

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Academic Council

Thursday, May 7, 2015

Joshua Socolar (Physics/ Chair, Academic Council): Welcome, everyone, to our last Academic Council meeting of the academic year. This year we have furthered the academic mission of this academic institution through our consideration of its academic affairs (laughter), ranging from academic freedom in Kunshan to academic integrity and academic standards in Durham. I am happy to report that our efforts have not been academic (laughter). Actually, I am even happier to report that they have been academic, but not in the derogatory sense of the term. I will have a few more words to say at the end of the meeting, but we have a lot to do today that I take to be more important than the obligatory annual remarks from the Chair. The first item is that our President would like to say a few words.

Richard Brodhead (President): I was permitted to say a few words by Josh fully on the condition that I not use more than about 11 words (laughter). So, I will hasten. We are all mindful of the fact that this is Josh's last meeting as the head of the Academic Council. On behalf of the Provost and myself I would like to express our extreme gratitude. You did not pick and choose; you didn't decide what was important and what was unimportant. If a faculty member was

interested in it, it was worth your while. You brought it forward for deliberation. We worked through a 1000 things, from questions of endowment divestments, through your trip to China -- you didn't see that coming did you?? (laughter) To all the important work we have today, I would just say it has been a pleasure to work with you and I think every member of this faculty is grateful for the way you have upheld the traditions of faculty consultation in the university. Thank you, Josh. (applause)

Socolar: Thank you. I have a couple of announcements. The first announcement is about the salary equity report delivered at our last meeting by the Academic Council's Faculty Compensation Committee. I received several inquiries from faculty asking for information that was not explicitly presented at the meeting. ECAC has asked the FCC to provide a full description of the statistical model employed in the analysis, along with the regression coefficients for all of the various factors used to make the statistical predictions of salaries. I received the FCC's response this morning, and it is now posted on the Council website. You're welcome to take a look at it. Second, I hope you all had a chance to read the reports from the chairs of APC, UPC, GPC, and Athletic Council, as well as

the response of APC chair Ed Balleisen to a question raised by a Council member. There have been no requests for further discussion of these reports, so I just want to officially note that they have been received, and thank the chairs of these committees – Ed, Peter Feaver, Susan Alberts, and Jim Coleman --for their excellent work this year. Next, it is my pleasure to announce the results of the recent election for the Executive Committee of the Academic Council. The new members will be: Trina Jones, Law School, Emily Klein, Nicholas School of the Environment, and Josh Sosin, Classical Studies & History (applause). Many thanks to all of the candidates. I also want to thank the members of ECAC who are completing their terms this June. Sara Beale, Claudia Gunsch, and Don Taylor have done a terrific job of representing a broad array of faculty interests, and we have all benefited from their interest in governance and their good judgment (applause). And while we are at it, let me thank those Council members whose terms end at the close of this meeting. Please tell all your colleagues what a wonderful experience it has been and urge them to opt in for election next year and re-up yourselves as well.

APPROVAL OF APRIL MEETING MINUTES

Socolar: May I now have a motion to approve the minutes from the April 16th Council meeting?

(Minutes approved by voice vote without dissent)

APPROVAL OF EARNED DEGREES

Socolar: Graduation is coming up and I’m sure the graduating students would

appreciate getting their official degrees (laughter). Let’s do our part. For those of you who are not attending the commencement ceremony on Sunday, here is your chance to sit back and let the ritual draw your attention to its purpose. In accordance with the University Bylaws, I will now call on representatives from the various schools and Trinity College for recommendations of approved candidates for various degrees. These lists will be forwarded by the Provost for approval by the Board of Trustees at their meeting tomorrow.

Graduate School

Dean Paula D. McClain

Doctor of Philosophy	191
Doctor of Philosophy in German Studies	1
Master of Arts	151
Master of Arts in German Studies	1
Master of Science	132
Master of Fine Arts	13
Master of Arts in Teaching	1

School of Medicine

Dean Nancy C. Andrews

Doctor of Medicine	89
Doctor of Physical Therapy	61
Master of Biostatistics	16
Master of Health Sciences	92
Master of Health Sciences in Clinical Research	9

School of Law

Dean David F. Levi

Doctor of Juridical Sciences	3
Juris Doctor	202
Master of Laws	95
Master of Laws, Law and Entrepreneurship	16
Master of Laws, International and Comparative Law	22

Divinity School

Dean Richard B. Hays

Doctor of Ministry	3
Doctor of Theology	5
Master of Divinity	123
Master of Theology	3
Master of Theological Studies	21
Master of Arts in Christian Practice	1
Master of Arts in Christian Studies	11

School of Nursing

Dean Marion E. Broome

Doctor of Nursing Practice	35
Master of Science in Nursing	87
Bachelor of Science in Nursing	63

Fuqua School of Business

Dean William F. Boulding

Master of Business Administration	461
Master of Management Studies	143
(MMS: Duke Kunshan University - 32 of total 143)	
(MMS: Foundations of Business - 111 of total 143)	

Nicholas School of the Environment

Dean Alan R. Townsend

Master of Environmental Management	151
Master of Forestry	1

Sanford School of Public Policy

Dean Kelly D. Brownell

Master of International Development Policy	25
Master of Public Policy	58

Pratt School of Engineering

Dean Thomas Katsouleas

Master of Engineering	18
-----------------------	----

Master of Engineering Management	60
Bachelor of Science in Engineering	285

Trinity College of Arts and Sciences

Dean Laurie L. Patton

Bachelor of Arts	682
Bachelor of Science	598

TOTAL 3929

Socolar: Thank you and congratulations to our graduates.

VOTE ON HONORARY DEGREES FOR 2016

Socolar: I will now call our meeting into Executive Session for our next agenda item. All those who are not members of the faculty, I must ask you to leave our meeting for a few minutes.

(This portion of the meeting conducted in Executive Session for the purpose of approving honorary degrees to be awarded in May 2016)

VOTE ON THE PROPOSAL FOR A MASTER'S DEGREE IN ANALYTICAL POLITICAL ECONOMY

Socolar: We will now complete our consideration of the proposal to create a new Master of Arts degree in Analytical Political Economy, presented at our April meeting. ECAC requested some clarifications of points raised by Council members after the meeting, and Professors Becker and Beramendi provided written responses that were made available to all Council members earlier this week. Pablo and Charlie are here to answer any other questions before we proceed to our vote. Are there

any questions or comments? In keeping with the practice we established earlier this year, the vote to approve a new program will be done by paper ballot. Council members, for the Academic Year 2014-15 only, please raise your hand so that you can receive a ballot. After voting, please pass them to the end of the aisle to be collected and counted by our colleagues Josh Sosin and Julie Edell. I'll announce the result later in our meeting.

FACULTY SATISFACTION SURVEY PRELIMINARY RESULTS

Socolar: I now call Nancy Allen, our Vice Provost for Faculty Diversity and Faculty Development, to present results of the faculty satisfaction survey conducted earlier this year. The full report is not yet complete because comparison data from other universities is not yet available. Nevertheless, there are significant findings worth noting now. Given our time constraints, I have asked Nancy to be brief. Though the report contains information that surely demands extended discussion, we have only 20 minutes to devote to it at this meeting.

Nancy Allen (Vice Provost for Faculty Diversity and Faculty Development): Thank you Josh and thank you all for being here and hopefully for reading the report beforehand or at some point during your next few weeks. It does have some very interesting aspects to it. Just a little bit of history going back to 2003: When I was chair of Academic Council, Provost Peter Lange came to the Council with the 2003 Faculty Diversity Initiative. He had a 10-point plan which we had followed up until this point and doing periodic climate surveys was one of the points for the procedure. In 2005 the first survey came out and that was developed

by the Faculty Diversity Standing Committee chaired by Professor April Brown in Pratt. It was based on prior MIT and Stanford surveys. Our 2010 and 2015 surveys included core questions that were developed with our Institutional Research team. David Jamieson-Drake is here with us today. Those core questions were endorsed by the AAU Data Exchange and our COFHE peers (Consortium on Financing Higher Education). We also have added Duke-specific questions to each of the last two surveys. I want to thank the Provost for support and leadership. I want to thank the 1,886 Duke faculty members who responded to the survey, I'll show you more about that in a minute, in whose honor we donated \$1900. There were 14 people missing but we rounded it up to \$1900 (laughter) to the Doing Good in the Neighborhood general fund. I want to thank David and his shop, Jiali Luo, who can't be with us today because he's on his way to China, but he did a yeoman's job putting all this data and reports together and to Pat Hull who read all of your write-in comments, some of you were very prolific (laughter). I also want to thank the faculty survey working group who met over the last couple of months to review the data that we have so far. That included David's group, and Emily Klein who also served on the Diversity Task Force, Ben Reese, Jackie Looney, Judy Seidenstein, Ann Brown, Cathleen Colon-Emeric. Here's a fun slide. This is the survey responses by date. You see here where Sally and Dean Andrews sent out the survey and it had the largest group of responses. I think it was 446. Then the three reminders, first, second, and third, and Josh's message to everyone garnered the second-highest peak day. I tried to find the snow day when none of us had power but it looks like somebody found a way to answer it

on that day (laughter). Here are the responses by division and school. You see the breakdown for Humanities, Natural Sciences and Social Sciences at the top. Natural Sciences won that competition. All of the units in the darker gray are called Non-Clinical. We had two versions of the survey, Non-Clinical and Clinical and you can see the response rates here. Nicholas had the highest at 75%, Clinical Sciences had the lowest at 48% but of course the highest numbers because that's the largest group of faculty. I do want to also point out that the response rate this year of 56% overall was 5% higher than in 2010. So people haven't gotten totally tired of doing surveys and getting input. So today we have time for just a few teasers, a few highlights and lowlights as we call them, areas of continued or new concern. And I want to interest you in learning more about the climate in your own units once the school-related reports and individual reports and even some departmental reports are available later in the summer or early fall. That will be a place where all of you can engage with your dean and key faculty and see where action items need to be addressed. The preliminary report is available as a link to today's agenda. The first section is for all faculty and the two appendices are for Non-Clinical and Clinical results. The key findings are addressed overall, so all faculty, and then by gender, race, ethnicity, and rank. We won't talk too much about rank today. There's also trend analysis available because we've given the survey twice before. The questions did shift and change some in 2010 so we don't have as many comparisons for 2005 but we have some interesting ones. And then there are the free text responses. Today we will particularly look at just two of the areas of questions: the satisfaction and

departmental atmosphere because those dovetailed the most with the Diversity Task Force which you'll be hearing about next. But there are also sections on workload, mentoring, promotion and tenure, hiring, retention, and life outside the institution if there is that (laughter). I don't know, Dick, Sally, is there life outside the institution? (laughter) Not that you've seen, Sally? (laughter) Okay, that's a given. So Duke's faculty overall in 2015 indicated similarly high levels of satisfaction of being a faculty member at Duke as in prior survey years, somewhat higher levels of satisfaction with resources for their research and scholarship than in 2005, and somewhat lower levels of satisfaction with resources for teaching than in 2010. That will need to be delved into further by unit. Non-Clinical faculty were just as satisfied in 2015 as they were in 2005 if you look overall. High levels of being a faculty member at Duke, roughly 81% are somewhat or very satisfied. However, I have my theories about this. Clinical faculty indicated lower satisfaction with being a faculty member in 2015 at 70%, which is still high, than in 2010 or 2005 when it was closer to 77%. I think some of that has to do with Epic, Maestro Care, (laughter) the computer, all that has come along with us learning how to get along with the electronic medical record. So just to put Non-Clinical satisfaction compared with Clinical, there are 26 areas addressed and 19 of the 26 show that Non-Clinical faculty had higher satisfaction in the areas that I put up here. I'll just highlight being a faculty member, resources for research and teaching, salary, startup funds, benefits. You can look on the right side of that and see time for scholarly work, intellectual stimulation in work, even office space and library resources. Tallman, it doesn't

mention parking here but there are a few places where that comes up. If we looked at the question of, would you come back to Duke, or would you come to Duke if you had to do all over again, 74% of Non-Clinical and 63% of Clinical faculty said they would do it all over again. There are a few slides on gender issues because there are still issues related to gender. Duke Non-Clinical women in 2015 were less likely to agree to 13 positive statements than Non-Clinical men. Highlighted in blue on this slide and the next slide are the ones that are more than 10% different. You can see the other percentages there for some of the concerns. My colleagues value my research and scholarship got 58% of women versus 72% of men. My department is a place where individual faculty may comfortably raise personal and/ or family responsibility: 62% to 75%. I feel that the climate and opportunities for female faculty in my department are at least as good as those for male faculty: again 54% to 72%. I feel the climate and opportunities for minority faculty in my department are at least as good as those for non-minority: 49% versus 69%. Good to know that the academic leadership is effective, there's a smaller difference but still a difference. And commitment to diversity is demonstrated: 60% to 77%. In addition, both Non-Clinical and Clinical women were more likely than men to agree to three negatively worded statements: I feel excluded from an informal network in my department, the percentages are shown there. It's highest in Non-Clinical: 36% versus 23%. I have to work harder than some of my colleagues to be perceived as a legitimate scholar: Non-Clinical 44% versus 26% and Clinical 38% versus 26%. Women faculty with family responsibilities are viewed or treated

differently than men with those responsibilities: 30% versus 15% Non-Clinical and 46% versus 23% in Clinical. We asked the question: Are you likely to leave in the next 5 years? Breaking that down by gender, 28% of Non-Clinical women say they're thinking about it, 23% of men, Clinical is higher at 38% and 31%. Both Non-Clinical and Clinical women were more likely than men to cite certain reasons for leaving: improving prospects for tenure, reducing stress, addressing childcare related issues. In addition, Non-Clinical women also noted finding a more supportive environment, handling family-related issues, and retirement. There are finally enough women to retire! (Laughter) We'll look at a few issues related to race and ethnicity. Again, of those same 26 satisfaction items, Non-Clinical Black faculty compared with White faculty in 2015 indicated lower satisfaction in 12 areas though those are not statistically significant. Being a faculty member, resources for teaching, salary, startup funds, benefits, intellectual stimulation, office space, lab research space. There was higher satisfaction in three areas: teaching responsibilities, access to teaching assistants, and computing support staff. Also for Non-Clinical Hispanic faculty compared with White faculty of which there are smaller numbers for Hispanic faculty in the survey, similarly high or higher satisfaction in 12 areas, higher satisfaction in 6 areas including startup funds, teaching responsibilities, quality of undergrads and graduate students, opportunities to collaborate with undergrads, and classroom space. But, lower satisfaction in 8 areas including being a faculty member, resources for research scholarship, resources for teaching, securing grants, intellectual stimulation, nearby parking, quality of

dining options, and computing resources. With Asian faculty, there was lower satisfaction noted in 18 of the 26 areas and I've listed those here. Parking is on that list too but these are all important things to look at in your own schools and units and departments when you have the full report.

Speaker: Did you include the Clinical in these last two slides?

Allen: I didn't because we are limited in time. That is in the report and I'd be glad to direct you to that. In terms of departmental atmosphere for race/ethnicity, a decreasingly smaller proportion of Non-Clinical Black faculty indicated agreement to the statement: My colleagues value my research or scholarship. In 2005 that was 80% and it has gone down to 52% in 2015. An increasingly larger portion of Non-Clinical Black faculty agree that I have to work harder than some of my colleagues to be perceived as a legitimate scholar. In 2005 that was 45% and it has gone up to 58%. Looking at the top comment or statement for Hispanic faculty, also there was a lower percentage of agreement in 2015 than 2005. Going down from 71% to 54%. Then Clinical Black faculty in 2015 were more likely than those who took the survey in 2010 to agree with 10 positive statements: My colleagues value my research and scholarship, my chair/ dean/ director creates a collegial and supportive environment, I have a voice in decision making that affects the direction of the department, I can navigate unwritten rules concerning how one is to conduct oneself as a faculty member, my department is a good fit for me, I'm proud to tell people I work at Duke. All of those have gone up in a 5-year time. On a negative note, however, Clinical Black

faculty in 2015 were more likely to agree with one of the negatively-worded statements: I feel excluded from the informal network and that changed from 43% to 23%. When we looked at the data related to race/ ethnicity for those planning to leave in five years, the main reasons were finding a more supportive environment, enhancing careers in other ways, increasing time for research, and retirement. I highlighted in each row the highest percentage. So retirement is a fairly big one there for White faculty. And then, just because we don't have it yet in the report but it is an interest for the Diversity Task Force, we looked at sexual orientation. We did not have this question on the 2005 so we can only compare 2010 and 2015. 75% of all respondents self-identified for sexual orientation this go-around. Because of low numbers, however, for survey purposes we grouped them into a non-heterosexual category for the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer results. So small increases in numbers since 2010 but a total of 59 individuals responded to the survey. So there will be some information further that we can gain. When looking at this from a high level, the non-heterosexual faculty in 2015 were less likely than heterosexual faculty to agree that they were satisfied with committee and administrative responsibilities, you don't know if that's too much or too little, you can guess (laughter). Office space, opportunities to collaborate with undergraduates and research, time available for scholarly work. They were less likely than heterosexual faculty to agree to positively worded statements: I have a voice in decision making, I have enough time to manage both responsibilities at work and outside the institution, my colleagues value my research, my department is a place where

individual faculty can raise family or other concerns, my workload is the same as other faculty of my rank in my department or unit. Non-heterosexual faculty were more likely than heterosexual faculty to agree to these three negatively worded statements: I feel excluded from an informal network, I have to work harder than some of my colleagues to be respected, I would be happier at an institution with less stress. Pat Hull is in the back there, who did all that bedtime reading, organized nicely the text responses to open ended questions into several themes. We'll be doing more of this throughout the report that you have available; there are some comments in the footnotes about the text responses. One big thing that came up is that faculty want to feel like all aspects of their work are valued and rewarded: teaching, research, service, and collaboration. Another theme is that recent reductions in research funding sources has made it harder for faculty in general and prompted some recommendations that the institution look at new models for financial support. A third theme was about training and mentoring, suggesting not just to help new faculty but also department chairs, other leaders, and refreshing teaching skills and teaching about implicit bias in hiring in promotion practices. Lastly faculty work-life satisfaction is affected significantly by a toxic environment described by some individuals as having one or more faculty members openly hostile to others, whether it's department meetings or in the hall or wherever. That's especially difficult in small departments or units. Also, work-life is affected when department chairs are ineffective so those of you like Dan who herds department chairs might want to make sure they're doing what they need

to do without being ineffective (laughter). It's a big job. Future work: we'll distribute school and division and department reports when numbers are sufficient later this summer or early fall. David and Jiali and Pat will be incorporating the AAU peer data for comparison that will also show up in the final report. Last time we had peers of Harvard, MIT, Northwestern and Stanford. I don't yet know who our peers will be this go-around but that will help us benchmark because if all of our women faculty in one unit are unhappy and that's the same at four other institutions, that tells us something, that we still need to do better, but at least you know that everyone else is working on the same sets of challenges. We'll be returning to Academic Council to present a final report during the next Academic Council year. So Nan, you can put that on your list of items somewhere in the late fall/ early spring. Thank you. I have a couple other teaser slides or one pretty slide that we can go for but I know you have to move on.

Socolar: Let me suggest that because so many of the issues that are raised by the satisfaction survey are related to the next report that we're going to hear about diversity and inclusion, let's hold questions about those aspects of the report until after we've heard the next presentation. But we have a minute or two if there are questions for Nancy about other aspects of the satisfaction survey.

Karla Holloway (English): I see, not in the report that you've given but in the depths of the report you made available to us, data from 2005 that suggests a very sharp decline in faculty satisfaction. If you go back and look at the trends, say, for minority faculty satisfaction, stuff has been happening since 2005. I know you

said that there will be a report at the end of the year. What I would like to know is what is the Provost's office, what have the deans been doing, knowing this trend has happened, at least from 2005 to the 2010 report and now repeated in the 2015 report. What's been going on administratively to address the decline in faculty satisfaction?

Allen: I think we've worked on that on a number of fronts over the years...

Holloway: But it's going down.

Allen: I think we have to delve into that further to give you a full answer. To some extent the Task Force findings will be helpful.

Holloway: Could I just add as a footnote: When it says in the report, on the other hand, the dean is effective but chairs of departments are not, by the time faculty have to get to a dean to express dissatisfaction that might not be a positive finding. That might actually be, I'm exhausted and let me take this to the dean. So although even in your report it's saying that administratively there might have been some good comments, you might read that differently to say, it takes an administrator to fix something going on in the department. This report was stunning to me and extraordinarily disappointing. I don't know anything going on in Arts & Sciences being addressed so I don't see how this has been happening for ten years.

Sally Kornbluth (Provost): Karla, I think this raises the general issue with this kind of data to say, obviously I can't speak to history here so much as going forward. I read the whole thing yesterday and your head could explode. It's a mass of data on

so many different things. And in a little bit I think we'll be throwing some of these things at the Diversity Task Force but I'm trying to think about how to turn this into actionable items. I'll just give an example. Some of the issues will be teased out of the Diversity Task Force report and we'll talk about recommendations on that. But I think about things like the comment on toxic environments, for instance. I know from my experience in the Medical School and I talked to some of the folks about this. There has been an establishment of a Professionalism Council where the notion of people treating each other unprofessionally can be discussed and faculty members have been brought in, not to say you've done something terrible, you're going to be fired, but that these kinds of behaviors should not be part of our environment. I think there are mechanisms to address some of these things. You've got two different categories. You've got issues that are very broad, whether they be gender issues or race issues that we need to discuss more in the next part about how you address them. But then there are common concerns or complaints that are showing up across all groups. I think the only way to deal with this is going to be to analyze those in those two different dimensions and figure out, what are the common concerns for everyone that we have to think about fixing across the university? And what are the concerns that, although they're common and important to everyone, we have to tease out as cross cutting issues. And then we can tackle them one at a time. If you just look at this whole report as a mass, there will be inaction because it's just immobilizing to see what appears to be at times almost self-contradictory data. I think it's going to take the summer at least to drill down

on what are the salient issues to even be able to address them in a pointed manner.

Holloway: I totally agree with you, Sally. One of the things that I'm concerned about is that it seems as if there's been room for action and we get reports but not accompanying it any form that would lead to anything whatsoever. I want to stress that, let's not let five more years and let another decline happen before we do something.

Kornbluth: I think that's fair. And I think it's fair to say, when Josh had asked me, can I preview the response in advance on the Diversity Task Force report? Because it's sort of in response to this. I'll address both at the same time.

RESULTS OF THE VOTE ON THE NEW MASTERS DEGREE

Socolar: Thanks very much, Nancy. Remember, there is more to come when the comparisons to other schools can be done in the fall. Before we move on I have the results of the vote. We have a new Master's program. There were 41 votes in favor, 11 against, and 9 abstentions. So congratulations to Charlie and Pablo and we look forward to hearing how the program succeeds when it starts a year from September.

AC DIVERSITY TASK FORCE REPORT

Socolar: We now have some time to consider the report from the Academic Council Diversity Task Force. The co-chairs are Nan Jokerst, the J. A. Jones Distinguished Professor of Electrical and Computer Engineering and Trina Jones, Professor of Law. I could go on and on about the tremendous effort that Trina and Nan have contributed to this Task

Force, and about the dedication of the DTF steering committee and the many faculty who worked with them on the various subcommittees. The total time devoted to this report should be measured in FTE's rather than person-hours (laughter). As a member of the Task Force myself, I hope and expect that the results will carry significant weight, both with the administration and with the faculty at large. I will remind you, though, that this is a report commissioned by the Academic Council, and the discussion today is an important part of the process that will ultimately determine its impact. Before turning it over to Nan and Trina, let me say a bit more about Council's role here. With the submission of this report, the work of the DTF is done, and the responsibility for supporting its conclusions (or not) lies with the Council itself. Given our time constraints today and the fact that all of the supporting documents are not yet available for your scrutiny, ECAC has determined that it would not be reasonable to ask for a formal resolution to approve the report's recommendations. We expect that the Council will deliberate further on these issues next year. Now we know that there are already efforts underway in the Provost's office and elsewhere that may address some of the issues raised in the report, and we want to be sure that faculty input is sought and provided at every step. Before we leave today, we will be passing (I hope) our standard resolution delegating to ECAC the authority to serve in a consultative role to the administration over the summer. We expect that Provost Kornbluth will indeed consult with ECAC about how to work with the DTF report, and she has indicated to me that this is consistent with her own expectations. Let's now allow Trina and Nan to present the

report, after which I will open the floor for comments.

Nan Jokerst (Electrical and Computer Engineering): Thank you for attending the Academic Council meeting today and listening to our Diversity Task Force report. Last spring you authorized this Task Force and you asked us to articulate a vision, examine our current position, and recommend actions that will move us forward for a more diverse and inclusive faculty. Trina and I, as co-chairs of the committee, generated a steering committee that we felt was representative of the diverse faculty, both demographically and we tried to represent each school. I'm sorry to say that we had two of our members depart Duke while we were in the process of creating the report, but I must say the steering committee worked very hard and this report represents the efforts of the steering committee. We had a large number of subcommittee members who worked very diligently and very hard on this report and we definitely want to thank them for their inputs that are reflected in the report.

Trina Jones (Law School): So what exactly did the DTF do over the last 14 months? We looked at history regarding diversity and inclusion at Duke University. We also engaged in review of scholarly arguments and empirical research concerning the value of diversity. We looked at best practices that have been employed here at Duke as well as elsewhere to promote diversity. We engaged in data collection. We sought input from the Duke community through our town halls, through our website, through emails, small group gatherings, one on one interactions, and some of you even sent letters to us in your individual

capacities as well as on behalf of subgroups in the faculty. We looked at existing mechanisms for advancing diversity and inclusion at Duke. We talked to over 28 university administrators and all the deans, including personnel from the Office for Institutional Equity, the Vice Provost for Faculty Diversity and Development, the Ombuds, and others. We appreciated the valuable feedback that we received from those individuals. We looked at Duke demographic faculty information and prepared that information to some of our peer institutions. We also looked at populations that are served by the Duke faculty including our students and patients. We synthesized all this information and today we are presenting our recommendations. Know that the recommendations arose from the collective efforts of the entire DTF as well as insights from faculty members and administrators. The recommendations represent the consensus of the steering committee. We thought it might be helpful to share some of our general conclusions before going into greater detail. First: diversity and inclusion are important to Duke's mission regarding research, teaching, and service. Second: while understandings of diversity are continuing to expand, race, gender, ethnicity, and sexual identity diversity must continue to be priorities for Duke. Third: Existing mechanisms to secure and maintain a diverse and inclusive environment should be strengthened. Fourth: we are all responsible, to paraphrase President Brodhead, for the Duke that we are and the Duke that we create. This means that all of us, faculty, administrators, must work together to achieve greater diversity and inclusion. Looking at Duke's history regarding diversity and inclusion, there have been a

number of initiatives in recent decades to increase the diversity of the faculty. Most of these initiatives have focused on race and gender. That is, until 2003 when the faculty diversity initiative began. At that time, our understanding of diversity was broadened to include a wider range of cultural, ethnic, racial, and religious groups as well as underrepresented groups like Latinas and women in science. Importantly, at the time the faculty diversity initiative began, then-Provost Lange stated explicitly that this broader focus should not be read to signal reduced attention to our concern about race and gender. The DTF recommends that the University continue to prioritize race and gender. If you look at the demographic information, while Duke has made some progress with regards to women and people of color, Duke is still not where it might want to be with regards to these groups. The DTF also recommends that we prioritize sexual orientation and gender identity. While keeping the focus on race and gender and sexual identity, there are other factors that contribute to a diverse community including intellectual diversity, of which political ideology and religious tradition are important proxies. In an increasingly global community, Duke can ill afford to be parochial. Therefore, we need scholars in the classroom and engaged in teaching who bring non-US based perspectives to Duke. This is increasingly important as we grapple with questions that have global dimensions. Age, ability, and socio-economic status are other factors that may lead to a more diverse community. The DTF did not specifically examine these three variables but we suggest that the university continue to be mindful of them. Inclusion: while increasing the number of diverse faculty is enormously important, we must ensure that when

faculty arrive at Duke, they are equipped to thrive here. Too often faculty from underrepresented groups report feeling undervalued and excluded from important social and professional networks throughout the university as Nancy's data just showed. To address these challenges and other challenges, the DTF recommends that we focus on creating a culture of inclusion at Duke. What we mean by this is that we should aspire to create an environment that positively recognizes the value of different individuals, environments which treat members of underrepresented groups as essential, constitutive members of the Duke faculty. Creating a culture of inclusion involves providing means for connecting members of underrepresented groups with other individuals within their demographic group. It involves improving mechanisms for addressing implicit as well as explicit bias and it involves ensuring that there is support for the professional advancement of all faculty and especially faculty in underrepresented groups who may feel especially isolated. We also looked at the value of diversity so we've been quite busy. For some people, diversity is an inherent value. Exposure to difference augments understanding of self, of others, and of our shared bonds of humanity. Exposure to individuals from different backgrounds and experiences also has the potential to undermine those ways of thinking that have led to exclusionary practices in the past. We also looked at empirical studies regarding the value of diversity. Those studies show that a more diverse faculty promotes positive educational outcomes not only for underrepresented students but for majority students. A more diverse faculty also leads to innovation and scholarship, better recruitment outcomes, a healthier

community, among other things. The research also shows that there are some challenges associated with more heterogeneous communities. The research shows that these challenges can be minimized through effective leadership at all levels and the development of a positive organizational structure.

Jokerst: We also looked at some data. Let's take a look at how Duke has changed as a faculty over the past ten years. In the past ten years, the faculty has increased by 32%. The tenure and tenure-track faculty has increased by 11% and the other regular rank faculty has increased by 67%. So the red bar here is the other regular rank faculty and here we have full professors, associate professors, and assistant professors. Now let's look at some demographic data associated with the last ten years and as Nancy indicated in her previous talk, it's from the American Association of University Data Exchange, the AAUDE, comparative institutions that we compare ourselves to. Let's look at women first. Our regular rank faculty increased from 30% to 36% in the last ten years, our tenure track from 23% to 28% and our other regular rank from 41% to 46%. When we look at our AAUDE top 20 schools, AAUDE has a large number of schools and we said, let's look at the top 20 to compare to Duke. Duke is shown in the blue for female faculty and our top 20 AAUDE peers are shown in red. Across all ranks, Duke has a lower percentage of female faculty than the top 20 AAUDE schools. Not surprisingly, the percentage of female faculty decreases with increasing rank and interestingly our Duke female faculty have a lower percentage of tenure track to regular rank faculty ratio than our male colleagues. 40% versus 57%. Let's look at

minority faculty. In the past ten years we've had some small gains in our Black and Hispanic faculty. Our tenure track to regular rank ratios are in the order of 50% to 53% for these minority groups. When we look at the AAUDE comparative data, once again since the AAUDE top 20 shown in red and Duke Blue is for Duke, we see that Duke is within about plus or minus 2% for both Black faculty and Hispanic faculty but the percentages and the numbers at both Duke and our AAUDE colleague schools are very low. Our Hispanic faculty are uniformly lower than our AAUDE peers and the results are a little more mixed for our Black faculty. The bottom line here is to underscore the low numbers and low percentages at all of these institutions. We also would like to talk about individual school reports. So we took a look at Duke broadly, we took a look at Duke Non-Clinical and Clinical, and we've also gone down to the school and department level for individual reports. These reports are not posted on the Academic Council website because, frankly, it's uneven. Diversity is uneven across Duke so looking down at the school and department level gave us a lot of information about where we have real successes and where we need a little bit more work. In these individual school reports, we have our Duke ten year comparison data, we have 2010 satisfaction survey results, and in some cases we have pipeline data. For example, the National Science Foundation has PhD graduation rates on an individual department basis for many of the sciences. And finally, as Trina said earlier, we have student, patient, and population demographics we can use as a customer base. One question is, what do we do? So many of the recommendations arose from our committee that looked at best practices. We used many sources, both

internal and external to Duke. We looked at practices at leading institutions and at Duke, scholarly literature, and also there are many organizations that really focus on diversity and inclusion and we looked at best practices from those institutions as well. There are a number of key areas that we have identified that we can apply best practices to in order to increase our diversity and make this a more inclusive organization for all of our faculty.

Jones: And now for the recommendations. We need a drum roll or something (laughter). There are eight recommendations. We're not going to go through the detail of all of the recommendations today. We'll just highlight a couple of key points. Before we proceed with this discussion of recommendations, we'd like to underscore, to emphasize, some of the key principles that will be involved in the implementation of the recommendations and also just for your understanding of the recommendations. Those key concepts are collaboration, partnership, transparency, responsibility, and trust. We hope that we can all collectively buy into these values. Recommendation one relates to vision and leadership. Based upon our review of best practices and our conversations with many of you, we have learned that effective leadership is critical to achieving greater diversity and inclusion. What do we mean by engaged leadership? We mean leadership at all levels that is visible, vocal, and persistently engaged in the pursuit of diversity and inclusion. We looked through many of Duke's foundational documents for a statement that exemplifies Duke's commitment to diversity and inclusion. While we found dispersed references to diversity and inclusion, we found no university-wide

statement about diversity and inclusion. Therefore, we suggest this position statement as a beginning for a conversation about the development of a university wide position statement. There are two key components to this statement. One, notice that it focuses both on creating a climate or culture of inclusion and it also focuses on achieving greater numbers of diverse faculty members. The second key component is that it's adapted from the recent words of our Provost and President. The second recommendation relates to structural and function changes that we are recommending. These changes are designed to strengthen mechanisms for sustained oversight of diversity and inclusion, to improve communications in the sharing of information across various entities at Duke, to develop effective resources for faculty-oriented concerns about diversity, and, of course, always, to greater empower you, the faculty. Our first recommendation relates to the present position of Vice Provost for Faculty Diversity and Development, which we recommend renaming as the Vice Provost for Faculty Diversity and Inclusion to emphasize the key function of this position. This position would have jurisdiction over two broad categories of issues. One, the development, implementation, and monitoring of university-wide diversity and inclusion efforts and strategies. Two, supervision over cases involving faculty concerns of harassment, bias, and discrimination. Because one person cannot possibly monitor the wide range of work that needs to be done with regards to diversity and inclusion, the DTF recommends the creation of an Office for Faculty Diversity and Inclusion, which would have appropriate administrative personnel. We also recommend, at the school, division,

and department level, the creation of faculty diversity standing committees. These committees would ensure that there is faculty leadership and monitoring of diversity efforts at the unit level and also try to make sure that there is continuous sharing of information between the schools among their various committees. We anticipate that the FDSCs would work closely with the Office for Faculty Diversity and Inclusion in developing and monitoring diversity efforts throughout the university and in the specific schools. We anticipate that the FDSCs would work closely with the deans and chairs in various schools and departments to develop unit-specific diversity plans which Nan will discuss in greater detail. The DTF looked at other administrative structures that are involved with promoting diversity and inclusion on campus with regards to the Ombuds office. Our recommendations substantially overlap with the recommendations of the Ombuds Review Committee which were presented to the Council last month. With regards to the Office for Institutional Equity, we suggest that Duke's harassment policy be reviewed and updated and that the training modules utilized in the Office for Institutional Equity be reviewed.

Jokerst: We've talked about leadership, but bottom line is, we as a faculty need to own this. In order for us to own it, we have suggested that the diversity plans that Trina talked about or that the Faculty Diversity Standing Committee at the school, department, or division level, depending upon size, of course, of department, division, and school, work in partnership with the deans and the chairs in order to develop diversity plans that make sense to both the faculty and to the administrators. It's very important to

have sustained faculty engagement. It's very important to have this partnership between faculty and the administration because the administration can tell us all it wants, but if we don't take ownership of this, of diversity and inclusion in our own faculty, we won't get very far. So we're calling these the school, department and division Faculty Diversity Standing Committees, they're a bit of a mouthful, but they'll work with the dean and chair and have access to and monitor the kind of de-identified data that I've shown you previously in this report. It's important for us to be informed. So talking is fine, but having data and having the satisfaction data as well is very important. The school reports that we talked about earlier can serve as a starting point for these Faculty Diversity Standing Committees and for the chairs and the deans to begin a conversation. You know, the DTF really believes that accountability and responsibility are very important. So accountability to the new Vice Provost for Faculty Diversity and Inclusion, the Provost, and Academic Council are all very important. Now training is an interesting idea. It turns out that the literature on training is a little bit mixed. It turns out that training is effective in some cases and it has been shown to be not effective in other cases. This is training for diversity, inclusion, and implicit bias. It turns out that the training and the follow through are both absolutely critical. In the Diversity Task Force, we don't pretend to be the ultimate experts that know exactly what this training should be but we know that we should have it. So we would like to recommend that this Vice Provost oversee the development of training and implementation for faculty broadly across the university and individualized to schools and departments and divisions to

meet the needs of that particular unit. Training is particularly important for APT, faculty search committees and mentors, and should address these particular issues that faculty in the satisfaction survey have said that they face.

Jones: The next two recommendations relate to increasing faculty diversity through hiring programs and the faculty search process. The DTF recommends that the university refocus the target of opportunity program to its original goal of hiring more women and minorities. We also recommend the creation of a centralized university committee to oversee the top hiring process. We would like to see an expansion in the Provost's Postdoc Fellowship Program. We'd like to see that program used as a basis for hiring more women and people of color on the Duke faculty. Because of the importance of leadership, the DTF recommends that candidates for deanships and departmental chairs be required to show a demonstrated commitment to faculty diversity and inclusion before they are appointed. Nan mentioned the importance of the diversity plans for each unit. We assume that most units are going to make really great progress with regards to the diversity plans but for those that do not we recommend that the university withhold lines from those schools. With regards to faculty searches, many universities use what is called a Faculty Search Toolkit which identifies best practices for securing greater faculty diversity. We recommend that Duke develop and use such a toolkit. We also anticipate that the FDSCs, the unit based committees, will partner with their deans and chairs throughout the search process from the very beginning, from the

formation of the committee through the actual making of offers to candidates to ensure that the best practices are actually being utilized in each individual unit. Finally, we recommend a revision of the timeline for faculty searches so that this process begins earlier. This will allow time to identify a broader, more diverse pool of applicants as well as to allow the opportunity for more faculty to engage in the process.

Jokerst: Two more recommendations, then you get to ask questions. Recommendation 7 has to do with what we're calling retention but really this has to do with inclusion. We can recruit and hire the most diverse faculty but if we don't have an environment that nurtures our diverse faculty and that keeps our diverse faculty here, but more than that, keeps all our faculty here and is inclusive for all faculty, then we're simply shooting ourselves in the foot. So what we have to do is focus on our environment and focus on retention. First, we'd like the director of faculty and diversity to address, as Sally alluded to, professionalism. Treating each other well. On the positive side, enabling sustained conversations among diverse groups is extremely important. People need to feel that they can get together and have real conversations in safe spaces. That's very important. Creating a faculty mentoring program is also extremely important. I have to say, for these recommendations, each of these little things I'm putting up here has loads of actual implementation information behind it. So please read the report, which is 50 pages, in addition to the three-page executive summary, but we'll have about 300 pages of supporting documents for you later in May. Use those as you will. Finally, to finish off this recommendation, something that came up that was very

interesting was access for all faculty to former APT committee members so that we can dispel misconceptions about what's important and what's not important on promotion and tenure documentation and this is a recommendation for all faculty. Finally, greater support of faculty identity groups whether they be formal identity groups or whether they be small groups of faculty who don't want to be a formal caucus or a formal network but just want to get together and talk about their experiences and offer support to one another. Recommendation 8: our last recommendation. One of the most interesting things that we have learned as a task force is how data can affect what our perceptions of Duke are and what the realities of Duke are. So some of the data was not surprising, some of the data was very surprising. So what we're recommending is faculty and administrative access and reporting on a variety of data, what we see now and some other data, de-identified and perhaps by percentiles. So we're not talking about any specific identification data, but a general idea of where we fit into this university. Pay equity for total compensation is something that is very important. And we've heard about it at the last Academic Council meeting. The DTF does recommend that we should do that for all ranks of faculty including our other regular rank faculty and include the School of Medicine the next time that we do that faculty salary equity. Finally, the faculty that we are not able to retain, we need to really understand what the true, underlying causes of them walking out this door and even interviewing at other institutions are. Interviews that are confidential are very important.

Jones: We are very happy to deliver this report on time to the Council and, Sally, on budget (laughter).

Jokerst: That budget was zero! (laughter) Just to let you know.

Jones: And as Nan already said, supporting documents will be available at the end of May.

Jokerst: Moving forward, we'd like to indicate that implementation requires a robust partnership between the faculty and between administrators and we really look forward to working together in that partnership. As Josh said, the DTF does agree that ECAC should work this summer with the administration because the time is right, the environment is right. It's time to begin considering how to implement these recommendations.

Jones: The DTF focused its work on faculty diversity. We understand that there are other constituent groups in our community for which diversity and inclusion are tremendously important. Therefore, the DTF recommends that future task forces be appointed that will address students and postdoc diversity issues as well as staff diversity issues. We'd like to thank all of the faculty and administrators who gave so generously of their time to the DTF over the last year. We really appreciate the candid feedback and the insights. In addition we'd like to thank Sandra Walton and Susan Jennings in the Academic Council office for their superb administrative assistance (applause).

Socolar: We have time for a few questions, and I know Sally wants to make at least one remark.

Mary Fulkerson (Divinity School):

Thank you very much. My question is about number 7. It sounds as if, and this was trying to retain faculty through an inclusive environment and mentoring, addressing macro and micro aggression. That sounds like an opening for teaching faculty how to do conflict. Am I right or not? Some of us don't know how to do that very well.

Jokerst: Looking at Ann Brown in the School of Medicine, the professionalism office, or what she runs associated with faculty professionalism, some faculty do need instruction on conflict management. The question is, do we need to educate all the faculty? The level of training, we don't know. We don't know what the best level of training is but we do know from the faculty satisfaction survey and from input from faculty through this task force, that there are issues of micro and in some cases macro aggression on campus that are very difficult to deal with because of fear of retaliation, for example. I don't think we have any good answers, but we have best practices. Thea, do you want to comment on the best practices associated with that?

Thea Portier-Young (Divinity School): In the best practices report, which will be one of the supporting documents that will be made available by the end of May, there is a subsection on climate, specifically that has within it a subsection on bullying, civility, and what we have identified as best practices for promoting a culture of civility and it does include training in how to do conflict constructively. There are models out there and we do recommend that that be included in Duke's ongoing effort to continue to create a climate of inclusion. I know that Ben Reese and Judy

Seidenstein and their offices have resources around these issues as well. So in many ways, we would be building on some of the knowledge that's already here but really pushing to make that a focus more broadly.

Speaker: Why go for a push? If it's just optional, then people who don't deal with conflict aren't going to do anything.

Jones: We were moving towards mandatory training, but we backed off because we didn't have sufficient time to examine what training modules are most effective. That's why we have this recommendation that the new Office of Faculty Diversity and Inclusion actually focus on training. You mentioned something else in your question and that was mentoring, right? We assume that people who volunteer to mentor are going to be really good mentors (laughter). But that assumption, like most assumptions, needs to be reexamined. So we're specifically looking for training modules for mentors as well.

Lori Bennear (Nicholas School of the Environment): Thank you guys so much for this terrific report. I really like that you expanded the notion of diversity to also focus on inclusion which is critical. My question is, how do we measure that? It's really helpful to actually have the satisfaction survey right before that because there are several questions in there that get at this notion of inclusion, but we do that once every five years. It's a lot easier to measure the numbers. How many women faculty, how many Black faculty, etc. what are your ideas about how we're going to establish metrics that we can really track over time on this important question about inclusion?

Jokerst: The DES survey is suggested in the report and Thea, why don't you say a few words about that?

Portier-Young: Judy can tell us even more about it but in our interviews with personnel across the university, on this issue I think the most effective tool we learned about was one that Judy Seidenstein shared with us, the Diversity Engagement Survey. Judy, would you say a bit more about that?

Judy Seidenstein (Chief Diversity Officer, Duke School of Medicine): So I only know about it specifically in terms of how we used it in the medical school environment and it was part of a benchmarking study of 17 medical schools the first time the survey was initiated. We did that about four years ago. It was designed with the hypothesis that there is a correlation between perceptions of how inclusive an environment is and also how engaged people will be. So the higher the perception of inclusion, the more engaged I am. Not a grandiose hypothesis, but certainly an important one for us to make the connection. We used it in the Medical School and it has really helped to inform the diversity strategic plans that each of our department chairs have been responsible for creating. We broke it down by department. We got a ton of qualitative responses which were really the heart behind the items that were asked. So there's a lot of research behind it. It was developed in collaboration with Dr. Deborah Plummer at UMass Medical School and the AAMC, the American Association of Medical Colleges. My understanding is that they are now offering this beyond the medical school environment to a wider academic community.

Jones: In addition to the DES survey, there are other organizations that evaluate campuses based upon certain diversity metrics including campus pride. So we might want to engage and participate in these organizations that evaluate many of our peer institutions with regards to how we're doing in respect to certain demographic groups. The other thing is, if we have opportunities for diverse faculty to get together and talk, I think that out of those conversations, especially if these venues are connected to the administrative structure in some way, we will learn more about how people are feeling on campus and it wouldn't happen every five years when the satisfaction survey is done. If we have these structures in place, you can get information on an ongoing basis.

Socolar: I'm going to propose that we extend our session for 15 minutes. I know that President Brodhead has to leave for another meeting but there are some other items of business we need to attend to and I don't want to cut this off just yet. I know Sally wants to say something. We'll take two more questions.

Harvey Cohen (Clinical Sciences): I think this is great stuff and I have a little bit of déjà vu. Having sat on the Black Faculty Committee in 1982 of this Council, I recall a lot of the same things you're talking about here today having been recommended then. And we're here today so there's a bit of a feeling of déjà vu and frustration about that.

Jokerst: And we're well aware of that actually.

Cohen: One specific thing I would caution about is, speaking from the clinical standpoint, the clinical faculty are already

feeling overburdened, overregulated, over-moduled, over-surveyed, and over-trained (laughter). I think you need to be really cautious about what you're going to ask of faculty and other faculty members in this regard. Every time I hear about a new module, I just want to throw up.

Jokerst: And that's exactly why we're not saying what the training should be. We got that feedback from faculty too. Some faculty said the faculty satisfaction survey was way too long. So we realize that there are various concerns to be balanced but thank you for that.

Jones: We've spent a lot of time talking about both of your observations. One, many of these recommendations have been made before. So what we tried to do was develop, you might cringe at this, systems for sustained monitoring and oversight of these efforts. And we also try to come up with ways to empower the faculty to engage more consistently at the unit level with regards to diversity and inclusion. So we were aware of that particular concern and tried to develop some mechanisms to address it. By the way, with regards to being overburdened, sometimes when I talked to faculty about some of the recommendations, specifically the FDSCs, the Faculty Diversity Standing Committees, women and people of color would say to me, I'm already tired! Who is going to staff these committees? That is a legitimate concern and something that we're going to have to work out and maybe if a greater number of faculty are trained with regards to implicit and explicit bias we can broaden the pool of individuals who can serve on these committees. But there are some real considerations and concerns that we have been thinking about as a task force that you might also have as well.

Sandy Darity (Sanford School of Public Policy): I want to raise a somewhat sensitive issue. I'm really thrilled with the substance of this report and the quality of the recommendations. But the sensitive issue concerns the notion of expanding who is to be considered targets for diversity and inclusion. I think the key concept for me is whether there is underrepresentation or overrepresentation. I think that simply having a list of additional options for whom could be included as establishing greater diversity or inclusion means that there is the mechanism for substituting for, say, the race and gender objectives with other categories. I would say there are departments that have already done that. So I'm a little concerned about how you manage that process to make sure that there is the recognition that there are some groups that are greater priorities in this process than others.

Jokerst: Absolutely.

Jones: Was that a comment or was that a question?

Darity: That was a comment. But my question was, what do we do about it?

Jones: I think that is a really important issue. I think that Duke has to do additional research. We know that we have some issues with regards to women and people of color. The data show that. With regards to other demographic characteristics, I think that Duke is going to have to do some hard work to identify where there are problems and where there are not. So we identify these characteristics or elements of diversity that have been used in particular context outside of Duke, historically, to exclude, but I think Duke has to do some work to

identify what's going on on campus with regards to those factors.

Jokerst: And frankly, the Task Force did take a stand. So our stand is underrepresented minorities based on race, Latino/ Latina, gender, and also sexual identity. We spent a lot of time discussing this in the steering committee so we did decide that we need to take a stand on which groups were, from our perspective, recommended priorities.

Holloway: A quick comment. I think I'm one of two faculty left over from one of the very first hiring initiatives still here at Duke. What I'm feeling now is this was a clear eyed, robust, thoughtful report that came from the faculty. The difference that you have emphasized the faculty ownership is something that makes me, in terms of faculty satisfaction, feel really satisfied being at Duke at this moment. I just wanted to thank you (applause).

Jones: We should acknowledge, because I remember being in this room when Karla, and Kerry Haynie, and I think the dean from the Business School were talking about a need for a faculty directed initiative. So thank you, Karla, for planting the idea (laughter).

Jokerst: It was a Council conversation after Susan Lozier.

Emily Klein (Nicholas School of the Environment): To follow up on that statement that we've seen all these recommendations before, yes, mentoring, retention, etc. The two critical things that are different in this is the faculty taking ownership of this and trying to put in a structure that will give some teeth and accountability and resources to make that happen.

Jones: Emily has worked extensively on the school reports that will be available in the end of May and that's an opportunity for Council members to actually engage in their particular units. You can take these individual school reports back to your schools and have important conversations about what's going on on the ground in particular areas of the university.

Socolar: Sally, did you want to say a few words about summer plans?

Kornbluth: I'll just say, first of all, because I thought this report was really terrific. I thought it was really well constructed, very thoughtful, and I really appreciated all of the work that went into it. I think Emily actually just summed up sort of what I wanted to say. There is a balance between faculty ownership and I feel like maybe the Provost's office's role, aside from resources, is teeth and accountability. What I was going to say is what Josh alluded to at the beginning. Over the summer I want to work with ECAC to think about what the best process is for implementation. I recognize that you can't tax people too much on committees, but frankly, without some kind of faculty steering committee for the implementation phase, I don't see how we're going to get there. So I'd like there to be some overlap, but I realize how much work the Task Force did, I think it would be helpful if a couple members who participated are part of the implementation just for continuity. What I'd like to see is a task force for the implementation that will really go thoroughly through the report, digest it into bite sized pieces, prioritize, etc. Then maybe have faculty working groups to work out each piece. So it's not trivial to think about how to balance that and I'm

also mindful of the fact that it's easy to tilt it to a feeling of, now the faculty don't own it anymore, it's an administrative effort. So I think I'll partially rely on ECAC to kind of be the police on that balance and figure out going forward how we're going to do it. What I was really worried about, truthfully, about this report, first of all that the recommendations would be vague enough that it wouldn't be easy to implement. These were very specific so I think we have marching orders here. The second thing, frankly, I think there's a nice blend of things that really will require substantial resources and things that we can do as well that will require substantial resources but will make a big difference. The last thing I'll have to say in terms of resources is, I can't imagine a strategic plan that's not going to have diversity as one of the pillars. So when I think about the money we were planning on mobilizing for the strategic plan, I don't really consider this a separate bucket. So I almost feel like we're going to credit card a little bit against the future here. I don't want to wait two years until the strategic plan is rolled out to start on these things but I just want folks to understand two things. One, we will be plagiarizing some of your report into the strategic plan (laughter). And second of all, I do think that we will essentially be paying it forward on some of these things and starting some of the actions that we want to see in the strategic plan. It's sort of like grant writing where you've done some of the experiments and you put it in, that's sort of the plan going forward.

TRANSFER OF POWER TO ECAC FOR THE SUMMER MONTHS

Socular: Thanks, Nan and Trina. At this point in our meeting, we need to transfer power to ECAC so they can actually have

these conversations with Sally on our behalf over the summer. Our bylaws state that the Academic Council meet monthly during the academic year, and at other times that the Chair or ECAC (or ten members of the Council) may call. Because it's tough to get us together in the summer, the Christie Rules provide that this Council can delegate to ECAC the authority to act in a consultative role to the Administration when the University is not in regular session.

ECAC now offers the following motion:

Whereas, the Christie Rules provide that at the last meeting of the Academic Council in any given academic year, the Council may delegate to the Executive Committee of the Academic Council the authority to appoint a committee of at least three Council members to serve in a consultative role to the Administration when the University is not in regular session, and whereas the Christie Rules note that this committee should normally consist of members of the Executive Committee of the Academic Council if they are available, ECAC recommends to the Academic Council and moves that the authority to create such a committee be delegated to the Chair and Executive Committee of the Council, and that such committee once formed would remain in operation until the first day of the fall semester of the 2015-2016 academic year.

As ECAC is presenting this motion, I only need a second – may I have a second?

(Motion approved by voice vote with no dissent)

CLOSING REMARKS

Socolar: I hate to tell you this, but my job description states that I am supposed to “apprise the faculty of the activities of the Academic Council during the previous year and on plans for the ensuing year at the Annual Faculty Meeting scheduled at a time by ECAC.” This year I chose to put that duty off until now, but I suppose I am required to speak, and if this is to count as apprising the faculty of anything, I suppose you are required to listen (laughter). I’ll be brief. The past year: If you’ve been paying attention, you already know of the activities of the Council over the past year, and if not, you can read the minutes (laughter). I’ll just mention that in my report to the Board of Trustees, I emphasized our attention to developments at DKU, to master’s programs, and to diversity and inclusion, and let them know that we appreciated the hour that David Rubenstein spent with us. The next year: I don’t know what will be on the Council’s agenda next year. It’s not my job anymore (laughter). One thing I do know is that the Council will successfully fulfill its mandated responsibilities. This is because my successor will benefit as I have from the organizational skills and good sense of Sandra Walton and her assistant, currently Susan Jennings. Beyond that, I can only make a few educated guesses. Expect to hear more about multiple facets of DKU, including at least one new master’s program to be offered there and crucial decisions about how to proceed with the undergraduate program and faculty development. Expect also to spend some time following up on recommendations in the Diversity Task Force and the Ombuds reports. And expect to be involved in the Provost’s strategic planning process as it moves

from brainstorming and idea gathering to the identification of key themes and priorities. And, of course, expect the unexpected. Duke’s responses to unforeseen events say a lot about who we are and the values we hold dear. It is important that the faculty be involved, and this Council is our primary forum for expressing our views. Now please allow me one moment of reflection on my experience working with the members of this Council, ECAC, and Duke’s senior leadership. My main message is that, from the inside, our governance system appears to be working. I have been impressed both with the serious attention that I see faculty giving to concerns of their colleagues and their students, and with the attention that our senior leaders, including the President, Provost (both Provosts that I have worked with), and the Executive Vice President, give to our opinions and suggestions. We should consider ourselves fortunate in not having to pass resolutions or make formal demands in order to be heard. That does not mean, however, that we should assume our ideas will simply diffuse into the necessary offices as we walk by or chat with our close colleagues. Please continue to make ECAC aware of the issues that need to be discussed, and lend your voice to the discussion. Before we wrap it up, I believe Sara Beale would like to say something.

Sara Beale (Law School/ ECAC): Duke has a very strong tradition of faculty governance and every person in this room plays an important part in that governance. There are always a few individuals that rise above the rest and take on a heavier burden. They play an especially important role in shaping what Duke is today and what it will be in the future. Josh Socolar has done that. He’s

been a marvelous chair of the Academic Council and it's been a privilege and an honor to serve with him. You all have seen him skillfully chair the meetings so that we can focus collectively on the most important issues and with humor as you all saw in this meeting. I would like to say just a little about what you haven't seen and give you a glimpse of what we say at ECAC. Josh chaired a weekly two hour meeting of ECAC and before we got to those meetings he had had multiple rounds of emails with the various committee chairs, faculty, students, and administrators we had been meeting with and often a lot of back and forth with ECAC. He would report to us on the dozens of committee meetings he had been attending ex officio. He was in regular contact in meetings, emails, and phone calls with university senior administrators and the chairs of all of the major committees. And of course he's the point of contact of all faculty so he hears from the Council members and a lot of other faculty members when they have an idea or a problem or a question. It's like 1-800-call-Josh (laughter). In fact, if Josh had a dollar for every email he sent or received on behalf of the Academic Council and every meeting he attended, he would be a very wealthy man (laughter). But, of course, there's a lot more that's important than just the commitment of time and energy. Josh made every meeting he attended, every decision he consulted on, better. He has an incredibly broad knowledge of Duke and the issues that it faces and wise and humane judgement about how we can best move forward. Perhaps some of you will remember the old E. F. Hutton commercials. "When E. F. Hutton talks, people listen." When Josh spoke, we all wanted to listen and we were all better for it. On your behalf I would like to thank

Josh and I would also like to let him know that on behalf of ECAC and the Council, a donation has been made in his honor to one of his favorite locales, the Mary Lou Williams Center for Black Culture. We thought that was important for two reasons. First, Josh periodically participated as a musician in the Wednesday night jazz series events, another element of his contributions you might not know of. Second, Josh is deeply committed to making Duke a more diverse and inclusive institution and the center is an important institution supporting those goals. So will you please join me in thanking Josh Socolar? (applause).

Socolar: Thanks very much. The meeting is now adjourned.