



Minutes of the Meeting of the Academic Council
Thursday, March 23, 2017

Nan Jokerst (Chair, Academic Council / Electrical and Computer Engineering):

Welcome, everyone and thank you for being here today. I would like to call the meeting to order. We have a full and interesting agenda today that brings to a culmination some of the Council conversations that we have had this year.

Before we begin, I would like to tell you about our special Academic Council meeting that we will have on April 6th, at 3:30 pm, in this room, to welcome President-elect Vince Price, and to share our thoughts about Duke's present and future with him. Please mark your calendars, and plan to attend.

APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 16TH MINUTES

Jokerst: Let's get started by approving the minutes from our February 16th meeting which were posted with today's agenda.

(Minutes approved by voice vote without dissent)

VOTE ON THE PROPOSED REQUEST FROM THE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE'S POPULATION HEALTH SCIENCES CENTER TO TRANSITION TO A DEPARTMENT

Jokerst: Next we will move to a vote on the request from the School of Medicine's Population Health Sciences Center to transition to a department. The supporting materials shared last month were posted with your agenda for today.

We received a request from a Council member to conduct this vote by paper ballot and our colleagues Kathy Andolsek, from Clinical Sciences and Steffen Bass, from Physics will distribute the ballots and tabulate the votes for us.

Drs. Ted Pappas and Lesley Curtis are here to answer any additional questions before we proceed to our vote. Are there any questions?

Council members for the 2016-17 academic year only, please raise your hands to receive a ballot. After you have cast your vote, please pass your ballot to the end of the row to be collected and counted. If you are here as a recently elected member for 2017-18, please do not take a ballot as you are not yet eligible to vote. I will announce the result of the vote later in the meeting.

VOTE ON THE PROPOSED JOINT PhD WITH THE SANFORD SCHOOL AND ARTS & SCIENCES

Jokerst: I'm going to go ahead and proceed because we do have a very busy agenda today. We will now proceed to the vote on the proposed joint PhD program between the Sanford School and the Arts & Sciences. The materials from last month's meeting were also posted again with today's agenda.

One advantage of proposing new programs at one Council meeting and then voting at the next Council meeting is that this process enables faculty to consider the proposals and to ask questions. We encourage faculty to submit questions to the Academic Council office, and questions were sent regarding the proposed Joint PhD program. We then forwarded these questions to the proposers.

Professors Ken Dodge and Elizabeth Marsh are here to respond to these questions today. They will also answer any other questions that you might have before we proceed to our vote.

Ken Dodge (Sanford School of Public Policy): Thank you, Nan, and thank you to all the faculty members who have communicated your support for the program. We appreciate it. As Nan said, we did receive two questions and we appreciate this opportunity to respond to them. Here is the first question (refers to slide): "Please provide an assessment of the program's plan to address diversity issues. The Public Policy proposal seems to be completely silent on this issue. I looked at the graduate student demographics (from the Graduate School statistics supplied on their web site) of Sanford, Sociology, and Psychology and Neuroscience. What can the joint program do to improve those numbers?" We went to the website, and these are the numbers

from earlier this week taken off the Graduate School website, averaging over the past three years (refers to slide). Graduate School-wide, about 46% of new matriculates for each of the last three years are women. Diversity matriculates are about 14%. Graduate School identifies categories of diversity as African American, Asian American, Hispanic American, and Native American. The Psychology and Neuroscience department over the past three years has admitted about 77% women and 16.7% diversity applicants. Sociology has 44% women and 32% diversity applicants. Sanford has 53% women and 23.5% diversity applicants. I'll leave that up there just for a moment so you can see. We think that these programs over the past three years are consistent with university-wide averages regarding women and are higher than Graduate School averages for Graduate School-defined diversity. So far, these programs are performing better than average. But of course we plan to emphasize diversity in our proposed program and this is the important part of the response. We believe the program itself is one that will attract diverse applicants, taking applicants in Psychology and Sociology, for example, and bringing to bear issues of practice in Public Policy, we think is a program that will attract persons of color, persons from all kinds of diverse backgrounds. Likewise, applicants to Public Policy we think will find it even more attractive. We plan to emphasize diversity in our recruitment, we will reach out to faculty colleagues across the country to encourage them to send their very best students of color and students of diverse backgrounds to our program. We will flag them above threshold in the applicant pool for closer evaluation and interviews with them. We will pay very close

attention to that in our admission decisions and after the admission decision we will do all we can to provide financial support for them. I'm sure these are things that you do in your departments and we know that we'll do them to our very best. We'll emphasize diversity in the content of our program curricula and bring it in so the students know that this is a program that attends to issues like income inequality, racial discrimination, and historical perspectives on opportunity. We will also make public statements of our values on our website and other materials. I'm going to go on to the second question. The second question is: "Some questions skirted around the issue, but I will ask it directly: are there substantial differences in the rankings of the three parties (Sociology, Psychology and Neuroscience, and Public Policy) and if so how is that expected to play out for people in the joint program?"

I looked in US News and World Report, that venerable journal (laughter), for the national rankings. They're the easiest ones to find. Here they are (refers to slide). Our Psychology and Neuroscience department ranks 17th according to that journal, higher in some sub-areas, especially those that we're going to emphasize. Sociology is ranked 14th and Sanford Public Policy Analysis is ranked 4th. I infer that perhaps the question might be, is there a difference in quality of the students that might cause problems in coursework or in committee work or some sort of imbalance there? These are the credentials of the incoming matriculate students for averaged over the past three years for the programs. You can see Psychology and Neuroscience, the average verbal GRE score is 164, quant is 160, and undergraduate grade point

average is 3.7. I will repeat them all but you can visually see that Sociology is very similar and Sanford is very similar. So, in fact, the incoming students in these three programs have very similar paper credentials. We believe that the national rankings of each of these programs are strong, but a goal, in fact one of the driving forces in the proposal itself, is to improve these rankings nationally. That's what we hope will happen. I should also point out that the denominator might be larger for Psychology and Sociology than for Sanford. In terms of percentiles, the ranking may be very similar. So, as we said, an important question is whether the quality of students differs. We think the answer is no. We also believe that the faculty quality does not differ. Numerous faculty have joint appointments or secondary appointments or cross-appointments and our own experience is that the quality is uniformly high among the faculty. Of course, we're going to observe the interactions among faculty and students across these areas to evaluate any potential discrepancies or problems that may arise. With that, I'm happy to answer any more questions.

Jokerst: Any other questions? Alright, thank you. We will now vote on the proposed joint PhD between the Sanford School and the School of Arts & Sciences.

(Proposal for the joint PhD between the Sanford School and the Arts & Sciences approved by voice vote without dissent)

RESULTS OF THE VOTE ON THE PROPOSED REQUEST FROM THE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE'S POPULATION HEALTH SCIENCES CENTER TO TRANSITION TO A DEPARTMENT

Jokerst: I also have the result of the School of Medicine's Population Health Sciences Center transition to department status which has been approved by a vote of 38 yes, 2 no, and 2 abstentions.

ACADEMIC COUNCIL STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE: EMILY KLEIN ON BEHALF OF ECAC

Jokerst: Next we will discuss an Academic Council committee that has existed in the past that ECAC proposes to reconstitute, namely, the Academic Council Student Affairs Committee.

The undergraduate Duke student government approached ECAC in 2015 and again in 2016 to collaborate on programs that will improve the undergraduate experience. Data such as that on sexual misconduct discussed in the Duke University Student Experiences Survey published on February 20, 2017, underscores concerns about the undergraduate experience that ECAC has gathered data on for the past two years. These concerns have motivated our call to action. Our graduate and professional students have also expressed concerns regarding issues such as dental care and access to Duke facilities that the faculty may be able to help with.

The proposal brought to the Council today is the culmination and result of nearly two years of discussions and fact finding by ECAC.

I would like to call to the podium Emily Klein, from the Nicholas School, and a member of ECAC, to share ECAC's proposal to reconstitute the Academic Council Student Affairs Committee. A document was posted with your agenda as background and Emily will share

additional information and take any questions.

Emily Klein (Nicholas School of the Environment / member of ECAC): As Nan said, we have been approached by various representatives of Duke Student Government, primarily undergraduate but also graduate students over the past year or so with requests for us to become involved and help them with various issues that are of interest to them. While we've certainly wanted to be of assistance to them and have had many meetings, both as ECAC as a whole as well as subcommittees or subgroups of us, it became clear that we really didn't have the bandwidth to do this right. Because what it would require is sustained commitment, information gathering, and we'd also need to bring together the student representatives and administration - Larry Moneta in Student Affairs, et cetera. So, we felt we just didn't have the bandwidth to do it. So that's the sort of reactive part of it. Things were brought to us by the students. Then there is also the proactive part of Council. Those of us on Council last year will remember we queried the administration and asked for updates and information. Starting from the noose incident, the Bias and Hate Task Force, the Allen Building occupation, et cetera. So it's clear that Council also has questions about things that pertain to student life. Though we are mindful of the fact that we, as faculty, our bailiwick is academics and student affairs is not our responsibility, nevertheless it's clear that student life affects student education and therefore we should have a voice in that to the extent that it's appropriate. So with that in mind, we'd been mulling this and I mentioned to Larry Moneta about how we could respond to these things, and he brought

up the fact that actually the Council had previously two different incarnations of a Student Affairs Committee. So we dug up the charges from that and we are now proposing to reconstitute that committee. You've got the full charge in your materials, but just to highlight some of the aspects of this. It's to examine university-wide initiatives and issues pertaining to undergraduate, professional, and graduate students, to proactively explore matters pertaining to these students, provide faculty input on administrative initiatives, early on, hopefully, and to formulate faculty responses to requests from students as it may come up. This would obviously involve working with the students, so we formulated the proposed committee with student representatives or their designates, as well as to work with the Provost, Dean and Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, Larry Moneta in Student Affairs, and others in the Graduate School and other administrative leaders. We didn't want the committee to become too big, so we're proposing an eight-member committee with two-year appointments. It's heavy on the undergraduate-involved schools because many of the things that come forward are undergraduate requests for involvement. So you can see what we're proposing in terms of committee composition (refers to slide). So that's it. We basically want to reconstitute this committee and if you are interested in participating, please email the Academic Council office. Questions?

Kerry Haynie (Political Science / African and African-American Studies): Is there anything comparable in the Arts and Sciences Council to this?

Klein: I believe there is a Student Affairs subcommittee in Arts and Sciences

Council. Can anybody confirm that?

Alex Rosenberg (Philosophy): Sounds plausible (laughter).

Klein: Have we heard from them in recent years?

Haynie: So if there is, will this duplicate that?

Klein: No, because the Arts and Sciences Council one would only have to do with Trinity and it would have to do with the graduate programs but it wouldn't have to do with the professional programs or bring in Nicholas or Sanford.

Steffen Bass (Physics): I'm actually not so sure they have one.

Klein: I thought maybe and I poked around at one point and thought maybe they did. Anyway, we're proposing to have one.

Craig Henriquez (Biomedical Engineering): Steve Nowicki's operation sort of has a purview over undergraduate education and I would imagine there are all sorts of student committees and interfaces with students. How is this different in terms of what his operation does?

Klein: I'll say that the previous incarnation of this was disbanded under the expectation that Steve's office would take over having a faculty advisory board but to my knowledge, there is not one. But Steve is on board on this.

Jokerst: Yes, so the Provost and Steve and Larry Moneta have all had a look at the charge and said they were comfortable with it.

Sally Kornbluth (Provost): I agree with that. One thing: this “provide advice and guidance” I think is the critical phrase because what we don’t want is students getting an answer they don’t like in one place and then going to another place to advocate. I think it should be really an open dialogue between the administration and the faculty committee. Otherwise it will fall apart.

Klein: We were worried we were falling into that when they were coming to us and what we really needed was to have the three parts together.

Josh Socolar (Physics): Along the same lines, will there be any formal connection between this committee and the Board’s Student Affairs Committee?

Klein: I hadn’t thought about that. What do you think?

Socolar: I think it would be wise, when the Board comes, it would be a good idea for them to have people at the table who are steeped in the issues.

Klein: Right. So now there is a member from ECAC on that Board one and maybe we should ask that whoever chairs this committee also join.

Socolar: Is there any stipulation that one of these eight faculty would be an ECAC member?

Klein: There wasn’t. I can’t remember what made it into the final. There was a stipulation that one of the Arts and Sciences people would be on Arts and Sciences Council.

Kornbluth: I think an ECAC member is a good idea.

Klein: Yeah, just for connection.

Harvey Cohen (Clinical Sciences): It strikes me that this committee could get very quickly inundated with a zillion requests and complaints and concerns from varieties of students. Will you have any guidance as to which of those constitute reasonable things for this committee to be concerned about? You used the phrase earlier, something about affecting academic life which seems like a reasonable thing. I don’t know how you judge that, exactly, but it seems to me you’re going to need some sort of filter.

Klein: I think you’re right. At least my thinking about this, although it’s not written down, is that the avenue that the students should come through would be through ECAC and then ECAC would say, let me point you to or delegate or send this over to this Student Affairs Committee.

Jokerst: A lot of the concerns that have been brought to us through the Duke Student Government, and that’s why the President of the Duke Student Government would be ex officio on this committee. Because so far, the requests have come to ECAC directly from the Duke Student Government. So they are at least a first filter. Now, I have heard that some students are not satisfied with that pathway, but I think that is a first filter for where this committee will start.

Klein: So volunteer, it will be good.

Jokerst: Thank you, Emily. I’d like to add my encouragement to you, our members of Academic Council, to consider volunteering for this committee. Because I feel, as a faculty, we have a responsibility for the welfare of our

students. And I think that, given some of the data that we've seen in the last few years, that this committee has the potential to make a tremendous difference in the lives of our students.

ECAC RECOMMENDATION TO ESTABLISH AN AD HOC COMMITTEE ON FACULTY RANK DISTRIBUTION: TRINA JONES ON BEHALF OF ECAC

Jokerst: During the course of the past academic year, we have had two Council conversations, expertly led by ECAC member Josh Sosin, on the state of the faculty at Duke. Last month, we approved changes to the faculty handbook that recognized the growing importance of our non-tenure track, regular rank faculty. Significant changes in the demographics of our faculty, questions about representation, and the meaning of tenure are all key questions that we must explore as we look at the path of the Duke faculty moving forward. The culmination of these conversations is a proposal that we will now discuss to form an ad hoc Academic Council committee to study faculty rank distribution. This is a tough title. We've talked a lot about what this title should be.

I would like to call to the podium Trina Jones from the Law School, who is also a member of ECAC, to share the proposal to create this Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Rank Distribution. A document was posted with your agenda and Trina will share additional information and take any questions.

Trina Jones (Law School): Good afternoon, everyone. As Nan said, I'm here to provide background information concerning ECAC's recommendation that the Council constitute an Ad Hoc

Committee on Faculty Rank Distribution. The American Association of University Professors reports that as of 2013, non-tenure track positions account for over 70% of all instructional staff appointments in US higher education. Let me repeat that. As of 2013, non-tenure track positions account for over 70% of all instructional staff appointments in US higher education. This represents a substantial increase in the percentage of non-tenure track positions since 1975 and an accompanying decrease in the percentage of tenured and tenure-track positions. You may all be aware of legislative attacks in recent years on tenure in places like Wisconsin and Iowa and Missouri. Now, no one is suggesting that anybody at Duke is trying to undermine tenure. But, we have noticed in the last 10-15 years an increase in the percentage of non-tenure track positions at Duke. For example, data from the Office of Institutional Research here show that between 2004 and 2013, the regular rank, non-tenure track faculty at Duke increased by 67%, compared to an 11% increase for tenure track faculty. The data for non-clinical faculty for the same period show a 50% increase for non-tenure track faculty and an 11% increase for tenure track faculty. These changes, which are not unique for Duke, raise a number of important questions concerning academic freedom, the university's commitment to tenure, and again, we're not making any normative judgements here. We're just pointing out that incremental changes over time can have a cumulative effect that may deserve some attention. And then questions about the adequacy of governance mechanisms to ensure that all faculty, regardless of rank, are appropriately represented and heard on university matters. So with that data in mind, and the larger context in

which we find ourselves in mind, ECAC recommends the constitution of this committee, which will be charged with examining two areas. First, changes over the last 15 years, the numbers and the demographic characteristics of tenured and tenure-track faculty, of regular rank, non-tenure track faculty, and non-regular rank faculty at Duke. We expect that this examination will consider variations by school, division, and department, so that we can have a better understanding of where the changes are occurring, as well as motivations for these changes. Are the changes being made due to financial concerns? Is it for curricular innovation? It is to free up time for faculty research? What are some of the explanations for these changes? So that's one set of issues. The other is the implications of these changes with regard to the core educational and research mission of the university. For example, who is teaching and advising Duke students? Who has primary responsibility for things like curricular oversight? In addition, there are implications for academic freedom, autonomy, and voice, which may be affected by the security of one's employment relationship with the university. There are implications for shared governance and the participation of all faculty in significant university policies and procedures. Finally, implications for equity and fairness. Are, for example, women and people of color disproportionately represented among the ranks of non-tenure track faculty? We expect that this committee will be asked to summarize its findings, to offer recommendations, and to report back to the Council in the spring of 2018. So one year from now. We recognize that this is ambitious, but remember that two years ago, the Diversity Task Force did its work in one year. That was ambitious and we

accomplished that goal so we expect that this committee will be able to do this work in a year. We also recommend that the committee be composed of faculty of all ranks: tenured and tenure track, regular rank non-tenure track, and non-regular rank faculty. So with that as background, I'm here, along with other members of ECAC, to hear your feedback and to answer any questions.

Roxanne Springer (Physics): I'm recalling that one of the findings of the Diversity Task Force is that women and people of color were somewhat over-represented in the non-tenure track rank and I'd like the committee to also consider, when it comes to equity and fairness, the impact of this on salary equity. I guess we're going to hear from Josh later about those numbers. Are you guys also going to consider relative salary differentials between tenure track and non-tenure track?

Socolar: Not today, but we'll talk about it.

Springer: I do think it's an important measure of the equity and fairness.

Jones: So we could flag that for the committee's consideration, that specifically within equity and fairness. And you are right. If you look at the DTF report, it did show that women are heavily represented in the non-tenure track ranks. So if you look at faculty by rank, at the time, and the DTF data goes up to 2013, so in the professor rank, I think that constituted about 20% women across the university and as you go down in the ranks, not in terms of significance but just in terms of hierarchy, associate professors were about 32% female, assistant professors were about 38%, and then in the non-tenure track category,

about 46%. So we're hoping this committee can drill down on that data a bit more and get us some more additional information.

Justin Wright (Biology): I'm curious if there's an expectation that the scope of this committee's work will be looking exclusively within Duke for motivations, or doing comparisons across academia. As you pointed out, this is something that's been happening across the board and it would be interesting to know how much of this is just us being swept along by a bigger wave, or how much of it is Duke-specific motivations. In particular, those ones seem, if it is something we want to change, that we would have more leverage to exert changes on.

Jones: We had not thought or discussed within ECAC doing the sort of comparative analysis because we were trying to get our minds around what's happening at Duke, but keeping this larger picture in mind. The Diversity Task Force did talk about some comparative reports. So after the committee composites information, one can imagine that once we get an understanding of what some of the explanations and motivations are at Duke, we can look at what other schools are doing and if they're similarly motivated in how they have responded to the concerns. For example, if it's curricular innovation or teaching innovation, are there other models for achieving the objective short of changing the faculty rank composition strata?

Jokerst: The demographic data is available and I would expect this committee to be interested in the comparative demographic data to our peer institutions and that's how the DTF

used that data. Does that answer your question?

Wright: Yes.

Speaker: Would it be possible to include, also, not in the scope of deep investigation, but just for comparison, the rates of change in terms of some of the administrative categories? The deans' offices, the Provost's office, just to see? It feels in a totally anecdotal way like there's been a lot of growth there while there's been shrinkage in the tenure track faculty line. It would be good to know the actual data on that.

Jones: Again, we had not explicitly discussed that within ECAC, but I can't imagine that there would be much pushback to that, except that the charge of this committee is already quite large. There is a lot of work to be done, especially if you fold in a comparative analysis in one year. But while the committee is looking at the composition of the Duke faculty, it may not be too much of a stretch to look at administrative changes as well. So the great thing about this discussion is I'm not hearing any negative pushback against the idea of creating the committee so I assume that there's some support here.

Kornbluth: We already know that the landscape is going to be incredibly heterogeneous. Because we already know that the distribution in individual schools already is very different. I'm not even sure the motivation is right because I think in some cases, the inevitable tumbling into where they are was not an intentional thing. The committee can discuss the motivations, they can hypothesize, et cetera, but I think the

most important thing is going to be the compilation of transparent data. So, for instance, teaching loads drive this, the percentage of faculty on leave, the percent of teaching that's being carried by another faculty, the actual responsibilities, because non-tenure track faculty in different schools also have extremely different rules and responsibilities. Creating a detailed picture that allows people to grapple with the problem locally as well as getting a global feeling, I think is going to be very valuable. But I question whether it's going to be possible to draw a uniform conclusion about what's happening at Duke. It's going to have to be very local.

Jones: I agree with you with the first part of your observation, that it's really important to compile the data to get an accurate picture of what's happening within particular units. I'm only speaking for myself, not for ECAC. But I think that there have been justifications that have been offered to ECAC members for some of these changes.

Kornbluth: Oh, absolutely.

Jones: So I wouldn't want to cut off the committee's charge prematurely when there are some deliberate choices being made in some units. Of course we shouldn't speculate, but where that information is available, I think it would be helpful to understand the data. Does that make sense?

Kornbluth: It does. I guess my point is, you're going to have to essentially report out all those justifications because it may not be possible for the committee to discern exactly what the historical basis was.

Springer: To that point, I think it's very possible that, in many cases, motivation won't be found. It's all the more reason to study the problem because we ended up in a place without our volition.

Kornbluth: That's exactly right. That's what I'm saying. What I hope is that the data are transparent enough that you can then analyze the problem and the units are going to think what they want it to be. In some cases, we are going to find that there was an unintentional drift to a certain situation.

Richard Brodhead (President): Just a little thing that I think would follow from that. I hope this committee will think that one part of its inquiry might be, if it should find that the reason that we've had such a drift of non-tenure track faculty is because of the offloading of things that ought to be the responsibility of the tenured faculty. I hope that you might recommend that those things be resumed. You can't solve this problem only by tenuring more people on the non-tenure line. You can't have a faculty that has exempted itself from its responsibilities and then solve the problem entirely independently.

Jones: ECAC was actually talking, or some members of ECAC were actually talking about that specific issue yesterday. Maybe some of these changes are, in fact, desirable. So maybe it's not fair to characterize this prematurely as problematic. I hear that in your observation.

Brodhead: I would just say one other thing. It's a complicated problem. It's a historical problem that everybody in this room has lived through. No one has wished it to happen. It has happened at

every university for a great variety of reasons. But I have to say, if you take this seriously, what responsibilities the faculty assumes for itself and the non-tenure track faculty assumes for itself. Not that that would be university-wide, but school by school, this group looking at some of this, you might say, you know, the teaching loads have been systematically drifting lighter and lighter for tenure track faculty, for instance. That would enable you to make some choices or at least engage in some discussions.

Jones: But know that that has implications for other aspects of the university missions. Who is teaching the students and how much is our research being utilized in the classroom? I think the committee has to think through the consequences of these sorts of decisions.

Brodhead: I would just say one other thing. I hope the nature of this committee, that it moves within each of the schools a want to not wait to the last day to learn about this, but to ask the question of themselves. Because these really are school by school decisions. So the burden of reflection needs to be closer to the place where decisions are made.

Haynie: I would just put a bookend to what President Brodhead just said. The committee should address, it would be in the context where at least in Arts and Sciences, there has been some shrinkage or non-growth in the faculty as responsibilities have not increased in some ways. With initiatives and various programs where faculty actually do quite a bit more without any growth in the size of faculty. One thing about the responsibility is that the faculty assume or reassume some of the responsibilities. Also in the context of the environment

where the size of the faculty is shrinking or at least not growing.

Ken Dodge (Sanford School of Public Policy): Thank you very much for all of this. It's very enlightening to me. The focus seems to be on teaching in what you're talking about. The duties of tenured and tenure track faculty include teaching, research, and service. I could imagine that if you were to chart the number of PhD scientists employed at Duke University, funded by external research grants over the same period of time, you'd see similar growth and similar proportional changes with tenure stream faculty versus non-tenure stream, non-faculty PhD scientists who are doing research. Then I thought service might well be the same as well. That we have professionals here who are performing service duties within the university who are not tenure stream faculty. So I'm not sure that this is simply an advocating of teaching duties by the tenured faculty, but reflecting generally that the growth in the university in teaching, in research, in service, has gone up much more rapidly than the growth in the number of tenure stream faculty members, generally. I hope your committee can examine whether it's specific to the teaching responsibility.

Jones: I think that's an important clarification to add to the charge.

Sara Beale (Law School): Is it intended that the committee would look at questions such as the term of contract of these individuals? Because I think that would be actually very enlightening. So it would have implications for their academic freedom, for their availability to students the next year as advisors, and so on. And that would be very helpful. So if it turns out that we have PoPs that come in

and do things that regular people can't do on long term contracts and we now do more of that, as you know we do in the Law School, I think that's a great thing. It's a whole different thing from a bunch of people who have part time, one-semester contracts. I think that's quite different.

Jones: That is, in fact, I think, pulled into the charge, and it's captured in the phrase regular rank and non-regular rank, these differentiations between categories.

Beale: And so on the non-regular rank, we may want to drill down a little more what that actually means.

Jones: Exactly.

Beale: Thank you.

Tallman Trask (Executive Vice President): To the point, we have to remember we have some non-regular ranks who are members of the labor union. Any committee will need to stay away from issues under negotiation.

Beale: I don't know who those are that are represented. I don't think our PoPs are, for example. Clearly I have no idea what I'm talking about (laughter). I'm ready to be educated by this committee.

Jokerst: But you have a valid point. Because our non-tenure track regular rank faculty are on contract. So the length of a contract varies. So that is an absolutely valid point. Tallman makes a different point, in that we have to be very careful in that we are in negotiations right now with the union that represents some of the non-regular rank faculty.

Jones: And I thought it might be helpful for you to see, at least as far as I can

discern from our very complicated Faculty Handbook, the various categories (refers to slide). So you have tenured and tenure track, professor, associate professor, assistant professor, regular rank non-tenure track: professor of the practice, but it also includes associate and assistant professor of the practice, and then the titles will vary by school. And then within non-regular rank, you have a huge number of categories, some of which would be subject to unionization and others would not. That's where I think your concern was.

Cynthia Shortell (Clinical Sciences): I just wanted to point out there are actually four ranks within the tenured / tenure track line, at least on the clinical side. Assistant, associate professor without tenure, associate professor with tenure, and that's where the tenure clock ends, and then professor. In the non-tenure track, there are only those three.

Jones: I was using just a little bit of shorthand just to get it in a framework that would be successful. But if you want to look at this in greater detail, I spent a lot of time reading the Faculty Handbook, it's in Chapter Two and Appendix C.

Jokerst: We have time for one more question.

Alex Rosenberg (Philosophy): Can you bring back the slide that identifies the two charges of this committee? One, I believe, is informational. Can you tell us how we're to understand the word implications? Are they to be understood as to include, for example, reports to the Academic Council and recommendations regarding the future trajectory of these proportions of faculty and the status afforded to them? Is there an expectation

of a report to the Academic Council at specific junctures in the future or recommendations beyond a discussion of rewards implication?

Jones: Beyond what I've said in terms of a summary of the committee's findings in regards to these issues and some recommendations, if the committee gets to that and it's successful...

Rosenberg: This looks very much like a fact-finding committee. Does its charge limit it in that way?

Jones: It is not limited in that way. For example, if one were to do comparative analysis to see that Duke is not that similarly situated to our peers in some respect, the committee could make some sort of qualitative analysis of Duke's position vis-à-vis another institution. Am I responding to your question that it's limited to doing just descriptive?

Rosenberg: By fact finding, I didn't mean data analysis only. Explanations would also be appropriate. But beyond these two, is it envisioned that this committee might make policy recommendations as well?

Jones: I think that, speaking for ECAC, we would be very open to that.

Jokerst: I think there is an expectation that this committee will, for example, in 2C, which is very much within the purview of the Academic Council, think about whether or not we are appropriately representing the demographic makeup of our current faculty with the current makeup of Academic Council. There has been a lot of discussion about this and I think this is one of the things that we would really like

to hear a recommendation from the committee on. So from my perspective, it is absolutely within the purview of this committee to make recommendations to Academic Council that are actionable.

Rosenberg: That attributes that the word implications has substantial content.

Springer: The last paragraph says summarize and make recommendations.

Jones: With that, ECAC is making a motion to the Council that the Council allow ECAC to constitute an Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Rank Distribution, to carry forth the two functions that I have described today.

(Motion to constitute Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Rank Distribution approved by voice vote without dissent).

Then we will move forward. As you can imagine, this is going to be a lot of heavy lifting. There are some complicated issues that need to be examined here. If you would like to serve on this committee, even to chair it (laughter), please email the Academic Council office.

Jokerst: Thank you, Trina. That was an excellent discussion. I would like to add my encouragement to you to volunteer for this committee. As we've done in the past, what we wanted to do today was present this to you and get your feedback and we are looking for volunteers for this committee. ECAC will identify people that we think would be great to serve on this committee, but we'd like to hear from you as to whether or not you are interested in serving on this committee.

One goal of ECAC in the past two years has been to engage a larger number of

faculty in faculty governance matters through committee representation. As a Council member pointed out during one of our discussions this past academic year, ECAC is the “committee on committees.” One of ECAC’s significant responsibilities in the spring semester is to discuss and secure members for various university committees including our own Academic Council committees, and we would like to solicit your suggestions for committee members now.

If you are interested in sharing your insights with your colleagues and the administration, I would like you to let us know that you are interested in participating on a committee. We have two new committees that have been discussed today, and there are other Academic Council committees that are listed on our website under the “committees and members” tab. You may target particular committees, or just let us know that you want to be involved. If you are interested, please send an email to acouncil@duke.edu.

BIANNUAL SALARY EQUITY REPORT

Jokerst: One of my personal goals as Chair of the Academic Council is to be responsive to the concerns expressed by the faculty. In 2015, when the Academic Council Faculty Compensation Committee report was shared with us, there was a call in Council to include non-tenure track regular rank faculty and the Clinical Sciences faculty in the School of Medicine in the next Faculty Compensation study. I am pleased to report to you today some progress on those two topics, and I will, in a minute, introduce to you Professors Merlise Clyde and Josh Socolar, who will present the results of the Faculty

Compensation Committee biannual salary equity report.

Before I invite Merlise and Josh to the podium, I would like to report on the Clinical Sciences faculty salary equity study performed by the School of Medicine. Earlier this year, Merlise, Josh and I met with Ann Brown, Vice Dean for Faculty in the School of Medicine, and the group of faculty members in the School of Medicine who conducted the faculty compensation study for the Clinical Sciences. Ann Brown could not attend our meeting today, but the School of Medicine supplied a memo for our meeting that I will now read to you:

“The Duke School of Medicine is committed to practices that ensure that compensation decisions are free from unlawful discrimination. Informal practices are in place in each department to review salaries as part of the annual budget process. In 2016, the School sought to formally review salary equity in order to understand whether its practices were indeed supporting the goal of equity.

A faculty advisory committee conducted the study. The committee was composed of faculty with expertise in compensation analysis. The key individuals on the faculty committee were: Carl Pieper, Biostatistician, Cathleen Colon-Emeric, who performs salary studies in the Department of Medicine, and Kevin Weinfurt, a psychometrician in the Department of Medicine.

We recognized that salary data, viewed out of context or explanation, could be interpreted incorrectly- particularly by parties outside the organization. With this in mind, the decision was made to

conduct the study under attorney client privilege, which we understand differs from the campus decision around its salary equity study. In this study, 260-plus new junior faculty in the Clinical Sciences hired between 2011 and 2015 were identified. A model for predicting salary was created based on about 20 measurable factors which could contribute to salary. These factors included discipline, clinical effort, publications, time at Duke and others. These factors predicted about 80% of the salary.

The analysis showed two interesting things. First, men's salaries were about 1% above predicted and women's were about 1% below predicted. We also looked at differences in salary by race, but the numbers were too small to draw any conclusion. Second, the productivity variables that were used to predict salary were higher for men than women. For instance, men had more publications, and had higher measured clinical productivity.

Like most studies, this one raises interesting questions and has been used to generate discussion with Chairs. As a next step, we are developing a "salary toolkit" that departments can use to ensure they are taking steps to make compensation decisions without regard to gender, race/ethnicity or any other legally protected characteristic."

That is the conclusion of the School of Medicine memo. ECAC and I are not able to answer questions about the study. However, if you would like to submit questions, please send your questions to the academic council at acouncil@duke.edu and we will collect the questions and forward them, de-

identified, to Ann Brown, and request a response.

Today, we will hear from Merlise and Josh regarding their salary equity study for regular rank tenure track faculty, the same as two years ago. However, as requested, they have also examined non-tenure track regular rank faculty salaries for the first time, and they are not yet ready today to present their findings but they will present them fall of 2017. I would like to invite to the podium Merlise and Josh.

Josh Socolar (Physics): Thanks, Nan, and hello everyone. I'd like to say a few words about the scope of the Faculty Compensation Committee's task. First, let me just thank the committee members listed here (refers to slide) for their contributions and I also want to thank David Jamieson-Drake and Kendrick Tatum for their timely and valuable assistance out of the Provost's office. The Faculty Compensation Committee has conducted a salary equity study every two years since 2002, excluding 2010 because the financial crisis essentially froze salaries for a cycle. Our charge is to check for statistical evidence of discrimination based on gender and/or race. The type of analysis we do allows us to identify individual salaries that appear, statistically speaking, to be anomalously low. So we bring those to the attention of the administration and the information gets filtered down to department chairs to see whether appropriate actions should be taken.

The report we're delivering today follows the form used for the past several salary equity studies and largely arrives at the same conclusion. We do not find statistically significant evidence for

systematic bias regarding female or underrepresented minority faculty. We'll flesh out the picture just a bit, however, by showing some types of data that were not explicitly included in past reports to the Council. As Nan mentioned, the committee did decide this year to expand our study to include non-tenure track faculty. We will need more time, however, to properly account for the variable expectations across schools and departments for faculty with similar titles. There's just a lot to be sorted out to make sure that we're interpreting the data correctly.

I do want to emphasize two points before Merlise presents the analysis. The first concerns the effects of scholarly productivity on salary. Except for the distinction between distinguished professors and other full professors, the committee judged it unwise to introduce assessments of faculty merit, primarily because we did not see a way to identify metrics that we would all agree capture the relevant factors for salary determinations. For this reason, the confidence intervals, that is, the uncertainties in our conclusions, are expected to get larger with increasing faculty seniority. The second issue is the effect the market force is in determining salaries and demographics in different fields. One could argue about whether these market differences are fundamentally equitable. The committee, wisely, we think, did not attempt any analysis of the relevant markets. The issue will come to the fore, however, when Merlise presents gender comparisons aggregated over schools and divisions. What may, at first glance, appear to be a salary equity issue, will turn out instead to be largely due to differing levels of demographic diversity

in different fields. The focus of our statistical interpretation is firmly on salary equity for individuals that are in comparable positions.

Finally, a general comment about the format of our presentation: I do want to explicitly acknowledge that there are important distinctions between the issues associated with gender, and with underrepresented minorities. Similar data for the two groups might call for very different conversations. Nevertheless, there are similarities as well, and, in the interest of efficiency, we'll present the two analyses in parallel. In any case, it's your job, collectively, to help Duke think through these issues in the most fruitful ways. With that, I will let Merlise, who deserves all the credit for the nitty gritty work that had to be done here, tell you what she found.

Merlise Clyde (Statistical Science): So what we'll do is we'll dive in and actually go over some of the conclusions that Josh alluded to before we get into some of the details of the study. So basically our statistical models that we have developed adjust for all available background characteristics that we included, so departments, for divisions, ranks, time in rank, and rank at hire. Taking those into account, we do not find significant evidence for any systematic difference in the salaries of tenure track faculty by race or gender at the ranks of assistant, associate, full, or distinguished professors, with the following exception: For distinguished full professors, the FCC does find that underrepresented minority males have higher median salaries than Caucasian males. However, there is a very small sample size in terms of our underrepresented minorities, and this is going to lead to substantial uncertainty

for the estimate of that percent difference in the salary. The other thing I'd like to add here before we go on is the results from this study are similar to findings that we've had from previous years.

Now to dive in to more about the details. For those of you who don't like statistics, go ahead and take a nap (laughter). The data that we're using, provided by the Provost's Office for Institutional Research, by David Jamieson-Drake and Kendrick Tatum. The data consist of 932 individuals in tenure track positions. This excludes 31 faculty who are in primarily administrative roles and also excludes faculty who left the university during the year. The variable that we are looking at is a salary. This is going to be nine-month based pay, or the equivalent for individuals who are on 12-month appointments. Our analysis excludes all summer salary that's due to, say, grants or administrative supplements, which are not actually available in the database. We have minor adjustments throughout the analysis. Basically, if the model starts to predict that someone looks anomalously low, we've actually worked with David and Kendrick to go back and verify that the data that we're using are accurate. There are often cases where regiments that are in the database represent, say, someone who is on leave., or maybe it's a step-down in terms of thinking about retirement. And so we need to adjust those so that they're equivalent to 100%.

Just a brief overview of the number of positions by gender, race and ethnicity at this point in time: In terms of diversity, there are still more males than females. There are still more Caucasians than Asians or underrepresented minorities. In this case, because of the small sample sizes, we're grouping together any faculty

who self-identified as Black, Hispanic, or Latinx, Native American, or any of the multi-racial categories into one category; that's the under-represented minorities.

So what we'd like to do is begin and start to talk about comparison in populations. The Duke faculty is a population and some people question why do we need statistics in order to study this salary equity? What one could do is compute the population means and medians by gender and race at each of the ranks and then compute what's called an equity ratio where we look at the average, say, female salary, compared to the average male salary. In doing this, our salaries are going to be aggregated over divisions and departments. This is basically the methodology that was used in the AAUP studies, so I'd like to just kind of illustrate a potential problem with this type of summary. So what we have (see table on slide) is two hypothetical departments, A and B. And you can see department A is very balanced. There are equal numbers of females and males, and there is also equity in terms of their salaries. They're both paid \$100,000 each, on average. If we compute the equity ratio, we have perfect balance, it's at 100. For department B, we have fewer females than males, but it is another equitable department. So everyone actually receives the same salary of \$200,000. Again, our equity ratio, men and women are equal. Now, if we aggregate this data, and now look at summaries at the division level, well we have fewer women. So the 30 females compared to the 50 males. If you compute the average salary, ignoring departments, so just computing at the division level, we have \$133,000 as the salary for women. The male salary, because, there are more men in department B, their average salary is

\$160,000. So now when we compute the equity ratio, we have 83%. So this is an issue in how we study the populations and summarize them. So we tried to break this down a little bit further. Ideally we want to look at them at department level.

Springer: I think you brought up this point to show how your conclusion could be misleading when you aggregate all these departments. But I still think it's a problem. Because that means as you walk around campus, the average woman you meet is making less than the average man you meet. And this has an impact.

Clyde: Yes. And so that gets back into more of the diversity question as opposed to the salary equity question. So, again, they're intertwined. You can't separate them. So just to summarize what we were planning for the AAUP analysis on what we find is our equity ratio for distinguished faculty is 92%, so women are earning 92% of what a male faculty member would earn. For professors, women would earn 94% of what male faculty salaries would be, associate professors, it's 98% of male faculty, and assistant, it's 87%. So what we did was actually try to look more carefully at those numbers, and the hypothetical example is at play in trying to explain some of these differences. So the question is, how do we actually refine that and look more closely?

So what I have here is a picture of this gender equity ratio by department and rank for all of the faculty. So each point on this plot illustrates one department. They're plotted on the bottom axis by percent women in the department, and the vertical axis here is the equity ratio. So if we were at perfect equity, everything

would be right there at 100% and what you can see is that we have some points that are above the line and some that are below the line. The size of these dots reflects the size of the faculty in those respective departments. So very small faculty, you may not be able to see the dots, particularly there at, say, 50%, those are the cases where we have one male and one female. So because of privacy, I have not labeled which departments these go to, not to cause everyone to panic and worry about if they're below the green line. Again, at this level, it's almost too fine a resolution because of very small sample sizes. But another issue is that we cannot tell from this is if it's really a problem of inequity or is it because faculty in this department, some have been there for a very long, others are new hires or entered that rank recently. So there are other factors that can go into play when trying to explain the differences in salary. But this plot still cannot capture it. Ideally we would compare the salaries of males and females, Caucasians to African Americans and Asians, who all have the same characteristics. That is, the same department, the same rank, the same time in rank, or the same time since degree. Unfortunately, Duke does not hire faculty like Noah's ark (laughter). We do not hire the male and female at the same time or equal numbers of Asian males as other underrepresented groups. So since we cannot do that direct comparison of looking at each one together, we are going to use statistical models based on regression to try to remove the differences in salary due to departments, the rank of the member, how long they've been in that rank, as well as the rank at which they were hired. After we adjust the salaries to remove those effects, do race or gender explain any of those

residual or remaining differences in salary? Again, limitations to this analysis, factors that influence salaries such as the research or other activities, are not available to us in the current database and so this is going to lead to increased residual and unexplained variations that may make it harder to be able to detect difference if it does exist. So for those of you who like statistics, we're using the robust regression techniques to minimize the influence of rare or extreme salaries in estimating these population results.

So now for some of the results. If we break it down by using the model to try to account for the ranks and different departments, we find that this model explains about 94% of the variation in salaries of assistant professors, of which we have 173. In this plot, what we have is, at the bottom, if it's at zero, that's implying that men and women or different categories all are earning exactly the same on average in terms of median salary. In the case here, what we have at the bottom, if you look at that point, it's close to two, so for male Asians, we're expecting that there is about 2% higher salary for them compared to the baseline for it which is the male Caucasians. So we've broken these down by the different categories of both gender and race to try to tease out if there are any differences in different areas. The vertical line is zero and reflects that there is no difference. The solid lines are kind of our best estimate, our point estimate of what that percent difference would be. So negative two would indicate that male underrepresented minorities are earning about 2% less. The intervals, those bars there, are really trying to reference our uncertainty for using a statistical model to try to approximate the population and so that range gives us the 95% interval as

the probability. So it's saying, for example, underrepresented minorities may earn up to 6% less, up to, perhaps, maybe, just over 2% more.

For associate professors, we have 220 individuals who were used for this. As we go up in rank, we want a variation that this model can actually account for is about 83% of that variation. So we can see this point in terms of the point estimate, female underrepresented minorities are earning slightly more than White males. Female Asians are earning again slightly less. These estimates are a little more uncertain than what we had previously. White females are earning slightly above zero in terms of the estimate difference between White males. I'm going down to (referring to slide) male underrepresented minorities are earning about 4% more. But all of these intervals, again, suggest that we do not have enough evidence to say that there is a difference of discrimination.

For the full professors, we have 314. Again, a lot less variation that we can account for by these factors. There are many more factors that go into determining the salary. You can see by the Y axis there, we have a lot more uncertainty. Low is about 30% on that interval going up to about 15%. The zero bar is still included in all these intervals, suggesting that we do not have enough evidence to be able to say there is any form of discrimination.

For distinguished professors, again, even less of the variation can be accounted for by just the department, time in rank, and time at hire. So the model is accounting for only about 64% of the variation. It's at this point that we do see that the male underrepresented minorities are earning

about 11-12% more than White males. If everyone looks at that, there's a huge range of uncertainty in the estimate and it's still pretty close to zero but it is suggesting that they are earning more.

Just to kind of recap those overall conclusions of the study. The intervals that were reporting suggested there is not a statistical significant evidence for systematic differences in the salaries by race or gender at any of the ranks that we see. The only exception here is the distinguished full professors, where the underrepresented minority males do have a higher median salary than Caucasian males. We do have to caution, if you have photographic memory and you look back at the beginning, there are only nine underrepresented minorities at the distinguished level. So we do need to take that into account when doing this analysis. The results are similar to the findings of the analyses from previous years and if there's time I can go into looking at the trend plots. What we do want to note, though, is that there are discrepancies that exist at population averages, which speaks to Roxanne's point that overall, we are comparing averages at each of the ranks. But there are instances in salary equity where the most likely explanation is that differences are attributed to the number of men relative to women or different numbers of minorities, as opposed to evidence of actual discrimination in differences of salaries or issues of diversity as opposed to salary equity.

Jokerst: So we have an option at this point. Merlise has data across a number of years that we've done in the salary equity analysis, or we can move to questions.

Beale: You're not going to present the

discrepancies at the division and university levels?

Clyde: We can put that into the final report.

Jokerst: Yes, that can be in the written report. Would you like to see the trend across the years or go to questions? We have about 15 minutes left.

Springer: I'd like to see the trend across the years because I remember one of the discussion points from two years ago was the statistical likelihood that a particular cohort would continue to remain below the average in study after study. As Merlise pointed out at that point, it could just be grandfathering the very same people who just stayed there. But I'd like to see that.

Jokerst: I find the time-based analysis interesting. So should we spend maybe five minutes on that and then go to questions? Would that be acceptable?

Clyde: Basically, in terms of trends or recording estimates over time from the previous studies, one thing that we'd like to point out is the methodology changed in 2012 to use robust regression methods, where we keep all the individuals in, while previously we had extreme salaries on either side that were removed as outliers in the analysis. In 2014 we also added additional race categories for Asian and underrepresented minorities. Those have been combined as one category. And just getting to Roxanne's point, if you think about assistant professors, at least in Arts and Sciences, typically what we would have is that in any given analysis it may be that from year to year, there could be seven-eighths of the observations are going to be common in the adjacent

estimates because basically you have that cohort that's moving through. So each year one group is going to move out from the assistant professors into that next category of associate professors. So we really do expect the numbers to be pretty similar from year to year, assuming everyone got the same percent raise. So that is something where there's going to be a lot of positive correlation between those estimates.

In terms of race, this is breaking it down by underrepresented and Asian. So what we find in the estimates for this year, this last point there, we can see, in terms of underrepresented minorities, the equity ratio now, instead of the percent difference, is about 102. So earning about 2% more than White males. Asians in previous years had been statistically significantly lower than White males, and now that has moved up. In previous years, again, we believe a lot of the effect of this being higher than 100 is due more to the combination of the Asian and underrepresented groups.

If we look at associate professors, again you see that the underrepresented groups in associates are moving closer to that line. So in the previous year, Asians were above 100%. That has actually shifted down. So there is fluctuation above and below. For full professors, it's similar to estimates from before. If we turn back to gender, you're seeing an overall increase from previous year. At assistant professor level, for associate, we're actually seeing improvement.

For full professors, it's still kind of fluctuating at a 4% difference. And we don't have the distinguished professors part because we haven't broken those out. Previously, distinguished professors and

full professors were all combined together. 2012 and earlier combined distinguished professors and full professors. This is only in the last two years that we've broken out distinguished professors.

Speaker: So doesn't that contaminate this data just like it would contaminate distinguished professors data?

Clyde: Yes. So the last two years does not include distinguished professors.

Cohen: Could you go back one slide? So we asked this question before. On this line, on most points, most points are below the line. None of them have statistical significance individually. Could you use meta-analytic techniques, if you isolated only those individuals so they appear only once, so it's not the same people all the time? Could you use meta-analytic techniques to decide if, when combining the data, if there is a real significant difference?

Clyde: So the issue is that, again, with this group, we have significant overlap. So you'd only be able to look at maybe one eighth or one quarter of the data because of the same people appearing in 2014, 2016. So we should, in principle, be able to use past data sets, rather than using just straight meta-analytics. Then we would have an actual longitudinal model that would take into account the fact that this is the same person, so it would have the trajectory over time which would probably be more appropriate than trying to use meta-analysis because you lose power by reducing and just using people that were not used before. But I think, again, because of the same people appearing, we kind of expect there to be positive correlation and so the meta-

analysis would not be appropriate.

Liz Ananat (Sanford School of Public Policy): I want to encourage a longitudinal analysis is what I want to say, and the other thing I want is to ask is another pooling question. If you pooled the non-White men, in, say, the assistant professor analysis, I realize, again, that none of the individual estimates are statistically similar to zero, but they're all below, except for the Asian men. Have you tried doing that?

Clyde: Could you repeat the question?

Ananat: Pool White men versus others, for say, the assistant professors. Because there's the same issue where all the points are below the line, except for the Asian men. None of the points reach statistical significance at the 95% level. But of course you have these small N problems.

Clyde: So in some sense, this does, because with the groups going in opposite directions, if you pool underrepresented and Asians together...

Ananat: Sorry, that's not what I'm asking you to do.

Socolar: Go back to the trend plot.

Ananat: If you pool all the non-White men, versus White men, people who are female or underrepresented minorities, versus people who are White men.

Clyde: So we actually did do a model before where we did have the kind of interaction, it shows the same analysis or same results. But because people were very interested in whether female underrepresented minorities were

different than other underrepresented minorities. So we wanted to separate that out and look at that question directly. However, when we do pool the groups together, then we find that there really is this interaction that is not significant. So there's an effect for gender, there's an effect for being underrepresented or Asian. There's not an interaction between the two.

Jokerst: This is a question that came up in ECAC that we specifically asked Merlise and Josh to disentangle.

Clyde: The only place we do see that interaction is here at the distinguished professor level. So that's why we basically kept the same parallel analysis going out throughout, just to be able to see that. And then perhaps in the future it could be done at that level.

Manoj Mohanan (Sanford School of Public Policy): So this is fascinating but it also occurred to me, early on you told us that you did something to the 12 month versus the nine month? Given that compositional effects are a big part of what you're looking at here, I was wondering, how sensitive are the results to the way that gets classified? So I guess what you're doing is, you take the 12 month salaries and essentially you're showing us nine-twelfths of those salaries, right?

Clyde: This is the salary that's basically reported in the database. Because everything is done at a department or the unit level, then what you would have is that everyone, when you adjust for department, that effect goes away as to whether it's a nine month salary versus a 12 month salary. Because there's more distinction between the units.

Mohanan: What is the sensitivity of that? Because depending on what units are, so much of this is coming from the composition of who is in what department.

Jokerst: Are there any departments where there are nine month and 12 month salaries for tenure track? So that would be good to know.

Clyde: I did not do any adjustment to the salaries in terms of correcting. That's what we received and it was supposed to have been the equivalent of the nine months.

Mohanan: It's the nine months reported equal, but that's not what they're getting paid.

Jokerst: Yeah, W2s are very different.

Klein: To follow on your point, in ECAC we raised the question, and they don't have the data to be able to address it, are there disparities in who is getting supplemental pay for this, that or the other? They don't have that data.

Socolar: We also don't have data on who is getting research grants that support summer salaries.

Mohanan: I'll stop after this but I'm asking a slightly different question. Let's say the department of Medicine, which has 12 month salaries. How do they report that?

Jokerst: So the salary equity survey, let's stay on the academic side. Let's take Pratt, for example. I believe most faculty are on nine month salaries and those faculty on nine month salaries, we divide it by nine. My understanding is, if they're on 12

month salaries, base pay, we divide it by 12. So we're looking at base pay because that's what we have access to in the database.

Clyde: The only question that sometimes comes up is that when we do the analysis, we'll sometimes discover an individual whose salary seems way lower than what you'd expect for that department. So we go back and ask if that's really their salary, or is there something else going on. Sometimes what we encounter is that the individual was actually on sabbatical at only 50% pay, so that's what was reported. In that case, we would increase their salary to what would be the equivalent of the nine month salary.

Jokerst: The FCC does an enormous amount of work because they get all this data and then they go and talk to the Institutional Research office about all the outliers.

Socolar: The FCC in this case being Merlise (laughter).

Clyde: So what we're trying to make sure is that we're receiving accurate data and sometimes we cannot say, okay, is that really the right number? That's where the robust model comes in. We're trying to use that so that we don't have to remove data points.

Jokerst: We have time for one more question.

Beale: Can I come back to the question that Emily raised about the summer supplements and the administrative? Is it possible to do some other study, even if that's not in the data, is that something we should be looking at? Is it possible to look at it? Because, at least in some

institutions, that has been a source of tension. It's not handed out equally. I don't know that there is a problem here, but to do a study that every year is our major study and never looks at that seems a little problematic.

Socolar: I think the difficulty is going to be in determining whether the supplemental salaries are being given for equivalent types of work. Some people are going to be doing two months' worth of work and getting paid for that, some people get a different job and get paid less, so I'm not sure how you would measure equity.

Jokerst: I just think having the data would be interesting, though. What I'm going to suggest is that we take that under consideration. So two years ago we heard we should include Clinical Sciences and non-regular rank faculty, and so we're working on that this year. So I think we're hearing longitudinal and supplemental pay. We're going to have to close the meeting now but I'd like to request that anybody who has further questions, send them to Academic Council and we're going to send them on to the FCC. Last year there was interplay and questions and the FCC was able to answer some of the questions in their report, which they have not yet submitted to the Academic Council. So if there are questions, please send them and the FCC will look at those and try to answer them in the final report or will project it to the next salary equity survey what we'd like to include in that next equity survey. I'd like to have a round of applause (applause). Speaking of compensation, this work is uncompensated (laughter). No supplemental pay. Thank you everyone for attending. This concludes today's meeting. Remember to put April

6th on our calendar to welcome Vince Price to Duke. Thank you.