to the curriculum, there is more to be done. One thing that we found there, I will just note, is that Duke students aren't necessarily taking the courses we're offering but instead, when they talk to colleagues, when I talked to Charles Piot, he told me in his economic development class that half the students had participated in our program in Kenya and that they are finding their own way connecting what they've done to the myriad of courses that they can take when they get back. We need to do a better job of documenting how students are doing that.

The last thing I will say is that we are always looking for new opportunities, new programs for DukeEngage. I very much enjoy going to schools and departments and talking to faculty about what it takes to put together a DukeEngage program and would be very happy to visit with any of your units if you think your faculty and/or staff would be interested in doing so. With that, I think we have a few minutes for questions.

### *Questions*

Steffen Bass (ECAC / Physics): I certainly can speak in support of the notion that DukeEngage has become a very big factor for students applying to Duke University; I have seen that in my own conversations with students. However, as Craig pointed out, there is a competition for resources and a competition for opportunities, and so you mentioned that students who participate in DukeEngage are more likely to participate in research on campus with faculty members. I was wondering, and that is my first



question, about whether you have numbers which reflect that? How did the number of students who have been doing research with faculty on campus develop over the years that the DukeEngage program has been active on campus? Do these numbers go down because students do DukeEngage instead or do these numbers go up because DukeEngage has this trailblazing effect to get the students in?

The second question I have is more in terms of competition for financial resources. Can you give us an average number for the cost per student that DukeEngage has, perhaps how much of that cost per student actually is

put to work in the local community or setting in which the student is put to do the project?

Mlyn: On the first question on research, I don't have the overall statistics on whether Duke students are currently doing more research now than they were before, but I think those numbers are up, way up. And so how much DukeEngage is responsible for that I don't know, but given the correlation for that I would imagine that DukeEngage explains some of it.

Your question about resources is a really interesting one and I'll be honest with you. I had a student who was in our Vietnam program and he was in a house course that I was leading, and he asked us how much we spent on that program: 12 students, that particular program may have been \$70,000-\$75,000 and he said to me, "What if we had just given that \$75,000 to that community?" Because their air fares were \$2,000, their pharmacy bill was \$500 each, the visas were \$100, and it adds up. My answer was that we are in the business of educating students and that we think that the ripple effect of having students being involved in civic engagement short term will actually expand the number of people, whether they are going to Teach for America or investment banking who bring that civic engagement sensibility with them. So I think the long term payment will be great. We are not a granting agency to communities, we're spending a little over \$4 million a year, and about over \$3 million of that goes directly to student costs.

Steven Baldwin (Chemistry): Has it made an impact on study abroad?

Mlyn: We work very closely with study abroad. We are 99% a summer program and we are looking at the summer numbers for study abroad, and initially their numbers were down. That also happened to coincide with the economic downturn and how much of that was because of DukeEngage or not I don't know. I believe last time study abroad numbers came up a little bit, but my overall sense is that DukeEngage has affected it to some extent, but what we are finding is that students are doing both DukeEngage and study abroad. Last year, a quarter of the students who completed DukeEngage did not come back to campus in the fall, but instead went somewhere else to do a study abroad program.

Thea Portier-Young (Divinity): Has DukeEngage partnered with professional schools at all? And if not, is that something that you see in the future? I am thinking in particular of the Divinity School; our students do a lot of international field eds, and we have relationships with various communities in parts of the world where I could imagine opportunities for undergrads that could be linked with those and I was just wondering if you had explored any of those tie-ins?

Mlyn: We are actually pursuing the beginning stages of talking about a Luce Foundation grant for a Divinity School project. I'm working with Abdullah the Muslim Chaplain, somewhere in the Middle East that has become an incredibly volatile region, we're not sure if our Cairo program will run this summer, we're making that decision on April 4th about whether we will be sending students there. We are open to those partnerships. We have not had a program with the Divinity School as of yet.

Bass: I have a suggestion in that same vein. I'm not sure how many people are aware of that here, but Duke is one of the few host institutions in the world for Rotary Peace Scholars, who are situated in mostly Fuqua and the Law School and that could be a very good cross-fertilization between those professional students who are engaged in very high level projects and the Duke undergrad population.

Mlyn: Duly noted.

Jennifer Brody (ECAC, African & African American Studies, Theater Studies & Women's Studies): Just to follow up on that point, the Duke Human Rights Center run by Robin Kirk would also be good.

Mlyn: Robin runs a DukeEngage program in Northern Ireland and is going into her second summer doing that.

Brody: On the poster you might want to have specific names rather than a Duke student, to think about the advertising of the program.

Mlyn: Thanks very much for your time and questions.

Henriquez: Thanks Eric. First of all before I get to our last item, does anyone need a ballot? Please come and pick up your ballots, fill them out quickly so that we can have them counted – at the end of the meeting, I'll announce the new chair.

### *Faculty Diversity Report*

Our last agenda item is a presentation of the Faculty Diversity Report, which was last presented to Council in December of 2008. If you had a chance to read through the report, you will see that there has been a long history in trying to actively enhance the diversity at Duke. You may not know that almost exactly fifty years ago in March 1961, the Board of Trustees announced that students would be admitted to Duke's graduate and professional schools without regard to "race, creed, or national origin" and then a year later announced that undergraduate students would be admitted without regard to race. Forty-five years ago Duke hired its first black faculty member, Samuel DuBois Cook. I am proud to say that my graduate student Navid Pourtaheri, who is of Iranian descent, did his own form of civic engagement and developed some science programs in the Durham public schools, and was one of the recipients of this year's "Sammie" awards given out this week, named in honor of Dr. Cook and his legacy of public service.

In 1988, Duke launched the five year Black Faculty Initiative (BFI) with the goal of adding one Black faculty member in each of the academic units at Duke. While that initiative did not meet its goal, it led to the Black Faculty Strategic Initiative that began in 1993 with the goal of doubling the total number of regular rank Black faculty members – a goal that was met with leadership by the administration and commitment by the faculty to this effort. In 2003, the Faculty Diversity Initiative (FDI) was launched with efforts to increase faculty diversity – where diversity was defined more broadly than it had been in the earlier initiatives.

Today Provost Lange and Nancy Allen, former Chair of this Council and now Vice Provost for Faculty Diversity & Development, will discuss the latest data that's in the report and the efforts underway to enhance diversity at Duke.

Lange: Thank you Craig. Actually Nancy has suggested that I do this, so I will. It's a little over seven years ago since we completed the Black Faculty Strategic Initiative and when we did that we created the Faculty Diversity Initiative which came out of two task forces, the Women's Faculty Development Task Force, which was part of President Keohane's Women's Initiative and a second one on faculty diversity and we agreed at the time that we would report every other year on our progress and that's what this report represents. The reason for every other year is that the numbers really don't move enough from year to year to warrant an annual report, but every other year is a good thing.

You have received that report, so what I am going to do today is pick out some things about how we are working on the initiative and what some of our areas of continuing concern and intervention are. In terms of efforts related to Black faculty development, the Black Faculty Strategic Initiative, as I said, concluded in 2003. In the Faculty Diversity Initiative we expanded the scope of our efforts to develop a widely diverse community, even as we as an institution committed to continuing our efforts to recruit and retain Black faculty, especially African-American faculty. We do not intend to lessen those commitments and we have not as you shall see. Since we compete with peer institutions for the recruitment and retention of Black faculty, we need to maintain strong recruitment strategies and ensure that we create the best environment and support for the retention of our colleagues when other institutions come calling which they very often do.

We also continue our efforts to recruit and retain other faculty of color in fields where they are underrepresented and our efforts to increase the number of women in sciences, technology, and engineering, and mathematics, the so-called STEM fields. What I am going to do now is comment on the progress we made as it relates to the ten-point plan we issued as part of the FDI and then talk about a few data points, and I hope to do that in time for plenty of discussion and for the announcement of the new Council chair, which I know you are all sitting on the edge of your seats awaiting – the tension is just incredible (laughter).

I'm going to just go through the ten goals, and the first was to form and charge a Faculty Diversity Standing Committee. This committee meets about two to three times a semester, and it basically gives me advice on initiatives we might take and criticisms and evaluations of the data that we present. In the past two years, the topics they have worked on include the development and implementation of the 2010 faculty survey data which is almost ready to be announced, data related to faculty diversity at Duke, discussions related to mentoring, associate professor women, junior faculty development, and obviously a number of other matters.

We also reported what we would do, we would report out every other year and that is what this represents today. We do conduct annual exit interviews with all faculty who leave the university. Ron Witt, a retired faculty member, emails them in order to have a call, most of them respond and Ron then has an interview with them and then reports back the results of those interviews to Nancy and myself and they are quite interesting. They don't tend to show broad patterns or trends but they do seem to highlight occasional areas where we need to take steps in order to better serve our faculty and obviously this is not uniquely a faculty diversity issue, this is an all-faculty issue. I review with the deans the inclusion of women and minorities in search and applicant finalist pools, we press this pretty hard. In addition, Nancy and Jackie Looney also work with the dean's departmental and search committees to proactively promote the inclusiveness in the search pools. They lead sessions every year, generally in the fall during the height of the search season. They had five this year with about twenty to thirty participants in each session. These are people who are actually serving on the search committees in order to encourage them to build strong pools and diverse pools and to watch out for the kinds of more subtle forms of bias that can creep into these processes as you're working.

And we've had, I think, a good deal of success with trying to raise self-consciousness about those issues. Mentoring is an ongoing challenge, it is very difficult, I will admit, for us to fully implement this initiative. We have a report that came out in 2006 which was developed by the Faculty Diversity Standing Committee and we do work with the deans on a regular basis, but I have to admit, every department and school has its own way of organizing mentoring and we're absolutely convinced that it is not useful to try to establish a unique model for how mentoring occurs. So, the most we can do is effectively jaw-bone in all the areas to try to ensure that mentoring is occurring properly and to respond when we can, when we identify places where mentoring has not occurred.

I will tell you that one of the best mechanisms for knowing where the weak points are is the APT process. Because in the APT process, we see the files of faculty members, we see the review committee reports, we see the re-appointment reports and we can see to what extent mentoring has been going on in the departments. And when we find out cases where it has been weak, we do push back with the relevant faculty leaders or administrators.

We have been trying to improve the recognition of women and minorities in distinguished chairs and as recipients of awards and honors, and I do want to show you what has been happening in this next slide which shows the pattern. Those are the results year by year; you can see that we had a big push from 2006 to 2008 in the area of women. That's come down a little bit in part because there was a real backlog, I believe, of senior women who had not been appropriately recognized for distinguished chairs. In the last five years, we've gone from 17% women to 20% women and we are continuing to emphasize that with the deans. As you know now, these processes sit within the schools and are driven by the

recommendations of faculty members and administrators to the school distinguished professors committees. I think that was a very good development, but of course it means that there's a little bit of decentralization – you have to work unit by unit. We are pushing hard, I tried to, with each of the deans, to emphasize the importance of diversity in their schools on a regular basis and also to participate in events which will encourage diversity across the campus.

I want to report to you on one initiative which is coming out of a school which I find particularly striking. Dean Katsouleas, in the Pratt School, has been developing a committee within Pratt, a new proposal to develop a diversity strategy. It has actually a thirteen-point plan, which includes a number of steps – I won't go in to all of the steps now – but that plan I believe is now being discussed at the faculty level within Pratt. It came from the committee, went to the executive committee of the faculty in Pratt, and now will be pushed down to the Pratt faculty. It's a kind of exemplary program, recognizing weaknesses in the school and opportunities in the school, and then trying to undertake a school-wise initiative.

We do have a number of pipe-line programs. In 2007, we launched the Provost post-doctoral program, which approved two-year funding for two minority post-docs per year. We're in the fifth year, we have four post-docs, therefore, at any one time and we're just concluding the selection for the 2011-13 post-docs. I think the striking thing there is the breadth of fields. I will tell you that initially we anticipated that most of these post-docs would be in the sciences, it's actually turned out that they are much more widely dispersed across the fields and schools at the universities.

One of the things that was a concern at the time that we shifted to the FDI was, would we be able to commit the funding for an expanded diversity initiative that would enable us to continue with what we were doing while also adding new categories for target? Let me just tell you about the numbers. At the time that the FDI was put in place, we anticipated that we would be spending about \$1.3 M each year from 2003 to 2006 – that was the original expectation. In the last three years, we have spent: 08-09: \$2.34 M; 09-10: 2.56 M; 10-11: 2.2 M – obviously, it goes up depending on who's coming in and who's going out because these are all positions that are walked-down into the budgets of the schools. But we have been able to sustain the funding even in the downturn – and I think, as I have reported here previously, we assured that the money going to the FDI would contract at the same pace that the overall faculty initiative contracted in and not that there would be no differences in that.

Let's look at some data [slides] – this chart shows you when the BFSI ended and what's been happening in the hiring of Black faculty since then. It's noteworthy that in 1993 we had 44 Black faculty members at Duke. In the fall of 2010, there are 142 regular rank Black faculty, up essentially 19 since the last time I reported to the Academic Council. The graphs show that we continue to track above the rate for doubling the number of Black faculty over ten years, because there's a curve here you can see – actually it's a straight line – which shows what the double rate would be. So, we've managed to maintain

the pace of increase that we had during the BFSI, post the BFSI, which is something that I had at least as one metric to measure our continued progress.

The tenure track numbers are rising more slowly than the overall numbers. We have gained four new Black tenured and tenure-track faculty in the past two years, compared with nine in the previous two-year span. Some of that is because we had substantially contracted hiring during the last two years, but it is a matter which we are continuing to pay close attention to.

Some more data: AAU Data Exchange, so this is data that measures Duke's numbers and percentages in different ethnicities across different fields only in the Arts & Sciences – because COFHE only includes Arts & Sciences schools for its data collection. The numbers here are percentages of Black faculty in the Humanities – it is generally above the COFHE average in associate and full professors, it's above in Asian faculty at all levels and for Hispanic faculty at the associate level.

Obviously, these numbers move around as people get promoted, but these will give you a general reflection of the percentages across these fields. And some of the differences between us and the COFHE averages are actually pretty striking. I think these are numbers which reflect all that work that the faculty have done and that the administration has helped to promote over the last two decades – you can't build up numbers like this overnight. Turning now to the Social Science, we're above the COFHE average for Black faculty at all ranks and it's interesting to note that the COFHE data includes here several full and associate professors as well as fifteen assistant professors who did not self-identify in terms of ethnicity. It's striking that this happened more in the Social Sciences than in either of the other fields – I don't know why but we have had this same thing occasionally happen in undergraduate admissions, and when that happens you don't really know what your year to year differences may actually pick up. We had a big spike a couple of years ago in undergraduates who did not self-identify and then in the next year it went back down. In the Natural Sciences, we're above average for full professor Asian faculty and in the areas of numbers for Black and Hispanic faculty, we really don't want to deal in percentages because the numbers are too small.

Now that's of course, itself a real problem. It's not a Duke problem or at least it's not only a Duke problem, it is a national problem. There is a disturbing absence of Black graduates in these fields and the result of that is that it is a very, very competitive area and there are very few candidates that we can hire. That is not however an excuse because basically Duke ought to be hiring the ones that are available to be hired or at least to be competing heavily for them. I believe we are competing fairly strongly for them, but it is a small pool and we need to work even harder.

Let's turn now to some gender data – what you will see is that we had overall gains in most schools, Arts & Sciences, Pratt, Nicholas and Medicine for women in the tenured and tenure track, but we note that a couple of others – Fuqua and Law have been relatively flat. I have been talking with the deans in both of those schools about this issue. Now Fuqua has very little hiring going on and

that's a constraint on their ability to address this issue. In Law, I think they are making some significant efforts to try and improve the outcomes. If you look at A & S, the percentage of women in Natural Sciences has basically risen 4% in the last decade, from 13 to 17% which I consider not really a satisfactory outcome. Now I have to also say that Natural Science appointments in Arts & Sciences have been making a substantial number of offers in a number of fields to women candidates – they haven't always succeeded and so the number is reflecting the fact in part not that we're not making offers but that we're not succeeding in hiring the women candidates. We're hoping this year to make a dent in that but we have real work there to do.

Here you're going to see the data in the Natural Sciences which basically reflects what I was just referring to which is even against the COFHE schools, we're not doing as well as we should. What about retention? This has been an ongoing issue. What you can see on this chart is the retention rate overall in the different schools, the retention rate for Black faculty and the retention rate for non-Black faculty. One of the concerns has been, do we hire but then lose at a striking rate? The red shows you a percentage which is lower, not statistically necessarily, in a significant way lower but in absolute numbers lower, and the green, higher. The rates are not dramatically different but they show that in some areas we don't retain quite as many of our Black faculty as we do of our non-Black faculty. I would be wary of any percentages in any schools outside of Arts & Sciences. Warren?

Warren Grill (Pratt): Does this [number] reflect whether they choose to leave the university or is it people who are not worthy of tenure?

Lange: It does not discriminate between the two.

Grill: So, leaving the university for any reason?

Lange: Correct. I'll show you the same statistics for women. Again, I caution you against using percentages outside of Arts & Sciences because the numbers are relatively small, and they jump around very quickly. But as you'll see in Arts & Sciences, the retention rate for women is pretty close to the overall retention rate – just slightly below. These rates reflect seventeen years of data.

So, where are we going? What are our planned future actions? The first is we are going to continue emphasis on retention of women and faculty of color in the fields where they are under-represented. I've shown you some of the areas where we are going to concentrate. We have particular interest, just to give you one example, that is: assistant professor women in Arts & Sciences, across all fields, has been an issue for a number of years. We are pushing quite hard in Divinity, Fuqua, Law, Nicholas and Pratt to accelerate faculty diversity. I already indicated to you the plan that Dean Katsouleas has brought forward – we're anticipating that within the next several months, we should get a similar plan coming out of the Nicholas School which is another area where we have highlighted issues, and I've spoken on a regular basis with the deans of the other schools. The more hiring we do, the more opportunities there are to redress any issues that we have. Hopefully, as retiring returns at a higher pace, we'll be able to make more progress.

We will continue support for the post-doctoral program. The Faculty Survey will be announced soon and the Council will receive the report at the April meeting, and we'll use that as the basis for further thought about strategic interventions we might make. You know that we have put a number of work-life policies and practices in place over the last several years – we monitor those closely and how they're being used. I think they are being used quite successfully and I have to say, that Medicine, which was an area where they were not being heavily employed, has really increased in the last couple of years in using some of those opportunities. That's basically it. Now Nancy said she didn't want to talk, but she asked me to show two photographs. So, she has particular skills as a photographer – the first one (photo of Duke Chapel) and the last one. Last week she was driving around southern Virginia, a little west of Richmond, she's driving around and she finds a town which is a very small town, I think town is probably a little too exalted a term – a burb? Two houses in this town, but the name of this town is *Provost* (laughter). Nancy wanted me to note that she stands by her *Provost* (laughter). Thank you all very much and I'm happy to take any questions.

### Questions

Kate Scholberg (Physics): It seems that the hiring of Black faculty has been much more successful than (hiring



of) women in the Natural Sciences – do you have any insight what succeeded there and what didn't succeed for Natural Sciences?

Lange: That's a really good question and I don't. I think that we had a very focused attention, number one; number two – it's a not a question of resources because we've made the resources available on the same basis for women for hiring in the Sciences that we did and are continuing to do for African-American faculty. It is the case that our Science departments have not been as successful in actually hiring the people they make offers to. Actually, that's not so true in your department, but it's true in some of the others and that's probably the biggest area where we need to probe more. Why we're not able to convert at the end from offers to hires. But that's all I can tell you right now.

Jennifer Brody: (ECAC, African and African-American Studies, Theater Studies and Women's Studies):



Two questions, first is statistical which I know you'll like which is what's the percentage of women faculty overall in the School of Arts & Sciences?

Lange: It's in the report – I don't have the report with me up here. But it is in the report that was circulated to you.

Brody: The second is, when you talk about we have more work to do, do you have any ideas what that work includes?

Lange: A significant amount of it is jaw-boning, some of it is in cases where there are....

Brody: Can you define that for me? What's jaw-boning?

Lange: Jaw-boning is my talking regularly with the deans and the deans talking regularly with their search committees and their faculty about the priority that is attached to this and the degree to which they're paying attention to the outcome. That's the most powerful tool that we have. The extreme tool, for instance, of the nine searches we have not exercised, and I would be extremely reluctant to do, and that is denying searches to units that are not succeeding – among other things, you have to be very careful, going back to what I said earlier, you have to be very careful about the issue of whether pools are strong and diverse, whether the offers reflect an attention to diversity and whether they succeed. We have departments where they have made numerous offers to women over the last four to five years in the Sciences, they just haven't been able to land them. Why that's the case, as I said to Kate, I can't tell you.

Brody: Two things on that: one is that it might be useful to conduct exit interviews with candidates who didn't take the job and the second is to think again about cluster hires, for some Black faculty – I know when I was hired, I was hired along with two other Black faculty members and that might be also an incentive to address the issue of climate where they wouldn't be coming in as a) a junior person and b) as the only one.

Lange: And the latter we are doing. For instance, I don't want to pick out the individual departments, but one

department in the Sciences identified two strong women candidates and they only had one search authorization and we told them they could make two simultaneous offers which is not only a cluster hire but increases your probability of getting at least one person to come. Whether they will succeed or not, I can't tell you – that's the kind of thing we do fairly regularly. The deans know that there is an opportunity to draw on central funding for these initiatives, so they are ambitious. The departments are not always as aware or as ambitious and that's partly the dean's job to make them more aware and more ambitious.

Nancy Allen (Vice Provost, Faculty Diversity & Development): So, Jennifer just to answer your percentage question, regarding women in Arts & Sciences, it's 30% overall in the tenured and tenure track which reflects 42% with men, 32% Social Sciences, 17% Medical Center.

Thea Portier-Young (Divinity School): I have a couple of questions – when you talked about retention on the one hand and especially I was looking at our statistics for Black faculty...

Lange: Ours being Divinity or of Duke's?

Portier-Young: At Divinity, which is the most egregious on that list and then attracting candidates and some of those questions that have been posed as to why it's so difficult to secure the hire even when we are willing to make the offer and in both of those cases I think it's not just the salary figure and it's not just that we've committed to draw these candidates into our purview, but what is our climate, and when I think about anecdotally my familiarity with folks who have left, the Divinity School, there are climate issues, culture issues more broadly, those are sometimes difficult to narrate, difficult to analyze, and difficult to understand. But what I'm wondering then is if we're waiting to exit interviews or if we're waiting until someone gets to APT to see if we have a mentoring gap, what are the other opportunities? I know we have the faculty climate survey, but I feel like it looks like the scope of the challenges would demand being more creative, more intensive efforts to analyze and to see where we have opportunities to improve the culture for women and for Black faculty and to recognize that there are going to be micro-cultures in each school. So while the university may be doing a good job here but not so much over there and how can we all be working together....what do you see are the ways we can keep doing that better?

Lange: Well, I think in part it comes back to the fact that I need to take these data as I do and push them down to the deans, and the deans need to push them down to the faculty, but at some level, the issues you just raised, are in part issues of the administration but they are in part issues of the faculty themselves and I think the faculty need to be encouraged by the dean, as for instance, the Engineering example, the faculty need to be encouraged by the dean to take these issues into their own hands, working with the administration to identify what may or may not be cultural issues in the school.

I don't know the individual histories over those seventeen years of the five Black faculty who were not retained. Let's remember some faculty are not retained because somebody comes along and makes them an offer

they can't refuse – and we might counter and even very well counter and they leave anyway. Somebody offers you something in NY and you decide you'd like to go to NY rather than live in Durham. Obviously, we get people in the other direction too – it's not a one-way street. I don't know the exact history of those five cases, but it would be worthwhile, the faculty and the administration in the Divinity School, taking a look at that themselves. The Allen Building can encourage, but an issue like that needs to be addressed at the level of the unit, especially a unit of the scale of the Divinity School.

Porter-Young: The other follow-up question that I had is when I look at the bar-graph that you showed us for the appointment of women and men to chairs – statistics nation-wide and across disciplines show that women take longer to achieve full (professor) than men by a few years. I don't know all of the issues there and I don't know which institutions do better with that timetable than others, but I'm wondering...you said a little about reporting on women associates but you didn't say much about that. I'm wondering if there's much discussion in your diversity committee about what kind of mentoring is needed for women associates and even women full professors who are not moving forward at the same rate as their male peers and what some of the issues there are?

Lange: I can only say that in that particular regard, about two or three years ago, I did a survey of all the associates and there were actually, in certain fields and certain divisions, there were disproportionate numbers of women at the associate level and we pressed the dean and the dean took action to assure that those – now I don't control who gets nominated, but I can encourage the deans to look at those cases and work with their departments about promotion. And in fact we did promote a number of those women. Interestingly, the dean went to one of those women and she said I don't want to get it until I get my next book out because I don't want it to appear that I'm being promoted without having met the same criteria that other colleagues in my department have done. That woman has now actually been promoted, that wasn't a totally self-abnegating response! But we have looked at that and I continue to look at that.

I think mentoring of associate professors – it's mentioned actually in our last strategic plan – is one of the big difficulties in all universities. We do a tremendous amount of mentoring up to the time of tenure – and then people kind of fall off of the radar. So, associate is a status which we don't pay nearly as much attention to – it's sort of like sophomore slump for undergraduates (laughter). There's kind of an associate neglect, if I could call it that, but I think to the extent that that is true, it probably affects women faculty in certain fields even more. Okay, I know that you are now waiting for the...I'm not trying to get out of here, I just know you're waiting for the election results. Josh?

Josh Socolar (Physics): Two quick questions about some data that you showed: First, was the distinguished professors – it looked like there was a salient feature in the data which was a huge spike in the numbers of men in 2008-09, question one, what accounts for that? And the

second question is about the retention issue – you showed us data that stands since 1993?

Lange: 17 years.

Socolar: If you cut that in half or something, is there any evidence that we're doing better now than we did earlier?

Lange: I can't answer the second question because I haven't cut it in half so I haven't looked, so we can do that and we can send you an email or we can let the Council know. On the first point, part of the determination of how many professorships there are in a year depends on how many are available. In some years, you'll have more chairs that are available to be filled than in others, so part of it is that in those two years, for a variety of reasons – including the fact that the Board of Trustees created some eponymous chairs, more chairs became available – that's probably the biggest driver. Last year there were relatively few, so there's a tendency, oh, finally we got these, let's go fill them. And then there was a falling off which would be consistent with that data as well. I suspect that that's the biggest driver.

John Staddon (Faculty Secretary / Psychology & Neuroscience): By emphasizing statistics, the implication is that these efforts must continue until there's proportional representation of every group in every employment category – that's point one. Point two is: if that were true, if, in other words we, are approaching that desired state as an asymptote, then you would not expect the second eight years to show as much improvement as the first eight years. So my main question is ...

Lange: Well, the first two weren't questions (laughter)...

Staddon: So my main question: is it your feeling that these efforts will continue until you get proportional representation by every entity in every category? When will you be satisfied?

Lange: When am I satisfied? I'm not the one to determine satisfaction. My view is that these efforts will continue as long as we believe that we may be missing excellent candidates from these pools due to a lack of sufficient effort to either attract them, hire them or retain them. I also believe that they should continue as long as we have issues of very, very severe underrepresentation in fields where we know there are more good candidates out there. The presence of minority and women faculty have implications not just for the quality of scholarship but for the type and quality of teaching and the kind of experience we give to our students, and the kind of role models that we enable our students to see in the classroom and outside of the classroom. I do not have a quota, I do not have a number, I don't think we as a faculty...we tried the number thing and it was a dismal and awful failure and fortunately we got rid of it fairly quickly. I think our efforts since then have reflected an entirely different approach. I think we've been successful with it and I intend, at least as long as I'm provost, to continue to push it. I don't think we've reached some asymptote, to go back to the first observation that you made.

Henriquez: Thank you, Peter. Just so you know, Peter, Provost, VA is officially an unincorporated community (laughter).

Lange: So far!

Henriquez: And it encompasses 2200 acres.

Lange: Thank you for that (laughter). How many people?

Henriquez: It actually didn't mention how many people – maybe 0!

Allen: And the name on the sign is on both sides of that post.

Henriquez: Well, there you go. We have received the final tally of votes for the Academic Council chair and before I announce the next chair, on behalf of the Council, I'd like to thank both Tom and Susan for agreeing to stand for election. Of course, I assume you did so knowing full well what you're getting yourself into (laughter). Without further ado, the next chair of the Academic Council is **Susan Lozier** – congratulations (applause). I believe that



Susan is the first chair to represent the Nicholas School and her term will begin on July 1 but she will have an opportunity to sit in on ECAC meetings – I know how thrilled you are about that – for the next few months and ECAC and I look forward to working with you. Thank you everyone – see you next on March 24th.

Respectfully submitted,

John Staddon  
Faculty Secretary, March 14, 2011