

Duke University

DURHAM
NORTH CAROLINA
27708-0928

ACADEMIC COUNCIL
304 UNION WEST
BOX 90928

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

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Academic Council

Thursday April 21, 2011

Craig Henriquez (Chair, Academic Council and Professor of Biomedical Engineering and Computer Science): Welcome, everyone – and an especially warm welcome to the new members of Academic Council. We had an orientation just before our meeting – if I could ask the new members to stand so the old members can see who they are (ap- plause). Some familiar faces, folks who’ve been here before, some newbies who have never done it before. Of course, it’s the second to last meeting, getting close to the end of the semester and also my term as Chair of the Council, which is officially over at the end of June. I will be passing the baton at our next meeting to Susan Lozier from the Nicholas School, who is here with us today. I’d also like to remind everyone that it is a custom of our first meeting of the new Council to have a reception following our meeting – there’s wine! (laughter) I hope many of you can stay for that and meet our new members and get to know old members as well.



Before we get started with the agenda, I’d like to extend our concerns to the faculty, staff, and students of Shaw University in Raleigh, a sister school, whose campus was significantly damaged from the storms and tornadoes that passed through North Carolina last weekend. As many of you know, the campus itself was closed and classes sus-

pending for the rest of the year which is a big hit on everybody in the university. There was a lot of physical damage done to the campus, to the dorms, the student union, but fortunately not one person was injured so there is much to be grateful for. I hope we can all think creatively as a community on ways that we can help our counterparts over the next few months until they are back on their feet.

So let’s get on with our agenda. I would like to ask for the approval of the March 24th minutes [passed by voice vote with no dissent].

Attendance sheets are being passed around, so those of you who are new and have never seen these before, this is simply a way of keeping attendance of who’s at our meetings. We need to know that there is a quorum in case there is a vote taken and we need to have sufficient numbers to do that. You also may not know that our bylaws say that you can get kicked off the Council. Sometimes we wonder if this is what somebody wants to do or not (laughter), but if you miss three consecutive meetings without an excuse then you can get kicked off the Council. We urge you, we know you are busy, simply call Sandra or email her in the Academic Council Office and let her know if you cannot attend. This helps us in planning, if it turns out that for whatever reason everyone is going to the same conference in France we will plan accordingly and cancel the meeting or do something else.

Also, when you ask a question at the meeting, it is helpful if you identify yourself. The meetings are recorded and transcribed, and it’s helpful, particularly for new people, to let us know who you are so that we can identify you correctly, not “unknown” or “anonymous person in the corner” asked the following question.

Faculty Secretary Election

Today we are going to do a couple of elections, which are with the Executive Committee and also our Faculty Secretary. Brief bios were circulated about a week ago and were also posted with the agenda – and there are

some copies on the front table if people need them. The Faculty Secretary is the first election that we will do today, and whose main responsibility is to provide minutes for the meetings and also serve as an ex-officio member of ECAC.

I, along with my fellow members of ECAC, would like to thank John Staddon for the minutes he has provided this past year. We are putting his name forward again, but first I will ask if there are any nominations from the floor for people who wish to serve as faculty secretary? They must have agreed in advance to serve. Are there any? Hearing none, I offer the name of John Staddon as Faculty Secretary for the coming academic year and ask all in favor to say aye? Opposed? Abstentions? Congratulations, John. One more year! (applause)

Executive Committee Election

We will now move to the process of electing the Executive Committee of the Academic Council known affectionately as ECAC. ECAC members are generally elected for two-year terms and, before I go any further, I would like to recognize the ECAC members who will complete their terms in June, I'm not sure if they are all here for various reasons, but they are:

Steffen Bass (Physics)

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

Ann Brown (Medicine)

Suzanne Shanahan (Sociology & Kenan Ethics Institute)

Marie Lynn Miranda (Nicholas School of the Environment & Pediatrics) who has also served as Vice Chair for the past two years.

I'd also like to recognize the sole member who will continue for one more year on ECAC:

Larry Zelenak (Law School)

You are welcome to join us at our next ECAC meeting and all subsequent ECAC meetings and we look forward to having you.

Even though there are a few meetings left of the ECAC, so to those ECAC members here, I want to let you know that you are not off the hook yet, but I do want to thank you all for your service to ECAC here and to Duke. This has been a remarkable and close-knit group, and I'm sure Peter and Tallman and Dick will attest that they are very willing to ask direct questions of the senior officers. This is a busy group; it meets every week for two hours usually around lunch and the members of ECAC also serve on a variety of University and Trustee committees as well. It has been a privilege to work with all of you – I greatly appreciate your hard work and your friendship over the past two years and I'm sure that in some point in the future we will see each other again on a committee.

For today's election we have asked Professors Julie Barroso from Nursing and Susan Spratt from Clinical Sciences to serve as counters. They will also distribute and collect the ballots. I should remind you that only elected

members of the Academic Council are eligible to cast votes, not alternates.

Our bylaws state that ECAC shall prepare a ballot with two nominees for each open position, and circulate this information in advance of the meeting. The goal of this ECAC election is to have a cross-section of the schools and divisions represented. There are only six ECAC positions and only three in a given year elected usually, this year we have five. There are twelve schools and divisions that we represent, so it is not possible to represent every school and every division in every ECAC. This year, because we have so many members rotating off and so many new members entering ECAC, we sought some nominees who have had considerable experience in University service. After the slates are determined by the current ECAC, only members from the Academic Council are eligible to serve on ECAC and then the nominees are contacted to see if they are willing and able to serve on ECAC.

I will now read the slates of the names of the candidates who have agreed to stand for election and I will ask each of them to stand when I call your name:

One slate from the School of Medicine: Cynthia Kuhn, Pharmacology & Cancer Biology Herman Staats, Pathology

A slate from the Fuqua School: Carl Mela and John Payne

Another slate is from the Pratt School of Engineering: Warren Grill and Lawrie Virgin

One slate from the division of Social Sciences: Phil Costanzo, Psychology & Neuroscience and Phil Morgan, Sociology & International Studies

And the last slate is what we call the former ECAC-er slate, it was going to be the old ECAC-er slate but I didn't want to use that, and these are two members who have previously served on ECAC and who have agreed to serve a one-year slate, to provide some institutional memory of ECAC to Susan and the new members of ECAC.

This is actually a hybrid divisional slate. We have Peter Burian from Classical Studies who is here and actually a former chair of the Council and Josh Socolar in Physics. We have the two divisions, Humanities and Natural Sciences represented so please vote and we will collect the ballots and I will announce the winners at the end.

After the count, the winners of the Executive Committee election are:

Cindy Kuhn, Pharmacology & Cancer Biology,

John Payne, Fuqua School of Business,

Warren Grill, Pratt School of Engineering,

Peter Burian, Classical Studies and

Phil Costanzo, Psychology & Neuroscience (applause).

Duke in Kunshan

Before we get started, I want to make a few comments about the email I sent to the faculty this week. Last month we had one of the more thoughtful and thought provoking discussions on Duke in Kunshan. Questions were

raised on issues of academic freedom, student experience, budget, governance, and even philosophical questions as to what type of events would trigger an exit.

Since that meeting, I have received many emails from the faculty at large. The emails raised many of the questions that were raised in Council and also reflected the fact that some faculty are just beginning to pay attention to the discussion and were in search of information. So one of the reasons that I prepared this page on the Council website which I referred to in my letter, was to allow the faculty at large the ability to follow the discussion as it has evolved over the last year and have all of this information in one place. I realize this would also be beneficial for other items that pass through the Council, the number of things that we see on a regular basis, the budget process, athletics, so we can do that at some point but I'll leave that for another time.

Since our last Council meeting, ECAC had an opportunity to have dinner with the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees. China, of course, came up in that discussion and we were told by the Executive Committee of the Board that this has been the most-scrutinized and most-actively debated venture in probably the last ten years in that group. Trustees are also asking many of the same questions raised by the faculty and as President Brodhead said last time – there has been a period of anxiety among the Trustees – “Because Duke has not done anything like this, and it is not a world we know and every particular question about what this program would look like could not be answered early.” Some of the important questions are beginning to get answers but some of the new ones are coming up everyday.

This is a very important venture for Duke and the game plan is being created on the fly. I urge the faculty to be ready to play their part and contribute and to make sure that we move forward and understand as much as we can and have had a chance to debate the critical issues proactively.

I think this Council -- I talked a little bit about the history of this Council and how it was restructured in 1972-- is very well designed to do this and be engaged in this conversation and we have the capacity to do more if needed. We have existing committees like APC and UPC, we have the new committee that we created known as the Global Priorities Committee which is GPC or we could go old-school and do what the former Councils used to do and create a task force to coordinate things like the receipt of faculty questions and use ECAC as a way of getting answers from the administration, solicit feedback from the faculty and students who have worked and lived in China and also come up with a set of guiding principles for new engagements as we move abroad. So these are things that the faculty can and should do. And the Council that was restructured in 1972 is able to do this because they know that all major decisions need to come before the Council before they go to the Board of Trustees. This is the Christie Rule that this Council is based on and I can think of no bigger issue that has come before this Council in recent memory than Duke in China. So the Council and the new ECAC that will be elected will be at the front of this, I will assure you, but the faculty at large need to be willing to

help so I urge the faculty to participate in this conversation as best you can and ECAC will do everything they can to make this information available. Any questions? Comments? Thank you.

2010 Faculty Survey

Our first presentation is from Provost Peter Lange and Vice Provost for Faculty Diversity and Development, Nancy Allen, to discuss the findings of the 2010 Faculty Survey Project. In my report at the University Faculty Meeting in February, I noted that we are in a time of self-reflection and assessment which led me to paraphrase Socrates, The Unexamined University is not worth attending (laughter). Some of this assessment is mandated from outside – some is done without our knowledge. There are groups like Academic Analytics who collect data from various sources and databases and determine metrics to assess among other things, faculty productivity – and make that information available to various groups – and some of the assessment is internal.

The survey that Peter and Nancy will report on is an example of a hybrid assessment, where some of the questions on the assessment survey were Duke-specific and some were common to a number of institutions such as Harvard, MIT, Stanford and Northwestern who have agreed to share data from their schools. Of course, such data collection is most useful when it leads to changes or new policies to correcting problems that the data has identified. We now have the benefit of two surveys, one from five years ago, so it is possible to talk about changes that have occurred as a result of last survey. Peter and Nancy will now tell us how collectively happy we are, how over-worked we are and perhaps most importantly, how we feel about our parking (laughter).

Nancy Allen (Vice Provost for Faculty Diversity and Development): Thank you, Craig. We'll do all that and more I hope. So this is a bit of time in the making to get from last year when we submitted the survey by email to



all 3,000-and-some faculty across the University, including the medical center – and I'm sure each of you read the 250 page link that we included! But really, we wanted all of you to have access to that information, not necessarily that you'd already looked at it today but this is kind of the tip of the iceberg and a way for you to become familiar with

the survey itself and some of our early data. So I will lead off and Peter will continue.

We administered the survey in the Spring of 2010 to all regular-rank faculty in the University. The 2005 survey was developed through the Faculty Diversity Standing Committee and was based on an MIT survey that had been administered a number of years earlier. The 2010 survey included core questions that were agreed upon by Duke and our COFHE peers and we then added back some Duke-specific questions and questions that we wanted to be able to compare to the answers in 2005, plus a few new questions such as how the economic downturn might have affected you as a faculty member.

We wanted to give special thanks to those 1,515 faculty who completed the survey and also to the Provost for authorizing us to again administer the survey. We are indebted to our excellent institutional research team including David Jamieson-Drake, Jiali Lu and Pat Hull, because they spent countless hours putting this data together. Pat spent countless hours reading all of the written comments on this. And you think faculty don't have time to fill out a survey, even clicking on answers, but many, many people did submit suggestions and ideas and comments and complaints. Pat read all of those and encoded those for us. David, Jiali, and Pat, could you stand up because I really want to recognize you and your work (applause). They plus a sub-group of the Faculty Diversity Standing Committee including Ann Brown, myself, Paula McClain and Tina Williams along with Ben Reese and Jackie Looney, constituted a working group that has met every two weeks since September. In today's presentation, we want to provide you with highlights of the institutional results comparing the data from five years ago to now. This will be high-level and will cover some broad themes, Peter will show some specific data that was selected, not totally randomly but to give you an idea of where some differences are. We wanted to show some examples of where we have made some progress since 2005 and start the conversation about actionable items.

Today's period of time is not long enough to get to all of those but again, this is a start. Many of the actionable items will take place at the school levels so Jiali, David and Pat have prepared individual school reports that the working group has reviewed and those have been made accessible to the deans who will hopefully, with pressure from you all as members of those schools, make them available more widely to faculty and discussion in your individual schools for actions that can take place from there.

So, comparing 2005 to 2010 we're comparing as Craig said data to four of our peers and they all administered the core survey before the economic downturn so you think maybe they're happier than we are – or they were happier in 2007 or early 2008 – before the downturn. So if we look happier than they do it's even more impressive. Results were stratified by school division, as I mentioned, and also by rank, gender, race and ethnicity. So that's part of the impetus for the original survey in 2005 to look at underrepresented groups to see where the differences are. We all think we know where they are but with data we can then say to the Provost or to Tallman where those differ-

ences are and also Dick, I think, would like to know too. I mentioned the free-text responses and we've incorporated some of those into the individual reports.

So here's just a little bit of a busy slide but it shows that we had a respectable percentage of response overall. Look at Arts and Sciences, the three divisions that are at the top. They are all in the high 60s. The other professional schools ranged from 54-71%. Nicholas gets a star there. Then, the Basic Sciences, about 50%, the Clinical Sciences come out at the lowest and Nursing gets the real prize at 87% response rate. We had a total of 1515 responders out of a total at the time calculated at close to 3000. The overall response was 51%, but if you leave out Medicine, Nursing and Basic Sciences, the response rate was close to 65%.

I will turn over the podium now to Peter to bring you the data. I'll mention that we stratified Clinical versus Non-Clinical. Clinical refers to Clinical Sciences only, which is a big group of people. Non-Clinical is everyone else. I tried to come up with an acronym for all those together but somebody will do that later.

Peter Lange (Provost): Thank you Nancy. A few introductory things: First of all, somebody remarked implicitly I haven't read the Provostopedia yet what is "COFHE"? COFHE is the Council of Financing of Higher Education. It includes all of our university peers plus the top echelon of private colleges in the country. It's a group of thirty-one schools. It's a comparison group that collects a lot of data. That's what COFHE is.

Second thing is, I really need to extend my thanks to the team. If you really get into this data, you will see that they have done a fabulous job of putting data together, putting it into individualized reports. We're able now to report on each school on all of the various subjects we have. It's been an incredible job. All year I've been saying "what's in the data?" They keep saying "We're working on it! We're working on it!" Then when you get in there and look at all that not just the 250 page report but all of the files in the Wiki which we have it's really an incredible job which they have done. I just want to add my thanks and add my thanks to Nancy who has really spearheaded this effort.

Third, when you sit there and start thinking – what are the implications for a lot of the data which you see? The implications are that where we need to do things they need to be done at the local level. It may be at the department level, it may be at the school level. There may be some things which may eventually end up as policy changes at the university level. As you will see, a lot of the things where we think we've had some challenges even if the overall pattern is pretty good, there are still some challenges they really are things to change at the department level – culture in the departments or attention paid to certain issues.

Let me start with the overall data on satisfaction. Yesterday I had almost twice as many slides to shift through in order to get the number of slides I'm going to show you. It's only about a tenth of the total number of slides we could have shown. But Craig really wanted to have this party at 5:00 (laughter). There's picking and choosing here and we shouldn't take too much out of this

to highlight certain issues although there are certain things I do want to come to. Let me start off with the overall findings on satisfaction. I know you can't read all these things so I'm going to just summarize for you. There are a set of 30 questions in the survey asked of the Non-Clinical and thirty-two questions of the Clinical respondents that asked about their satisfaction with various aspects of professional, intellectual life on a five point scale which goes from 1 which is very dissatisfied to 5 very satisfied.

The first thing you can look at to get an overall impression of what the data shows you is if this is the three line and five is the best you can get the overall picture by looking at that pattern about satisfaction and the second overall picture you can get from that pattern is that the blue represents 2005 and the yellow represents 2010. The other way around, sorry. Thank you all for being able to read better than I can (laughter).

What is the overall pattern? The overall pattern is obviously pretty good. The overall pattern shows a pretty high level of satisfaction. We do pretty well along many dimensions compared to our peers and there are some substantial numbers of areas in which we have improved since the previous survey. That's not true on everything and I'll break out some things but the only way to look at the data in a sense is to treat this not as individual lines but treat it as an overall visualization of the results of the survey on this satisfaction framework. I don't want to go through question by question because I think that's a crazy thing to do in this setting but if you look at it as a pattern you'll see the overall picture. You'll see in general with respect to our peers the differences aren't very large. I'm happy to take questions by the way along the way if you see things I'm not seeing. But I think that's the best way to deal with this first slide and I'll just leave it up there a minute more. Berndt?

Berndt Mueller (Physics): Peter, on what scale would you count a difference large? Sometimes a small difference is really a large difference. Do you know in which cases the differences are statistically significant?

Lange: Where you see a plus in the column that indicates a significant difference. The problem is...I apologize...Let me give you an example. For instance, availability of nearby parking (laughter), a plus or minus in this column means a significant difference and availability of parking is one. On the other hand, gathering spaces, well there's nothing to be significant about it. Teaching responsibilities you can see there's no significant difference. There's no mark in the column. Access to teaching assistants, you can see there's no mark there either. On the other hand, advising responsibilities there is and so forth. Ok Berndt, does that answer your question?

Berndt: That answers the question.

Linda Franzoni (Pratt School of Engineering): If the cross-hatching bar is not there for example on teaching responsibilities does that mean that there was no data collected on that in 2005?

Lange: Correct. Because remember in 2005, the questions came from the MIT survey. This time we put a lot of input into the survey with our fellow survey developers.

Phil Costanzo (Psychology and Neuroscience): So we don't know from this whether the differences are between 2005 and the present here or whether the differences...

Lange: It's Duke versus Duke or the pluses are significant differences between Duke and Duke and the minuses are significant difference between Duke versus peer. There are huge amounts of data in here. That's the only thing I can tell you. So, we did some sub-analyses, we did lots and lots of sub-analyses. Here's an example, in 2010 almost all faculty indicated higher satisfaction with office space and classroom space than their 2005 peers. This is particularly true for Humanities, Social Sciences, Natural Sciences, Engineering, Environment, Business and Nursing. Now if you think about that list I just read, those are all units in which we did major construction or major renovation since 2005 and for those of you who can remember back that far, when in 2005 the classroom space issue jumped out, we actually developed a plan of systematic improvement of classroom spaces in Arts and Sciences which was a place it most jumped out and where we hadn't done much classroom, as much new building, creation.

This is, in a way, a reflection of a good response of the faculty to changes that we have made in space, especially in classroom space since 2005. The office space I think is more of a reflection of new construction. Another finding of interest is while faculties for most schools and divisions indicated higher satisfaction with technical and research staff, faculty from all schools and divisions, except Divinity and Public Policy, indicated lower satisfaction with committee and administrative responsibilities than their 2005 peers. I have absolutely no way of knowing why that's the case. It may be however related to that issue of the fact that in the downturn, people's time in a sense became a little less available and people were a little more sensitive about doing committee work. That's just a speculation on my part. We don't have a detailed underpinning for that workload.

So here you see a comparison of workload between Duke in 2010 and Duke and peers in 2010. Duke faculty and their counterparts at peer schools rated the reasonableness pretty similarly. About 55% of Duke non-clinical faculty and 49% of clinical faculty considered their workload was about right compared to 54% of non-clinical faculty and 49% of clinical faculty at the peer schools. As I said, if you want to comment or make observations please do. Here you'll see a finding about opinions and overall workload and what you think about your workload sometimes as compared to other individuals – well, mostly to other individuals or at peer schools. What you see here is that overall the pattern...there have been changes in one direction and changes in the other direction but the one



that I would note is the difficulty to combine career and family where the falloff in the five years is fairly significant. I mean, it's big, that's what fairly significant means. That will come up again later when we look at some of the gender differences.

Priscilla Wald (English): I'm trying to interpret that. That means that we're now saying it is more difficult? That people are less satisfied? I'm trying to figure out how the question was phrased in order to understand what the fallout means. Are people happier or less happy?

Lange: Difficulty in combining career and family was closer to strongly agree in 2005 so actually it's gotten better. I apologize. I looked at these data yesterday. So, actually it's better

Wald: So, it's an improvement? People are saying that it is less difficult?

Lange: Right. Which is odd. Not what I expected. Not what you expected either. Would they be happier with lower stress? About the same in both periods. Then we asked a set of questions about: do you agree that the criteria for tenure and promotion are clearly communicated? What you'll see here is that we appear on the non-clinical side to communicate better in both periods than our peers did in this period and worse on the clinical side about tenure.

You can see the data about promotion. This is actually a finding which is interesting because there have been some surveys done in between the 2005 survey and now only with pre-tenure faculty and this was an issue about the communication of tenure standards.

It's been pretty interesting to watch because whereas we always looked fairly okay with respect to our peers if you bring in the public institutions, they're generally thought to communicate better but when we drilled down on what that means it generally mean they have very hard criteria with respect to productivity. And since we have a very strong quality component to that, it means the criteria don't look as clear compared to those institutions.

Now we're going to turn to some gender data. As we go through these I would urge you, as I highlight some of the male-female differences, to note two things. First of all, in general the differences that show up at Duke between genders on most of these criteria show up as well at our peers. So where you see differences, let's say males being more satisfied with something than females, those patterns appear as well at the peers. The second thing is pay attention to the absolute levels as well as to the differences because sometimes you'll see an absolute level which is quite favorable despite the fact that there's still a significant difference. Overall Duke female and clinical faculty and their corresponding male peers were similarly highly satisfied with most aspects of their professional and intellectual life. They differed from each other in their perceptions of a few areas. Compared to their male peers, Duke female non-clinical and clinical faculty indicated lower satisfaction with salary and access to teaching assistants.

In comparison to their corresponding COFHE peers, both Duke female and male faculty, non-clinical and clinical alike, indicated higher satisfaction with availability of nearby parking. Now this parking thing (laughter) comes

up a lot. Tallman's been asking about this parking thing because he's going to have to do something about parking and office space. While Duke female, non-clinical and clinical faculty, indicated lower satisfaction with salary and access to teaching assistants than their COFHE female peers, this has to do a little bit with the balance of resourcing for faculty in certain areas. Something which we need to attend to.

Gender and workload: Here you see a slide which covers a number of questions we asked locally which were not on the peer survey. Remember Nancy said that we introduced some questions just for Duke. With respect to five local questions about overall workloads, Duke female non-clinical and clinical faculty were less likely than their male peers to agree "I have enough time to manage my responsibilities as a faculty member and my personal and family responsibilities." But more likely to agree that "I would be happier at an institution with a lower stress level due to time conflicts between work and personal family responsibilities." The difficulty is, if you go and look at the peers, they have the same patterns. So you're not going to be able to go to a peer and find the solution to that particular problem.

Now I think this is a challenge for us as an institution to be honest to you, it's one we've tried to address. Some of it happens at the department levels. Some of it has to happen at the institutional level. We've taken steps – our family and parental leave policies have been steps – that are designed to address some of those issues. Some of them remain and they remain across Duke and across our peers.

How about sources of stress? Here's an example. Women find the timing of meetings to be substantially more of a source of stress than males do but notice the absolute levels. This is a place where the absolute levels matter. That's also one of the areas that is fairly low in the overall scheme. You have a problem but it's not a problem where there's an extensive sense of it and that one is significant. On scholarly productivity, that's a source of stress more for women than for men and it's a fairly high one but that goes back to the finding I illustrated on the preceding slide and you can go through these further. Securing funding men found slightly more stressful than women. Oh, right only in clinical not in non-clinical.

Departmental atmosphere: Here again the pattern is probably more discernable from the slide than in any of the specific things so I'll come to a couple. Overall, you can see the departmental atmosphere in general looks pretty good and on a couple of them that are very low it's because the order of the answers are reversed. So the lower score is actually better. Nonetheless, there are patterns and I would say the gender differences are there in some areas but there are a lot where they're either reversed or fairly similar. These are the kind of findings, when you break them down into schools and schools push them down onto departments – they'll be valuable starting points for discussions in the departments about ways the departmental procedures and issues can be addressed. They're not issues which the dean can just say 'do something different' because an awful lot of these have to do with what happens

in the department on an issue by issue or case by case basis. Want me to hold there for a second?

Allen: Just one comment. The collection of issues here may be important to kind of read as a group. Some of the statements that women put a little bit higher are “My colleagues...my chair being a director creates a collegial and supportive environment, helps me to obtain the resources I need, my department or unit is a good fit for me. My department is a place where individual faculty may comfortably raise personal or family responsibilities...”

Lange: ...when scheduling department or unit obligations...And they cluster but the point I’m trying to make is those will be meaningful when they’re done unit by unit or division by division.

Susan Lozier (Chair-elect/NSOE): Is there a gender difference in retention of faculty?

Lange: Not very substantial. It’s a small one and I’m not even sure if it’s statistically significant but there is a slightly lower retention rate for women, I think.

Lozier: Slightly lower.

Lange: Slightly lower. But that can, just to be clear, that can be a function of many different things. “Do you agree that the criteria for tenure and promotion are clearly communicated?” Men, yes more than women in the non-clinical departments with regard to tenure and men, a little bit more in the clinical and in promotion on the non-clinical side again, men more than women and it reverses on the clinical side with respect to promotion.

Now I’m not exactly clear on what to do or what the significance of this issue is. I don’t know if for any instance it is financially a mask for other concerns of the tenure process with respect to women that get wound into this question as an uncertainty question or if it reflects something else. I can’t quite understand it, we hold meetings every year that lay out the criteria that all junior men and non-tenured women are invited to and they can come to multiple times. I think the criteria are fairly laid out and not in a gender-specific way so there is some process that we are not quite picking up.

Lozier: The official channels are not the only channels for communicating and oftentimes the mentoring opportunities for junior men are different than the mentoring opportunities for women.

Lange: And you think that might be it?

Lozier: I’m just offering a suggestion.

Lange: And if that’s the case, then again that’s an issue that needs to be pushed by the administration but needs to be handled at the level of the unit, because most of that mentoring goes on department by department and we have tried other schemes and they have been pretty roundly rejected. Here’s a slide on retention. In percent comparison to their male peers, Duke female non-clinical faculty showed lower likelihood of staying at Duke while Duke female clinical faculty and their male peers show similarly high likelihood of staying at Duke. And again I could go through a number of these comparisons but the point is that what I’m trying to show you is areas that highlight things that we might attend to coming out of the survey.

Voice: How many actually left?

Lange: That’s what I’m saying. The retention rates don’t look very different and so you don’t know. What this

question is really picking up is not totally clear but it is some increased anxiety, the combination of any of the things I think we can really talk about.

Jennifer Brody (African and African American Studies, Theater Studies and Women Studies, ECAC): It’s a small point but I do notice that women are listed in yellow which in the previous slide in the data the yellow was the color that signified other institutions and the men here are in blue.

Lange: You wouldn’t be in the field of Literary Studies would you? (laughter) I get it.

Allen: We took red and green out because I was meeting with a visiting faculty member who said 10% or 8% of men are red-green color blind so we had to come up with some kind of scheme and the blue and yellow were a nice contrast.

Lange: So we also have some data on satisfaction based on race. Duke non-clinical and clinical faculty on each racial and ethnic group were similarly and highly satisfied with most aspects of their professional intellectual life. Of the thirty of the thirty-two satisfaction items, Duke non-clinical and clinical racial and ethnic groups showed only a few significant differences. In comparison to their white peers, Duke Hispanic – this is where you have to start listening carefully – Duke Hispanic non-clinical faculty indicated lower satisfaction with the availability of nearby parking while Duke Asian non-clinical faculty indicated lower satisfaction with being a faculty member at Duke, the quality of graduate students, and intellectual stimulation of work. In addition, Asian non-clinical faculty indicated lower satisfaction in the quality of graduate students then did for instance their black peers. In comparison to their white peers, Duke Black clinical faculty indicated lower satisfaction with their faculty, time available for scholarly work, and intellectual stimulation of work. Also Duke Black clinical faculty indicated lower satisfaction with being a faculty member and salary than did their Hispanic peers. Yes?

Wald: Are these overall numbers here? How many people were in these groups?

Lange: I don’t have them here. Do you have these data? Do we know?

David Jamieson-Drake (Office of Institutional Research): Yes. They are in the reports. Go to the website. I’m not sure if it was in the link that was provided.

Lange: If it’s not, we’ll put it in there. Workload: of all Duke non-clinical faculty, Hispanic faculty were most likely to indicate that their workload was about right, while white faculty were least likely to indicate so. Black 53%, Asians 61%, Hispanics 75%, and Caucasians 52%. In comparison to their white and Asian peers, Duke Black and Hispanic clinical faculty appeared less likely to indicate that their overall workload was about right.

Allen: So, Peter, we do have the numbers on pages 27 and 51, the introductions to the non-clinical reports are given by gender and race.

Voice :What’s the lowest one?

Allen: The lowest is Hispanic with 20 in the non-clinical and 13 Hispanic in the clinical.

Lange: So the percentages here are susceptible to fluctuations because the base is very small. Departmental

atmosphere: in general, Duke non-clinical faculty from each racial and ethnic group viewed most aspects of their departmental atmosphere quite favorably and only two significant differences were noted. Duke Black non-clinical faculty were more likely than their white peers to agree that “I have to work harder than some of my colleagues to be perceived as a legitimate scholar” and Duke Black and Hispanic non-clinical faculty were less likely than their white and Asian peers to agree that “commitment to diversity is demonstrated.”

On the clinical side, Duke Black faculty were less likely to indicate agreement to the two statements: 1) I have a voice in decision making and 2) I am proud to tell people that I work at Duke. But again I would remind you that percentages can jump around with fairly small changes in perception which also means that work can be quite effective.

Here are some key findings on overall satisfaction on the non-clinical and clinical side by these different groups. I don't think I'm going to review these in detail. They differ by rank as you can see. In general, it's actually interesting because the full professors are most satisfied (laughter). Here you see it by rank in terms of sources of stress, I'm going to move through these because I know we have other business.

So what are our next steps? First of all, we intend to share these results in the large report and then in the unit reports with academic administration, with our colleagues and with different faculty groups and we'll take them to different faculty groups, highlight specific issues. We will share the school reports with the deans and support their efforts to discuss with their faculty and to generate action items where change and improvement are warranted based on discussions they have with their faculty. We're going to analyze the survey responses by department where possible and report those to the departments. This is a lot of work to go down the road what we've already done. And we will respond to today's discussion and other discussions to try and work out some kind of action program over the next year, we'll address various things just as we did in the last survey. Comments? Suggestions?

Questions

Patricia Linville (Fuqua): Would you be breaking it down to look at the correlations, so that if you wanted to see what connected to something that would be linked, why stress here, why this, you have the data so you would be able to do that?

Lange: Do you



think we should do that? We can do that.

Jamieson-Drake: Sure, we can easily do regressions to do those types of things but we need a research agenda.

Lange: We don't want to do it with all the data, we're not going to data mine all of the data. As the discussions go forward, questions get generated, questions like that may get generated, I can feed them back to our institutional search group and they can work on those but we can't do this as a general.

Thea Portier-Young (Divinity): One of the things you said to look sometimes more at the overall numbers than the breakdown and for the question about commitment to diversity, the response was somewhere around 3 on a 5 point scale which I thought was kind of striking and I wonder does that make that issue institutionally something more of a priority? If so many of the respondents did not feel that there was a strong commitment demonstrated.

Lange: I'll have to go back and look at that. I think we've tried and we've reported here fairly frequently on our commitment to the University and the steps that we have taken but we'll have to go back to that and if it is not being effectively communicated because we're not either communicating well or doing the right job with it, then we'll obviously have to highlight it because it is a priority institution.

Costanzo: Just a thought for 2015. I think we'd get an estimate as a baseline on general quality of life that would be apart from their job. I'm thinking a satisfaction survey, where it would be good to know whether or not you have declining problems over time in terms of satisfaction and how much that might be attributed to Duke.

Lange: If Durham's getting to be a nice place to live, is that what you're talking about?

Costanzo: Well, I don't know about Durham.

Lange: Or Chapel Hill.

Costanzo: It's not just the environment.

Lange: The restaurants, schools, things like that. That's a good point.

Jane Richardson (Biochemistry): I presume that of all of these differences would be more striking in the divisions where the departments in spite of smaller numbers, but particularly when these reports go out I presume you give people the comparison of the overall?

Lange: Yes, we will hand out the overall data then we will hand out the school reports. The thing is, it's going to take work by the faculty for us to be able to make the best use of the data from a policy point of view because there is a lot of data in there and while we as an administration can identify certain issues to know what the best approaches to them are will require discussions from the faculty which will highlight certain issues and highlight some potential solutions.

Richardson: Most of the differences are really awfully small.

Lange: In many areas and overall the data is pretty good but then there are these areas that we wanted to highlight. Thank you.

Overview of Research and Research Administration

Henriquez: Our next presentation – hopefully we'll achieve my goal of getting out of here by five – is an Overview of Research and Research Administration at Duke University which of course can be done in fifteen minutes. This will be given by Jim Siedow and Sally Kornbluth. I had a long preamble but I found it interesting that our last two presentations are given by two former chairs of Academic Council, Nancy and Jim. If anyone has not voted and is eligible to vote, please pick up a ballot.

Jim Siedow (Vice Provost for Research): Thank you, I will try and move through this fairly quickly since it was originally scheduled to take a little longer than we thought so we'll do what we can. I'm Jim Siedow, Sally



Kornbluth my counterpart in the Medical School, and basically we're going to look at four general things associated with research and research administration at Duke.

One is the recent funding trends, second is the stimulus funding that came to Duke, research administration initiatives that are taking place and make you aware of those and to talk a little bit about research compliance. All of these are major issues. What I want to show here – I'm just going to rip through these slides very quickly – is that basically if you take a look at new and competing proposals coming in at the Medical School, the yellow lines are NIH proposals and the blue lines are everything else, but notice that is the number of proposals, not dollars or anything, but you'll notice we've been fairly flat over the past several years. If you ask yourself how proposals have done, and this is in the School of Medicine relative to the awards received, it's relatively flat though I would point out that when you take a look at NIH and do the percentage of awards over proposals, we do better than the NIH average, and I guess we would expect that of Duke faculty. But nevertheless, the thing you will notice is that these graphs are all fairly stuck at the same point over the last four or five years.

One of the things you'll continue to notice is that over the course of time in recent years, if you look at the non-federal versus federal funding, the federal funding is going down and the non-federal is going up. Again there are several issues that are coming into play there. By and

large federal funding is a little bit larger but more importantly federal funding almost always comes with full indirect cost rate paid whereas non-federal funding or foundational support often comes with much lower indirect cost recovery and some with no indirect cost recovery. The net effect of that – and that indirect cost, let me remind you, really is very important to basically helping Duke support the research infrastructure, not just administration, but the operation of labs and new buildings, things of that nature, those moneys are absolutely critical. And if you take a look then the net upshot of the stagnation if you will of the number of awards, the number of proposals and the changing distribution from federal to non-federal you can see that over the last four or five years that basically our indirect cost recovery in the School of Medicine has pretty much remained flat.

If you take a look at what happens on the campus side, everything outside of Medicine you can see it's somewhat of a similar picture although there has been some increase in total proposals coming from campus in the recent years. Let me point out, I didn't on the earlier slide, that that's non-ARRA. We've broken out the ARRA because we're going to talk about the ARRA funding separately but you can see there's been a bit of an uptick in recent years in terms of proposals that hasn't necessarily reflected itself in awards where we've sort of fluctuated around 560 or thereabouts. 619 in 2009 was kind of an upward trend.

The other thing that's happened too is we've also seen that federal funding, the percentage of our funding that is federal, has gone down in recent years. It's at about 80% percent earlier in the decade and now moving closer to 70% now and that's being replaced then a little bit by industry funding and a little bit by other which is mostly foundational support. Again that comes at a lower indirect cost rate. However the one curve that might surprise you then is having said all of that, the F & A cost report have gone up and continue to go up. And in large part, I guess we have to thank our friends in Pratt where they've been getting much larger proposals in recent years and that's been one of the main drivers to help bring this up. That's also true to some extent in Arts & Sciences but nevertheless our F & A numbers are continuing to go up. And with that, I'll pass it on to Sally.

Sally Kornbluth (Vice Dean for Research): So as everybody who was partaking in the ARRA frenzy knows, we had a huge turnout in Duke in terms of ARRA funding. What you can see here is that we did extremely well. Total university: 217 million and a 181 some million of that from the School of Medicine. So we did tremendously well. I think we were number two or three in the end nationally. A lot of awards, and I have to say that we've used a lot of these ARRA indirects. There was a sort of controversy about the indirects not going really to backstop normal operations but really to improve the efficiency of research administration and to improve the infrastructure and to make really targeted investments in particular areas.

So, how have the ARRA funds been used? We, in a global sense, have developed new IT tools to support research administration. There's been a lot of money that

has had to go into support for clinical research infrastructure, equipment for research core facilities, vivarium improvements – this is just one example, things like ventilated mouse caging. The School of Medicine has some specific programs like Partnership Hires where money was put out for faculty hires sort of between departments or between departments, institutes and centers. There's a voucher program in the School of Medicine for funding of vouchers to be used at core facilities so it's sort of short proposals from faculty to get those.

One thing that will be rolling out soon this year, using ARRA funds, that has been requested for a long time is a trainee database. So for putting together training grant and so that faculty won't have to keep submitting the same data over and over again for every training grant that is submitted. Bridge funding and in the School of Medicine, and I understand that's something's coming on the campus side similarly, a sort of grant-writing assistance office where if you have a large grant someone to help put together templates and really move the grants into sort of one voice, etc. That's started on the School of Medicine side and already quite a number of proposals have rolled out using that office.

Now this is a little bit complicated because these are personnel that were supported by ARRA funding through tracking, in other words personnel that people reported were funded by the ARRA funds and this is really the number of people for any given percent effort. So you know 200 some-odd for between 0-25% effort. 132, etc. for 638 total positions. Obviously, some funds were used to pay people that otherwise would have been paid from other sources. So it's a little bit difficult to know exactly how much hiring was solely due to ARRA funding but it has been thought that there's obviously potential risk when we're facing the cliff of loss of ARRA funding. What has been done is there's a team of ARRA administrators



who've really reviewed the people who were supported at the high percentage end by ARRA funds, looking at what kind of job titles were involved, what kind of appointment types were reviewed and it was deemed that there's only about sixty-nine people who were vulnerable for layoff at the end of ARRA based on what is known thus far and basically the way that was determined was a little bit soft. It was really people who were hired into job titles and categories that seemed to be created or hired specifically be-

cause of the ARRA funding. But it's pretty soft, and I think until we really know what kind of replacement funding is coming behind, it's going to be hard to how many jobs are lost because you don't really know what the cliff looks like until you know whether people who were losing ARRA funding are going to replace them with regular grants and that's something we're going to have to just wait and see. Obviously determined a little bit by what the funding environment looks like.

Now, as Jim presented and we'll get to a little bit later, at least from the School of Medicine perspective, the flat indirects may not look like a really big change but as you'll see a little bit later our costs have gone way up, particularly in the compliance area and I'll tell you a little bit about that later. The question is what do we do if the NIH stays flat which is the majority on the medical school side of our funding or things start to get worse? Obviously we can say that we are going to reduce expenses and use reserves and really make more sort of targeted judgments about what programs should be funded, some combination of the above and obviously the best thing would be if we can find ways to increase revenue, philanthropy, and industry partnerships, finding new ways to find funding. It's interesting we've been approached recently by several large pharmaceutical companies who are interested in things like funding, partnership, post-doc programs, etc. because a lot of industry is really ramping down their R&D. Whether we can find creative ways to partner I think is going to be important in this funding environment.

Siedow: Okay, research administration initiatives, I'm sort of curious, for how many people does the term RACI resonate with? Ok, unfortunately, this has been about a five year initiative actually... (laughter)

Kornbluth: We just got a logo (laughter).

Siedow: This is [Research Administration Continuous Improvement](#) and actually honestly if you haven't been to the RACI website and obviously most of you haven't (laughter) go to that website because a lot of things have been done over the last several years with the Medical School and campus in collaboration to try, if you will, to make the research administration enterprise much more efficient than it has been.

This was in response to a Huron report that we got about six years ago and a lot of interesting improvements have been made. However that having been said, things are going to ramp up in the next two or three years and this is the Integration Initiative, [I²](#), that you see on that so it's the RACI Integration Initiative where we're basically going to start rolling out in four areas. One is [Buy @ Duke](#). Two is something called [Financial Ownership and Investment](#) which is about as opaque as the name implies.

There are going to be a number of IT projects that are basically going to help automate research administration in ways that we think will be helpful and then we're going to also have research administrative staff review changes taking place there – so that people doing research administration are basically professionally trained to do research administration and not do research administration as sort of the sideline of one of the other five things they do.

I'm going to run through these really quickly so these may not make much sense but I'll try. The objective here

is to improve service to faculty and grant administrators – areas which, in every survey that we’ve taken, have shown need of improvement. The goal is to reduce the faculty burden of research administration, streamline the administrative processes reported by Best in Class technology systems, increase accountability and transparency and as I said have a better trained staff that are more dedicated to research administration.

Buy @ Duke is rolling out as we speak. There are several pilot projects going on in pediatrics, immunology and cell biology. The goal here is to, first of all, save money through consolidating spending with preferred providers. In essence you’re going to have a card and you can go in 24-7 and purchase whatever you want to purchase and it’s helpful that one of the areas where in purchasing a lot of effort goes on in both the front end and the back end to ensure that the purchasing is compliant with federal guidelines, to ensure that you are purchasing things that you can purchase if you will. The goal here is to basically eliminate the backend, that the front-end compliance will basically tell us that this is a reasonable purchase or not. If it isn’t, it’ll get kicked out. Therefore again, take a lot of work that goes on right now, will hopefully go away.

The financial ownership and assessment: basically the goal here is we control 35,000 fund codes across the university and those codes have to get reconciled every month and that’s a big job. So the goal here is to basically try to reduce processes at the departmental level associated with reconciling these fund codes, provide more efficient focus on risk areas and not get so focused on every nickel and dime that gets spent but to find out where the problems might be and focus on those.

Increase ownership of grant funds by the individual administrators: We want to basically have the administrators that are administrating these funds have a greater ownership of those funds and just to get an environment for better accountability.

IT Projects: I’m not going to go through all of these in detail. Every time we’ve had a survey asking faculty what in terms of IT dealing with grants would you most prefer to see – what’s missing or what’s lacking? *Grant-projection tools* comes out time and time again and in fact in a large number of departments there are shadow systems that have been developed to do that very thing. Hopefully, beginning this summer where five pilots are designed to go online, we will grow forward some grant-projection tools that should be very robust.

Richardson: What’s grant projection?

Siedow: Well basically if you want to know, you’ve got a grant and you’re spending it out and you’ve six months in and say I want to know, more importantly you don’t just want to extrapolate where you are but you say, if I hire a post-doc three months from now how is that going to affect me? In any event, there’s a number of other projects that are coming including getting SPS on the web and those of you that know about SPS know that’s long overdue. In any event, a number of IT projects will be coming forward and then finally on the human resources side, we basically want to create a human resources infrastructure that basically allows research administration to become a professional path. That someone can come in at

the entry level and see a path where they could stay at Duke for forty years and see how they would work their way up in the research administrative structure. That actually hasn’t existed before. It’s in the process of being developed by the HR folks in conjunction with research administration and we think this will make for a much more professional grants and administration staff in the long run.

Kornbluth: So the last thing is research compliance and this is everybody’s favorite topic. So, we’ve really sort of reached a perfect storm where NIH is going down and administrative costs keep going up and this is what we call “quality assurance” which may be a bit of an euphemism. So, what you can see is that the cost of quality assurance has really spiked and in fact that sort of peak had to do with changes that were put into place around clinical research to really safeguard the clinical research operation and we saw a peak there which if anything is continuing to increase.

This kind of gives you an idea of where things are relative to each other and I think if you just look at the red line and yellow line you can see that our indirect cost recovery is not keeping pace with our quality assurance costs. That’s obviously a problem. Here’s where the growth came in this area. One is the research compliance office. This is really for people sort of in the clinical trials arena. This is people who do auditing of clinical trials, etc. Office of Research Integrity, in other words, misconduct. Pre-Award and Post-Award Management. Some of the information technology tools that were put into place. Human Subject to Protection Program, IRB, Animal Welfare, IACUC. The Institutional Bio-safety Office and Clinical Trials Billing and Management and much of this is really in response to federal mandate to satisfy certain areas of compliance so as is shown here, basically there are a lot of new areas of compliance being brought down on Duke: export controls, information technology security.

What’s required for clinical research oversight?

Many of you probably, well at least on the Medical School side, are familiar with the introduction of the site-based clinical research units, really to try to maintain the highest integrity and compliance in our human-subjects research that’s done here at Duke and again in clinical research. At least on the Medical School side, the problem has been really having adequate IT systems in place for the clinical research operations. And as I have said, a lot of this has come down federally and a lot of it has to do with the interpretation at the federal level of the existing regulations and what they really mean and of what kind of survival you’re going to come through with after an audit process if you don’t have certain compliance pieces in place.

There’s a lot more congressional oversight and resulting focus by OIG [Office of the Inspector General] on specific compliance areas, so that has cost money and that, as I have said, is really outpacing our indirect cost recovery, and we have to balance in and out and our arms are a little bit tied in terms of what we have to do to maintain these programs in terms of mandate. And that’s where we are. I’ll answer questions.

Questions

Warren Grill (Biomedical Engineering): I'm wondering if you add the ARRA data back in, does the line kind of continue along the same trend because if I think about a faculty member who writes grant proposals, let's say one every three months and they happen to get one for ARRA, they're not going to replace that with another one through their conventional non-stimulus mechanism. So it seems a little odd to pull that out of the pool and say oh, things are flat where if you put them in, my guess is the trend line is going to continue on as it has in the past.

Kornbluth: Well it's a little bit difficult to say because we just have no idea. You're right – I mean, obviously if you put all those dollars back in it's going to keep going up. That's just the math but the question is how many of those dollars are actually going to be replaceable? In other words even with a very high hit rate, it's not entirely that that total dollars is even going to be available to the research community so it's really difficult to make that extrapolation. But your point's well taken. I mean, there's no way...I think perhaps if you look at the trajectory though up until ARRA funding kicked, in your kind of get a sense of that because at least on the Medical School side it was flat even before ARRA came this way.

Siedow: And we didn't want the ARRA funds to be looking like they are just normal indirect costs, we wouldn't be able to put them in there, but you wouldn't want to treat them as if this was...

Grill: I understand that, and just one comment about this financial cost of compliance. I think if you plotted it on a different y axis that said "negative impact on the quality of life of faculty members" (laughter) you would have an even steeper slope than what you have shown in dollars, though I think it's not a guess that the people implementing these policies need to look at the impact on faculty and the amount of time that we have to devote to these tasks.

Kornbluth: There's no question about that, though I have to say that a large part of that cost is in things like auditing and clinical trials. I agree with you that ways to decrease the compliance burden on the day-to-day life of faculty is a priority and I think that is part of RACI. In other words trying to make a lot of the stuff that you need to do to keep the trains running, reduce that as much as possible. But the fixed cost involved in the infrastructure that you need to run some of these programs is just increasing, so again it is just a little bit misleading when you just look at the increase in costs. But you're right, it does reflect increased burden to faculty but a lot of it just looks like the machinery that you need to do this kind of work.

Siedow: Those RACI Initiatives really are designed to help reduce the burden on the faculty and the grant managers and it really would behoove you to go look at the RACI website at what has been accomplished already. A lot has been done to help reduce that burden. Maybe we're fighting when we are trying to win one thing down when another thing is going up.

Lozier: I know the reception is waiting, and I'll try to make this quick. I'm sure you know this, but it would be really helpful to know when we are looking for proposals and awards and indirect cost recovery what that trend

looks like per PI. It would be really nice to know are we more productive, are we less productive, what are the changes as a function of year, how many faculty members there are on the clinical side and non-clinical side?

Siedow: On the campus side, there wasn't a lot of growth associated with the time period that we were talking about.

Lozier: But you could look at that per PI and could also look at inflation in adjusted dollars. So we could look at that. That'd be helpful.

Kornbluth: What we've seen, a lot of the impact on the medical school side has been the loss of some very large projects so I don't think that if you analyze the number of ROIs per faculty, etc. it hasn't really changed that much but you get a disproportionate impact of losing, for instance, very large program project grants or collaborative grants of other sorts and I think that is the major hit on that side.

Richardson: So you've already asked one of my questions about thinking about the number of faculty being flat and we're not going to write more proposals per year, hopefully, but one other minor comment is that there are some trends on the compliance side that truly are stupid. The fact that we have a grant for instance with computer methods development in the title and every year we have to go through the cash report some of these things, and that's not mandated by NIH, it's mandated by Duke. So, if we find more of those things maybe it would help a little bit.

Siedow: Is this a purchasing of computers off the grant, or would you say have to fill out a form?

Richardson: We have to fill out a form every year to say this is not office equipment.

Siedow: Right, okay, that's a federal compliance.

Richardson: There's nowhere in Circular 21 which is always what we had pointed to. It isn't in there.

Siedow: I think I've been down this road with you, haven't I?

Richardson: Yes (laughter).

Siedow: It doesn't say computers specifically but the implications...

Richardson: But there are at least some ways of doing it and saying on this grant you have to have them.

Siedow: We're standing in between these folks and the wine. I'm happy to talk to you about that.

Henriquez: A couple orders of business before we leave. We now must go into Executive Session because we are now to discuss honorary degrees. Everyone who is here who is not a faculty member or member of Academic Council must leave. There's a good reason for leaving, you have wine on the other side of the doors.

[EXECUTIVE SESSION]

Respectfully submitted,

John Staddon
Faculty Secretary, May 5, 2011