

Duke University

DURHAM
NORTH CAROLINA
27708-0928

ACADEMIC COUNCIL
012 ALLEN
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, May 9, 2013

Susan Lozier (Chair of the Academic Council/Nicholas School of the Environment):

Welcome, everyone -- if I can have your attention, I will start our meeting. Welcome to May, to the return of blue skies, and to the last Council meeting of the academic year.

By way of announcements, I have a few individuals to recognize before we start our meeting. As continuing Council members know, we recently elected three new members to ECAC. Those new ECACers are—and if they are here, would they please stand while I read their names—Sara Beale, Law School; Brenda Nevidjon, School of Nursing. Brenda is the first representative from the School of Nursing to be elected to ECAC; and Don Taylor, Sanford School. Thank you for your willingness to serve this Council (ap-
plause). While we welcome these additions, it means that we must reluctantly say good-bye to three outgoing ECAC members. I would like to thank the following for their outstanding service to this Council, and on a personal note, for the support and counsel they have given me over the past two years: Phil Costanzo (Psychology & Neuroscience)—Phil served as Vice-Chair this past year; Cindy Kuhn (Pharmacology & Cancer Biology) — Cindy served as Faculty Secretary this past year, and John Payne (Fuqua School of Business). John is finishing a two-year term as well as chair of UPC. Thank you all (ap-
plause).

On the theme of gratitude, I have decided to share with you today my favorite poem. I have saved the best for last. While my poems to date have mostly been selected because they somehow were pertinent to the issue at hand, today, I ask your indulgence. The reason for today's poem is simply that it is early May when thoughts turn to Mother's Day, and to one's own mother and, in turn, to gratitude.

The Lanyard - by Billy Collins

The other day I was ricocheting slowly
off the blue walls of this room,
moving as if underwater from typewriter to
piano,
from bookshelf to an envelope lying on the
floor,
when I found myself in the L section of the
dictionary
where my eyes fell upon the word lanyard.

No cookie nibbled by a French novelist
could send one into the past more suddenly—
a past where I sat at a workbench at a camp
by a deep Adirondack lake
learning how to braid long thin plastic strips
into a lanyard, a gift for my mother.

I had never seen anyone use a lanyard
or wear one, if that's what you did with them,
but that did not keep me from crossing
strand over strand again and again

until I had made a boxy
red and white lanyard for my mother.

She gave me life and milk from her breasts,
and I gave her a lanyard.

She nursed me in many a sick room,
lifted spoons of medicine to my lips,
laid cold face-cloths on my forehead,
and then led me out into the airy light

and taught me to walk and swim,
and I, in turn, presented her with a lanyard.
Here are thousands of meals, she said,
and here is clothing and a good education.
And here is your lanyard, I replied,
which I made with a little help from a counse-
lor.

Here is a breathing body and a beating heart,
strong legs, bones and teeth,
and two clear eyes to read the world, she
whispered,
and here, I said, is the lanyard I made at
camp.

And here, I wish to say to her now,
is a smaller gift—not the worn truth

that you can never repay your mother,
but the rueful admission that when she took
the two-tone lanyard from my hand,
I was as sure as a boy could be
that this useless, worthless thing I wove
out of boredom would be enough to make us
even.

Happy May—and to all the mothers in the
room, Happy Mother’s Day (applause).

Approval of Meeting Minutes

Our first item of business is to approve the
April 18th meeting minutes.

(Approved by voice vote with no dissent)

Nomination of Candidates for Earned Degrees

Our next item on the agenda is the approval
of candidates for earned degrees. In accord-
ance with the University Bylaws, I will call on
representatives from the various schools and
Trinity College for recommendations of ap-
proved 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	182
Master of Science	122
Master of Arts	114
Master of Arts in Teaching	1
Master of Fine Arts	15

School of Medicine

Dean Nancy C. Andrews

Doctor of Medicine	106
Doctor of Physical Therapy	58
Master of Health Sciences	85
Master of Health Sciences in Clinical Leadership	5
Master of Health Sciences in Clinical Research	11
Master of Biostatistics	13

School of Law

Dean David F. Levi

Doctor of Juridical Science	1
Juris Doctor	240
Master of Laws	119
Master of Laws in Law and Entrepreneurship	12

Divinity School

Dean Richard Hays

Doctor of Theology	1
Master of Theology	4
Master of Divinity	132
Master of Theological Studies	15
Master of Arts in Christian	

Studies	8
School of Nursing	
<i>Dean Catherine L. Gilliss</i>	
Doctor of Nursing Practice	35
Master of Science in Nursing	53
Bachelor of Science in Nursing	67
Fuqua School of Business	
<i>Dean William Boulding</i>	
Master of Business Administration	430
Master of Management Studies	107
Nicholas School of the Environment	
<i>Dean William L. Chameides</i>	
Master of Forestry	2
Master of Environmental Management	163
Sanford School of Public Policy	
<i>Dean Bruce Kuniholm</i>	
Master of International Development Policy	27
Master of Public Policy	55
Pratt School of Engineering	
<i>Dean Tom Katsouleas</i>	
Master of Engineering Management	61
Master of Engineering	14
Bachelor of Science in Engineering	285
Trinity College of Arts and Sciences	
<i>Dean Laurie Patton</i>	
Bachelor of Science	502
Bachelor of Arts	751
TOTAL	3796

Thank you and congratulations to all of these graduates. Allow me though to call out one graduate in particular: Robert Becker, an 80-year-old member of the class of 2013, is to receive a Bachelor of Arts degree in political science this Sunday. On behalf of the Duke faculty, let me say: Well done, Mr. Becker, and thank you for this fine example of lifelong learning (applause).

Recognition of past chairs of the Academic Council and Professor George Christie

As we close the year on the Academic Council's 50th anniversary, I would like to extend a warm welcome to several of the former chairs of the Council in attendance today. We have marked the Council's 50th with our Council Conversations series, which will conclude today, but our celebration would not be complete without recognizing those who, through the years, have stepped forward to lead the Duke faculty.

Earlier this month, I invited these past chairs to join us today, and to provide a short statement that summarizes their tenure as chair. I told them they were free to express themselves in verse, via haiku or through stream of consciousness. Thankfully, I did also give a word limit! An invitation was also extended to Professor George Christie, from the Law School, who in 1972 was instrumental in the creation of the "Christie Rules." I now will call each individual to stand while I read their statement.

Don Fluke, Chair from 1969-1971

I would also like to add that Don was a member of that first Council of 1962-1963. He was an elected representative from the Natural Sciences division. We are very pleased you could be here today (applause).

During my tenure there was campus dissension, mainly about ROTC; even a Council meeting was disrupted. We focused on recruiting faculty leaders and a new president, and urged an emphasis on long-range issues. The convocation welcoming Terry and Margaret Rose Sanford was marked by the last remnants of a protest over the perceived ostentation of the then-new mace and chain (laughter).

Thank you, Don. I don't know why people would think that would be ostentatious (laughter). The last time I carried the mace, I had a student tell me after the ceremony that she liked my "torch of knowledge" (laughter). I have been using those words ever since.

George Christie, who was chair of the 1972 committee responsible for the establishment of the Christie Rules

The Academic Council was established in 1963 to serve as a forum for faculty discussion. Whatever official authority over general university matters the faculty possessed was vested in the faculty at large. The purpose of the committee I chaired was to give that authority to the Academic Council and, more importantly, to broaden the faculty's role in University decision making and make the Academic Council the vehicle through which the collective opinion of the faculty would be sought and given. With the approval of the University faculty in October 1972 and the support of President Terry Sanford, that objective was achieved.

Thank you, George (applause).

Lawrence Evans, Chair from 1979-1981

Three action verbs characterize my term: retrench, catch up, delay (laughter). Retrench: eliminate academic programs to save money in tough times. Catch up: bring salaries more in line with the high inflation, by mandating comparison to comparable universities. Delay: let no agreement be made to bring Nixon's archives to Duke before the Council could have its say. We managed to do all three, with strong support from the faculty. The tough times and high inflation were temporary, but the Nixon thing would have been permanent, as SMU has learned (laughter).

Roy Weintraub, chair from 1981-1982 and then again 1991-1992

During round 1: There was the Nixon library debacle, with raucous meetings. President Sanford was furious at the faculty. The Christie Rule was invoked. Faculty said "Yes" to library, "No" to gift shop. We held a secret meeting and there was a vote of no confidence in the Chair of the Board of Trustees.

Lozier: Rebels (laughter).

Round 2: Provost Griffiths resigns, President Brodie resigns, and the Trustees were warring. We wondered: who's in charge?

Thank you, Roy (applause).

Rich Burton, chair from 1992-1994

I served during the transition between Keith Brodie's last year and President Nan Keohane's first year. The faculty was deeply involved in the search for a new president. The Council led on significant issues: the first strategic planning process for Duke, the development of a harassment policy, and the revision of the Black Faculty initiative.

Thank you, Rich (applause).

Jim Siedow, chair from 1994-1996

I was young—[Lozier: actually we were all young in 1990 (laughter)]—and Nan was still new as President and grappling with the significance of the Christie Rule. Working our way through the Freshman East Campus issue was rocky but it got the two of us on a path that led Nan to understand the tradition of faculty governance at Duke.

Thank you, Jim (applause).

Nancy Allen, chair from 2002-2005

During my years as chair, the Council celebrated its 40th Anniversary, and we considered and implemented policies on emeriti faculty, harassment, parental leave and tenure clock relief. We revised the Distinguished Professor

selection process; saw the completion of the Black Faculty Strategic Initiative and started the 2003 Faculty Diversity Initiative.

Nancy also provided this haiku:

*During my tenure
Faculty governance worked
Quite well don't you think? (applause and laughter).*

Paula McClain, chair 2007-2009

As I review the events of my term as Chair of the Academic Council, it seems that lots of "unhappy" things took place--the economic meltdown in 2008 that resulted in the disappearance of the new Central Campus; no raises for several years; and the endless presentations and discussions of the SACs re-accreditation report (laughter). In the words of that great political philosopher, Jackie Gleason—"A lot of people say, 'Well, I like a challenge.' I don't like challenges. Life is tough enough without any challenges!" But, on a more positive note, we moved to electronic voting for Academic Council, and approved the creation of the Sanford School of Public Policy. So, the two years were not totally filled with "unhappy" events.

Lozier: Paula nobody really blames you for that economic downturn, so... (laughter and applause). At least, not the faculty (laughter).

Craig Henriquez, chair 2009-2011

In memory of my English teacher father, a trio of Henriquez haikus are offered to summarize my tenure as chair:

*council forty-six
processes on scattered sheets
ac handbook born*

*submerged endowments
tallman's DART slays budget bloat
raises are restored*

*nebulous kunshan
stirs a vigorous debate
GPC begins*

Lozier: I think we owe our past chair and might I add, colleague from engineering, a round of applause for this poetic contribution (applause).

To you all: on behalf of this Council, I would like to express our gratitude for the role each of you has played in faculty governance at Duke. Through your efforts when we look in the rear view mirror, we see fifty years of winding roads, with ups and downs, a few potholes here and there, and definitely some detours, but all in all we have arrived here in pretty good shape, ready for the next few miles. You have prepared us well for the road ahead, it is well-lit, amply marked and, of course, it is paved with precedent. Thanks for taking your turn at the wheel. And on that note, I would like to recognize the next driver, so to speak. Professor Josh Socolar (applause) will be taking over as Academic Council chair this July 1st. This occasion of recognizing the past chairs gives me another opportunity to thank Josh for his willingness to serve and to wish him well.

Before we move to the Council Conversation, which concludes our anniversary celebration, I have one last passage to share with you from the 1962-1963 Academic Council minutes. As you know Duke is currently observing the 50th anniversary of desegregation: in the fall of 1963 the first black undergraduates enrolled at this University. I have read every word of the 1962-1963 Council minutes, and there is not one mention of this fact until the last meeting of the academic year, which was held on May 23 in 208 Flowers. Vice-Chairman Lamar Callaway presided and called the meeting to order at 4pm. Near the end of the meeting, following discussions

of a slew of recommendations from ECAC regarding committee assignments and visiting faculty housing options, a motion was made from the floor that the Council express its approval of the integration of restaurants and theaters in the city of Durham.

The minutes read: "The question was raised whether such actions were within the limits of the business proper to the Council. One Councilman expressed the view that it was fitting that members of the faculty should concern themselves with this problem since the University had admitted students who would be subject to discrimination in eating places and movie houses in the city unless effective steps were taken toward their integration. The question was called, and the Vice-Chairman ruled that the motion carried with a clear majority. The meeting was then adjourned at 5:45 pm."

Though we are ending today our 50th anniversary celebration of this Council, the 50th anniversary of desegregation continues through next fall. Allow me to borrow words from the May 1963 minutes to say that it would be "fitting that members of the faculty should concern themselves with this" anniversary. It is a celebration for all of us.

Council Conversation: The Professoriate

We now turn our attention to our third and last Council Conversation. Our conversation today is on *The Professoriate*. ECAC has invited four faculty members across the campus to lead this discussion. Allow me to introduce these faculty members. Phil Costanzo, Professor of Psychology & Neuroscience, will serve as the moderator for today's conversation. Phil's research interests include the development of children's ideas and beliefs about the social environment, the relationships between values, motivations and depressive

states, and prevention research on alcohol and drug abuse. Phil joined the Duke faculty in 1968. Dennis Clements, Professor of Pediatrics & Global Health. Dennis's clinical and research interests include infectious diseases, epidemiology, vaccine research, managed care, and global health. He is also interested in Latino health issues, and health manpower needs in the third world. Dennis joined Duke's faculty in 1978. Anthony Kelley, Associate Professor of the Practice of Music. Anthony's interests include post-19th century composition, African-American music, performance and improvisation of New Blues, and documentary, film and video music. Anthony joined the Duke faculty in 2000. Sunny Ladd, Edgar T. Thompson Professor of Public Policy and Professor of Economics. Sunny's current research focuses mostly on education policy. She is particularly interested in various aspects of school accountability, education finance, teacher labor markets, and school choice. She joined Duke in 1986.

Phil Costanzo (Psychology & Neuroscience/ECAC member): Thank you Susan. Welcome to our third Council Conversation, but before I begin I do want to provide us with the opportunity to give our sincere thanks to Susan. She has been a steadfast leader, one of humor and balance. A person who introduced us social scientists and natural scientists to the beauties of poetry, our humanities could do that too I suppose, but Susan really made it an intrinsic part of faculty governance (laughter). I do want to provide the opportunity for the Council to applaud her wonderful efforts, and it's been a pleasure to serve with her on both ECAC and this Council (applause).

Costanzo: This is our third Council conversation, and we have three very august individuals who are going to share their ideas about changes over the last fifty years, which is the number of years that this Council has existed.

Before I turn to them, I wanted to address a couple of questions, and then I'll completely shut up and let them really educate us as to their experience. I think all the prior conversations were about the nature of change and the nature of essence. That even though many things have changed, has the essence of this community, and this academic investment that all of us have made, both in our disciplines and in the enterprise of Duke University, has that changed? We're actually struggling with that. What's changed and what remains essential. It actually reminds me of one of the first problems I confronted as a psychologist, and that was how a child learns—that while things change in appearance, their essence remains the same. Work with children on how they conserve properties across variant changes in their appearance: whether a small beaker holds more water than a large beaker; whether a thin beaker than a thick beaker. How do we conserve the essence of that substance, water, its volume, across changes in the appearance of the receptacle that it's in? And I look at the University in that way. The University has changed in many ways: we've become more diverse, and that's a good thing. We've become more mercantile, that may or may not be a good thing. We compete with other universities, to a larger extent than we did at one time, and in many more playing fields than before. We've become more global. We've become a population of individuals who don't have to retire on the faculty. The professor has changed in that regard—it's become a lifelong concern that we don't have to leave. With regard to what's good and what has been retained, I'd like to address what's been retained. I think we've had discussions of teaching, and we've had many changes in teaching. Recent debates over should we have electronic teaching? Should we be on the internet? Does that change the essence of good instruction? Does it change the essence of our commitments to education? My own

view is that I don't think it does. I think it is a change in appearance, just like the beaker that holds the water. It could be in many shapes. With regard to the definition of excellent teaching, our disciplinary alignments have shifted remarkably. When I got to Duke 45 years ago, individuals lived in departments. They spent little time in other departments, they asked their questions within the confines of their discipline, and they were less connected across the world in their discipline. Right now we can reach a colleague in Afghanistan in a moment on our internet. Life has changed greatly. We've built programs of learning, knowledge and knowledge acquisition between disciplines that were formerly separated. We've globalized and we've created a lot of odd bedfellows. We've put people together from the humanities and the sciences, pursuing what the meaning of song is. We've put individuals together from the social sciences and natural sciences that look at what the nature of an individual's thought process might be. And we have a visual guide, where we can do a lot of things that tell us about visual perception. Many changes have occurred. I challenge each of you, given your commitment to this institution—mine has been long—to actually consider what is of essence. And in looking at what is of essence, I'd like to turn to individuals to talk about the changes, and then see if we can recover the volume of the water from the beaker or container that it's in. I hope we can, because I think this institution is predicated on some essential properties and we can look at change from now until the cows come home or until our next iteration. But I actually think if we don't find what links us to what this University was when I got here 45 years ago, then we don't make a connection to what our purpose is more broadly. So what I'd like to do is look at the changes that this very august group of three faculty can take us through, and I'm going to start with Dennis Clements from the School of Medicine and the Global

Health Institute. Dennis will let us know what, as a medical professor, has changed and maybe what has remained the same.

Dennis Clements (Pediatrics & Global Health): Thank you for not passing the microphone because from an infectious disease point of view... (laughter). That's a great experiment actually --always worries me when that happens. I think there are several ways to look at what's happened over time. I mean the University is a living object. It's different every day, and the changes I look at are the changes in student population, the changes in professoriate—who is actually doing the teaching, what it's comprised of, but also the environment you find yourself in, and a lot of that has to do with, these days, not just social and political implications but financial. All of these pieces together have to somehow find a way out and to be innovative while you're doing it, to be looking ahead. I do think that a lot of the courses that we've been teaching online, that are flipped classrooms etc., are an attempt to be ahead of the curve. I think a lot of that is determined by our students to be honest. Because if we don't, I don't want to use the word entertain our students, but there's a certain element of that, they are going to be buying shoes or doing something else with their time or they are not coming to class. So the idea of giving them the information ahead of time before they ever come to class, and then discussing things from what they've read and making it make sense, is a more useful way in the long way to keep them involved. And actually the data is pretty clear, even in our own courses that some of us have taught that doing that is just as good as what we did before. Certainly in medicine, even when I was doing it 30 years ago, there were a lot of people sleeping in class, that all seemed to pass the test, and they are your doctors today (laughter). But somehow they survived all that. But I think, one of the things that my students have taught me is I'm not

teaching them to answer yesterday's question. I'm teaching how to think about answering tomorrow's question which I don't even know yet. If I do a good job, they will do that for me because I'm counting on them to do that for me. So I look at it as my investment on the teaching side to have the students actually provide that for me. The electronic information that is available for students is so broad that standing up in class and giving them information which thirty years ago we had to do because there was no other way to do it, it's a waste of our time. Having them get the information ahead and discussing it is a better way to go. There is considerable change for the teachers. And thank you to Jim Roberts and others who have sent me information about some of the financial implications which have reflection on how many research people you can have, etc. because research funds are not expanding. They will probably contract to some degree, certainly relative to the whole expanse of the system, and we've seen that with the decrease in the tenure of faculty, and more faculty that are just professional teachers or maybe working the lab etc. And it's all part of a vibrant and well-orchestrated university and we have to be sure to cultivate all of those different people, doing all those different tasks. Everybody is being more specialized. You don't have people that are doing all three of those things. When the medical school started, which was eighty years ago, there were eight professors and they did all the teaching, and now we have a thousand doctors, so it's quite different. So everybody can't do everything. I do think if you look at the University, all of us here, all the students, everybody, the money has to come from somewhere, and historically over the last fifty years, for sure after World War II, a lot of federal grants and money came in for research. If that sort of plateaus we have to ask if it is going to come from students? From philanthropy? Is it going to come from patents? How are we going

to pay for it all? I think that helps determine the essence of what a university is. And we just have to look at those parameters around us, and be leaders in where we are going. I've done my research part, and now I'm doing more teaching and I've enjoyed all of it so I feel very lucky. I just look for the next class to come along and do even better.

Costanzo: Thank you very much Dennis. I'd like now to introduce Anthony Kelley from the Music department.

Anthony Kelley (Music): I'd like this opportunity to visit this topic. And I also go towards some observations with some trepidation because I often have to teach lessons to my composition students that there are two behemoths that can destroy their art: one is the behemoth of the ego, and the other is the behemoth of fiscal preoccupation. And I know that many of you know of cases where there are musicians you loved a lot who began to generate kind of the same thing over and over again. And it's probably because some producer said "make the thing you made before." And that sort of self-consciousness that Duke is a brand, and that we as professors are collective of a certain power is something remarkable to consider but it should be considered, in my opinion, in the context of the same thing that Brantley York and Benjamin Duke, were thinking of before we got here, which is what are we here for? Any of my observations will hopefully point me and all of us, who are some of our most engaged leaders of academia to not only our collective force, and our charge as a collective force but to the intersection of our work and conscience. My view of Duke's force of professors can be seen through the eyes of a 1983-1987 undergraduate who saw Duke before some of the diversity took place, when my first couple of years there were no Mac computer clusters. I remember a young lady who is now head of psychiatry here, Holly

Lisanby—good friend of mine and fellow classmate. She introduced me to my first Mac computer, and I was excited to be able to use it. And the Duke music department was happy to embrace whatever technology would come along. The thing that might have been a little missing that exists today, which I'm excited to report, is that sort of crossing beyond the boundaries of what music can be. And that sort of interdisciplinarity obviously is exciting and vibrant today among professors to the point where your new leader of the Academic Council has actually played on my piano—has played some beautiful blues and jazz on my piano at my apartment during blues night at my dorm (laughter). So Josh and I have a musical connection beyond his leadership here. That's how far I cross. Now whether or not I can do physics (laughter) he and I are going to have to have a chat about it, but I'm willing. Of course I've worked with Dewey Lawson, I've took Dewey Lawson's course on acoustic and music analogy.

Josh Socolar (Physics and chair-elect): It takes practice (laughter).

Kelley: It does indeed. So I've seen it go from very minimal technology to the sort of explosion of even the nuances between Blackboard and Sakai, which is something that affects us all doesn't it? And it affects us aversely or we have to embrace it because it's the next thing. I feel like today there is an acceleration towards the next thing, which is part of what I was saying at the beginning of this is; that just as another last analogy, before I pass it over to someone who's really going to fortify all this with real numbers and statistics (laughter), let me say one more little thing. Barry Gordy started with an imagination about what music and popular music could be and he started Motown, and it grew and it became this thing that we know today. You can play a Motown song and you know what it is but soon they began to go to Los Ange-

les—I mean that’s not even the Motor Town, that’s not even Detroit—they began to make movies, and they lost the sense of what Motown was in a pursuit of what? Fiscal preoccupation and the ego of what they were. So we have to watch ourselves at Duke for those two behemoths, just as much as my students would have to watch these things in their compositions.

Costanzo: Thank you Anthony. I would next like to introduce Helen “Sunny” Ladd who is from the Sanford School, and makes sense of a messy world frequently in her research.

Sunny Ladd (Sanford School of Public Policy): I’m delighted to be here, so thanks for inviting me. I like to focus on policy related issues, so I’m going to talk about two issues specifically. One is the growth of the non-tenure track faculty at Duke, which I interpret as an explicit policy of Duke, and then I also want to talk briefly about the aging of the professoriate, which reflects changes in national policy related to the removal of mandatory retirement. So let me start with the growth of the non-tenure track faculty, and as an economist I do like to start with data and fortunately Peter provided some data from his talk to the trustees last fall. So according to that data, in 1999 39% of the regular rank faculty at Duke were non-tenure track faculty, and that’s primarily Professors of Practice of various types and Research Professors as well. By 2012 that had increased to 46% of the regular rank faculty. So that’s a big increase. In fact it came about by about a 2% annual increase in regular rank faculty and a 6% annual increase during that 13 year period in the non-tenure track faculty, tenure and tenure track. So, from my reading of a Chronicle article in 2004, I realized that this really was an explicit policy decision by this University to embrace non-tenure track faculty and not all universities embraced this change. Stanford being a clear ex-

ample. So I went to IPEDS data, which is the Integrated Post Secondary Data that is put out by the US Department of Education, so it’s a different data source. As of 2011, according to that data source, which has a slightly different definition of full time faculty, 39% of Duke faculty were non-tenure and tenure-track. That contrasts with 6% at Stanford. So Stanford is very different from us. The universities that are closest to us of the ones I looked at, and I wasn’t fully comprehensive, were Yale with 36%, Northwestern with 32% and Harvard with 25%. So we clearly made a decision to expand the share of non-tenured track faculty. So the question is, how should we think about this increasing reliance on non-tenured track faculty? My answer is that it depends on two things. It depends first on how we treat them and secondly the extent to which they can contribute to our mission. So as I think about how we treat them, my understanding is that we at Duke treat our full time non-tenured track faculty really quite well. I don’t know anything about the part time people who come in to teach individual courses, but based on my discussions with people, we appear to pay them at the same general rates as the tenured track faculty, and we engage them in the running of programs within our departments. That’s certainly true in Public Policy. They’re also members of the Academic Council. When I think about this question, the crucial thing for me is that we do not treat our non-tenured track faculty as second class citizens. Now that’s not the case in all universities. In the last few weeks, I’ve been talking to people at the University of Michigan and other big state universities where the growth of non-tenured track faculty is just a huge issue and my understanding in many cases those are adjunct part-time faculty. But often at the big state universities, especially in these days of financial distress, universities are bringing in non-tenure track faculty as a cost cutting device and then not treating them well. So their

salaries are low, they have insecurity in their positions and at these other universities—not at Duke—they are very much viewed as second class citizens. So I hope I am right in thinking we treat our non-tenure track faculty well, and if there's someone in the audience who wants to disagree that's fine. Certainly it's what we try to do in the Sanford School. So the other part of it is, how do they relate to our mission, how do we think of them as contributing to the mission, because that's just a central issue, I think. My experience here is primarily at the Sanford School with some knowledge about what happens in other schools and other departments but clearly in the Sanford School many of our Professors of Practice who come directly from practice and policy, directly contribute to our mission. So our mission is very much putting knowledge at the service of society, and I remind you that two of our graduate programs are involved with training professional students. Our main Masters degree is an MPP program—Master of Public Policy—it's a professional two-year degree and we have an international program bringing in policymakers and practitioners from around the world. We need Professors of the Practice who have that context and real world knowledge to help us fulfill our mission of being a first class public policy program. Now another main role of non-tenure track faculty in our department or school and also around the University has very much to do with teaching and often undergraduate teaching. We have a number of PoPs around the University who teach big core introductory courses, and also do administration with respect to undergraduate programs. Our DUS at the Sanford School is a PoP, not a regular tenure track faculty member. There's lots of administrative work these days related to various programs including the undergraduate program. And I know around the University there are a number of PoPs who teach the big introductory courses. Now, how

should we think about that role? My guess is, in many cases those non-tenure track faculty have not only a comparative advantage but also in many cases perhaps an absolute advantage in teaching some of those courses, and given teaching is a major part of our mission, it makes sense to have great teachers in the classroom. We owe that to our students. Now having them in the classroom does free up some of the rest of us, at least this is the way I like to think about it, to teach electives, where we can expose the students to our research, and encourage the students to do the sorts of research that we're doing. So I think there are some real advantages of having some of the non-tenure track faculty play this teaching role. But there is a big caution here, and one that we've paid a lot of attention to at the Sanford School. It would be a mistake, I think, to have all the tenure and tenure-track faculty to not be engaged in our core courses, and we have pretty much a rule in our department that all of the tenure and tenure-track faculty teach at least one core course in one of our various degree programs each year and I think that's absolutely essential. If we moved away from that I think it'd be a disservice to our mission. It's really important that those of us on the tenure track and tenured faculty have a big stake in our teaching programs which are so central to our reason for being here. So let me turn more briefly to the aging of the professoriate. In case you haven't noticed, we at Duke—many of us on the faculty—are getting older.

Kelley: I didn't notice at all (laughter).

Ladd: And this is true at Duke and elsewhere as well. Once again, turning to Peter Lange's data, this time on just the tenure track faculty, so I'm not talking about non-tenure track, I noticed that the percentage of faculty over age 60, that young age of 60, increased from 15% in 1999 to 24% in 2012 and presumably will continue to rise. Moreover, the percent of

faculty—this is tenure and tenure-track faculty who are over 70 has increased over the same period from about 2% to 6% and presumably that's increasing as well. Now I want to point out that this is happening at lots of universities. There was an article in the Chronicle recently that highlighted Cornell, and noted that the percent of faculty there over 60 was 35%, and we're at 24%, so we're not as high as all universities. Now there are lots of reasons for this aging of the professoriate. The main one obviously is the removal of the national policy of mandatory retirement in 1994. I might remind you that mandatory retirement ended earlier in most other professions, but for many years from 1987-1994 universities had an exception, on the grounds that it would be a mistake for us not to encourage our faculty to retire because we want to bring in new blood and new ideas and new thinking. But interestingly there was a national research council study in the early 90s that said it was okay to remove the retirement age for universities, that people would be willing to retire, and that this would not lead to dramatic changes in the university. I believe that study was wrong (laughter). In part because since then we've had the recession and that affects things, but I think it's particularly wrong for a university like Duke. Working conditions at Duke are terrific, and it's tempting to stay on—I can talk as a 67 year old—it's tempting to stay on for a long time. I love what I'm doing, as do a lot of my colleagues and contemporaries. We still do research. We may not be able to play tennis as well as we use to, but we can still do research and teach. Now the situation in other universities is not always similar and big universities, state universities where there are cut backs and huge classes, the situation may be different. But in any case, I think this is an issue and one we ought to think about. So my final comment just to relate to the question of how big a cause for concern is this? Well certainly having an aging professoriate here at

Duke does limit our ability to hire new assistant professors, and to benefit from their new ideas and energy. It also may limit our ability to attract PhD students to the extent that this is going on everywhere, if we get PhD students and then there aren't jobs for them, this is a problem for the professoriate more generally. Another consideration is the aging professoriate raises salary costs. Typically those of us who are older get higher salaries than the younger group. So the larger proportion of higher salaries there are, the same number of faculty, then the higher the salary pool. In terms of the net effect on the quality of the faculty that's a hard thing to say. Some of us, like myself in the social sciences, think we're smarter, and know more than when we were a lot younger, and so having more of us around would be a good thing in social sciences. I know a lot more now than I did thirty years ago, but in other fields the situation may be different. I hear about math and other science fields, maybe people peak much younger. I don't know what it does to the overall quality, but it's clearly a problem to have an aging professoriate, if people like me stay beyond our "use by date," (laughter) and I've told all my friends not to let that happen to me. So I'm not sure what can be done about the aging professoriate, but I think that it's an issue we ought to talk about. Thank you.

Questions

Costanzo: Thank you to all three of you and I'm going to open this up to questions. I would just like to do a very short summary of what I've heard. I think all of you have spoken to the many changes in relation to the essence of the University. I think diversity is not a separate issue, it improves what we're attempting to do as a University: engaging people in the outside world. It's a big change. But we don't do it for its own purpose, we do it because it has an effect, it makes better

doctors, it makes better musicians, it makes better policy makers. I think it's important that we keep anchoring in what we're actually trying to do, and have been trying to do since we've been an institution, which is about when I got here (laughter). So as one of the people who continues to peak (laughter) I would like to turn to you to address questions to anybody from our panel that you wish to discuss the changes in the professoriate with.

Jane Richardson (Biochemistry): I'm interested in another piece of the non-tenured faculty that I see more of, which is the research faculty, both in Arts & Sciences and particularly in the medical school. Having been one for a number of years, I certainly am not against it, and actually I had a marvelous position which doesn't exist anymore, where you accrued years to tenure but you didn't get thrown out if you never did it. I don't think we have that anymore, that would be nice, but it is a concern, particularly now that research funds are dwindling, that it's harder to support these people on soft money. But there's another thing that I think that we can do as a matter of policy that would help with your issue of how they can contribute because in recent years, at least in some departments and some programs, there's been a problem because people were not allowed to teach or take graduate students if they were 100% on soft money. And this is bad for them, and it's bad for the department and programs, and if the University would pay a tiny percent of their salary then they could do these things and I think this would be an excellent use of some of our money.

Ladd: Interesting. I don't have a lot to say about that. My understanding is some of our research professors in the Sanford School are given opportunities to teach, but not a promise every year. Maybe somebody can correct me about this. But when we have opportuni-

ties for teaching, such as a lab, we pay them extra to do that. But maybe somebody else like Peter (Lange) has some other thoughts on this issue.

Costanzo: I would like to say, I agree with you that our research professor ranks have really increased with the increase in the external support for research, and the bringing in of smart, young post-docs and then bringing in research scientists that stay for a while. And I don't know that we've figured out how to handle that contribution to the University. I know Jim Siedow has been working with continuing to have a post doc feel like a member of the community, but I think that you're right, that they're really endangered by what changes in fiscal policy happen, and I don't know that there's a collective response to this or an administrative response, but it is difficult. We've inflated our ranks, let's put it that way. We're a larger faculty because of the diversity of the ranks that we have, but then again we are inflated, we are like a balloon that can burst at some point – hopefully that won't happen but I do agree with you that it is a problem to solve.

Jocelyn Olcott (History): I have a question for Professor Ladd about the change in the figures of non-tenure track. Because it seems like the thing of using them in the Arts & Sciences and places like the Sanford School, the number would remain fairly constant, so I'm wondering if those are the places that it's going up or if there's other things driving the change. And the other percent, talking about the third rail issue, is the issue of scholarly endogamy which is that we let the bigger demographic change in the time that we're talking about. And at least in the history department, which is where I'm based, I feel like with everybody that we've hired in the last ten years, there's this so called two-body problem and that relates to how we think about the professoriate. I think that Duke has

really flourished in a way because we've managed to attract and retain really top notch faculty because we make their partners more accommodations, but it creates pressures in other ways. So, I was wondering where that part of the puzzle fits in to the overall demographics that you discussed?

Ladd: I'm glad you mentioned the demographics because that in part relates to the aging of the professoriate. So one of the reasons I believe that universities made the exception from 1987-1994 was not only that we needed new, young professors but that a lot of those young professors would be women and minorities, and it was important to allow them to come into the University and change what had been, in many cases, a very white and male profession. So your other question about spousal hires, that's a complicated one. What I know from the Sanford School is whenever we hire one person that there is often an issue about a spouse, and we do whatever we can to try to find a place for that person. I can tell you that I am very concerned about cutbacks in this state for funding of the public universities, so we're not alone, and we are fortunate to be at Duke at a private university. But when we see cutbacks in the public universities that's also cutbacks in places that spouses of some of our faculty could work, so that's a huge issue for us going forward and we ought to be up there lobbying with UNC to not have cutbacks in our public universities.

Clements: There are a couple things going on if you look at—this is actually from Cornell—a report about the professoriate of the decrease in the full time faculty percentage as well as a change to non-tenured faculty. So both of those things are going on at the same time, and it is different by department. So what you observe is correct.

Ladd: So I do have some data and Peter can give you more on differences by department. The fastest annual growth in non-tenured track faculty among the schools and departments at Duke between 1999 and 2013 was in the Law School at 19%.

Peter Lange (Provost): If I can just say, the numbers are a little deceptive because you have to really look carefully. So the growth rate in Arts & Sciences for non-tenured track is about 4% as compared to 1% and it means at the end, the total number of non-tenured track went from 94 to 144 and of the tenured and tenure track went from 491 to 520. So the percentages of non-tenured track did not grow as fast. The law school is irrelevant to the total numbers because it's so small. The biggest driver of non-tenured track faculty is in the medical school, and most of it is on soft money environment in which those non-tenured track research faculty are essential to the success of the tenure track faculty in being able to conduct their research and renew their grants structure. So it's been very different across schools. In the Law School it's been the expansion of clinics, and Sunny's absolutely right that there was a self-conscious policy in the early 90s to create the PoP track in order not to have faculty who had those kinds of responsibilities but who were not well treated, so that's when we created the ability to promote people and all of that. So those things are tied up, but the Arts & Sciences numbers, which are the second biggest driver after Medicine, are very different than the Medicine ones.

Lozier: I'll just add that ECAC looked at this recently, both over the ten year window of 2003 to 2013 and other than the Sanford School and the School of Medicine, there are some units that have actually decreased their fraction of non-tenured track. So the numbers are very small, these are the past ten years. We actually went through school by

school. So we have about five more minutes for Council Conversations. There are so many other interesting things on the agenda. So if there are other questions?

Richard Brodhead (President): I'd like to ask a question and maybe you think someone should ask this of me, but I would actually love to hear what you or anyone thinks about this. We are all in the professoriate, and you may like some things day by day more or less, but here we are inside a great university, in a faculty meeting, and I think the main question that all of this raises is the question of the renewal of the professoriate, and what are the conditions that encourage the kind of people who great universities are going to be built on to want to become faculty members? Because that is itself one of the things that has changed. It hasn't only changed recently, and it doesn't only ever change for the worse. I mean I'm in one of the fields where it changed for the worse around 1971, and then there's been a variety of better and mostly worse (laughter) since then, but now I go to these places where you hear that the average age at which a person in biomedicine gets their first ROI is 42, and then I recently went to a place where I heard the truly scary statistic, which is that the age gap between when faculty members are first hired in biomedicine and when they get their first independent research grant has grown from about 1 year to 5 years. Now think what that means for the life of the University and how tellable is that going to be, and what's the consequence of that going to be? It just seems to me, you know you're all thoughtful people and you're all great mentors, so it seems to me that it would just be interesting to ask you, how do you see the question of the renewal of the professoriate? There are macro-things none of us can change, but are there things that a university can do itself to help to recruit its students for universities and to help make sure there are openings?

Clements: Well, the greatest attribute of Duke from everyone that I talk to who wants to come here, is its ability to innovate, be progressive, try things that you couldn't try elsewhere, and so you tend to get eager and excited people. What we have to do is do a good job of getting them to that first step, particularly with the RO1 grants. Now you know, you're supposed to put that thing in three or four times before it gets approved. You can get a perfect score and it's not funded, so you know a lot of it is bumping up against law because there are so many people in so many places all submitting at the same thing. So that's one of the issues that I think is a real obstacle for the future—how to be more successful at that. We've been pretty successful at some other grants with our students, and you know mentoring them and getting stuff out and finding out we got five or seven that are awarded in the US or something, but this kind of funding is really, really hard.

Costanzo: It goes beyond funding. I mean one of the things I think that's really pivotal in thinking about developing the professor from within our structure and mentorship of students is the movement of the University to renew the professorate. One has to increase the degree of independent scholarship of our undergraduates and I think we've been doing that. To make scholarly work enticing, to make it part of my own search for identity to a lot of these kids, to use a cliché. And I think we've been doing that, but maybe we need to really focus on how we do that. I think things like new innovations and Duke IDEAS and Bass Connections really bring undergraduates to the same table as graduate students, post-docs, and faculty. That's terribly important. We really need to have them understand the virtues of inquiry, and I think that that will renew the professorate. For a while we were educating and buying into the no-

tion and idea of being here a long time, to educating people to go to medical school or law school or into business. But now we should feel noble enough to educate our students, to some of them at least, to become one of us, and to in fact enhance what we've done.

Kelley: And I think about, even though it was just a small peripheral comment, Sunny mentioned that early on some minorities and maybe some demographics were brought in to change the set up, and that puts a little pressure on the people who were brought in to sort of change the system (laughter). I just want you to know that it will be best for the University to not think of it that way anymore but rather—which is where we are going, this is just a reflection of reality, this a reflection of the world that is and will be and this will be a greater motivator for having diversity on all levels.

Dona Chikaraishi (Neurobiology): I've just got a comment on what people are saying. The problem is there aren't enough jobs for the biomedical PhD. I did a study for the Duke graduates of our biomedical PhD program, that only 9% of them have tenure-track jobs at research intensive institutions. About 30% would like to but there just aren't enough jobs nationally and this a reflection, which everybody has been talking about, of the NIH legacy, and in terms of what Jane was saying, if you look at the last 30 years, there's been a 250 almost 300% growth in the soft-money jobs in universities. If you look at the growth in the basic sciences in the biomedical spots, that's grown about 1% a year, so it's a tenfold difference.

Cindy Kuhn (Pharmacology & Cancer Biology/ECAC Member): I have a slightly more optimistic point of view that's going to cycle back around to our best asset which is us, and we have to be very careful about how we use that. I went to that other university as an

undergraduate that you mentioned, the 6% university and the reason I'm sitting here today is that the chairman of the department who was an active neuroscientist taught freshmen chemistry, and he's still the most exciting professor I ever had. And it is why I became a neural pharmacologist, and so you can't underestimate the importance of any one of us, but you have to be accessible to students to do it. We are our best asset and I worry as Dona does about this, because this is where I live, I'm in the biomedical discipline but we also bum our students out from the day they get here, rather than trying to inspire them about the excitement and have them aspire to be us. And mostly we aim to lower their expectations to what is realistic rather than aim for what's possible, I think, sometimes.

Costanzo: I agree with that. But one of the things I would just like to close with as we discussed and run around the topic of funding—we have to remember that universities existed prior to people's funding inquiry. It was here. It had a meaning to all of us and when I was in college, funding was not so evident, and I'm sure for some of the older among us that's true and so that's one of the beakers I think, in relation to the volume of the water. I think in some sense, you're right, it's changed things from the sciences to have funding decline but we have had a university in the sciences and the humanities and in the social sciences prior to external support, the question is how do we maintain the vital vitality of the professorate of inquiry into it by building an internal engine, not only from funds but from enthusiasm for what we do?

Kelley: I would say fiscal preoccupation is what psyched Lionel Richie (laughter) but fiscal accountability made Beethoven and Stravinsky what they were (laughter and applause).

Closing Remarks from Chair, Susan Lozier

Lozier: I think that is a fabulous note on which to end. I want to warmly thank Professors Costanzo, Clements, Kelley and Ladd for their participation today. I hope all of you enjoyed it as well. Before we move to our next agenda item, which is going to be the executive session, and I want you all to know that there are refreshments out in the lobby because this meeting is a little longer than usual but we are going to try to finish by 5:15. But before we move to executive sessions, I have a few words to mark the close of my term. I thought they would be most appropriately delivered at the conclusion of our Council Conversations because the theme of these remarks centers on the faculty voice.

When I started my term as chair, two short years ago, I imagined my primary role to be “the voice of the faculty.” I have to admit that I was a little taken with that thought, but mostly I found the thought daunting and now, I know it was naïve. In fact, when a reporter called that first September to ask what Duke faculty thought about DKU, I hesitated and then asked, “How long do you have? (laughter) This could take a while.” There is hardly one faculty voice on most any issue. Would we expect it any other way? Would we want it any other way? As I have said before behind this same podium, in a diverse and intellectually vigorous environment, there are inevitably differences of opinion. As it turns out, I had more of a background for this position than I ever suspected, because, you see, I have four sisters. Years ago when my mother tired of five voices simultaneously explaining their side of a story, she would tell us, “Enough! I know the truth is somewhere here in the middle,” which being the middle daughter, I took as her way of signaling me as the truth-sayer (laughter). I was not then the

holder of truth, and I am not now, but I have been largely in the midst of faculty issues, in the midst of faculty opinions, and very much in the midst of the faculty, these past two years. As a result I have some thoughts on faculty governance and on faculty issues that I would like to share with you today and besides it’s my last chance (laughter).

First, despite our differences of opinion, there is one thing upon which we all agree: That faculty should have a voice. But do *all* faculty have a voice? Last month, at the height of the vigorous debate in Arts & Sciences around the proposal for Semester Online, faculty in favor of the proposal were incredulous that faculty opposed to the proposal said they felt rushed into making a decision. Seemingly, information had been available for months. A trusted colleague helped explain this situation: It is not so much that people have not been informed, he said, but rather that they have not had an opportunity for their voice to be heard. And so here is the simple truth of what I have learned these past two years: that the role of the Academic Council chair, or for that matter the role of any chair of a faculty governing body, is not so much to be the voice of the faculty, but rather to *allow* faculty to give voice to their concerns, their objections, their concurrence, their ideas. Indeed this is the role of this Council. The University is not a democracy. The matters on which we vote are few; the matters on which we want a voice are many, as are the matters on which our voice is essential. As I mentioned in my remarks last March, an often-stressed role of this Council is in the shared governance between the faculty and the administration. An important role to be sure, but to me we have largely undervalued the role this Council plays in pulling us together, not so that we can oppose or support the administration on this or on that, but so that we can collectively understand and advocate for each other, so

that we can each give voice. And so I am suggesting today that our conversations continue. What started as a 50th anniversary celebration, where we take time out from business as usual to explore faculty views on a host of issues, could turn into standard practice. Today, when so much information is available all of the time, the one thing in short supply on this campus might just be conversation. When there are over 3000 Duke faculty members pulled in all directions, this Council could serve as the collection point for faculty voices. This Council could serve as the antidote to the centrifugal forces pulling us apart.

My suggestions for conversations moving forward include: First, a conversation on how we govern ourselves. Many of the deliberations during the first year of the Academic Council focused on setting the rules for this governing body. Those rules, 50 years later, still stand, largely intact. During our Council Conversations this past year we have focused on how the structure of the University, teaching and learning and the professoriate have changed here at Duke over these past 50 years, but we have not asked whether all of those changes should impact how we govern ourselves. For example: 1) As the structure of the University evolves, should too our governance structure? The divisions by which representatives are elected are the same now as in 1962. Three divisions come from Arts and Sciences, two from the School of Medicine and all other Schools provide one division each. This past spring a faculty member asked whether the University's institutes should be represented on this Council and before too long this Council will face the question of whether faculty at DKU will or will not find representation in this body. 2) 50 years ago, non-tenure track faculty were allotted at most one seat in ten for representation on this Council. And this allotment still holds today, despite the numbers we just

heard from Sunny Ladd a moment ago. Are we representational with such a limit? 3) In our by-laws, ECAC is designated as the committee on committees, meaning that all committee members, whether those committees advise the President, the Provost, or the Board of Trustees, are nominated, or in some cases, appointed by the eight members of ECAC. Is this practice sufficiently inclusive or does it create structural and/or cultural impediments to inclusion? Does it adequately bring enough players to the plate, different voices to the table? 4) During this past election cycle, less than 5% of our colleagues opted to stand for election, only 25% of the faculty voted, and two divisions did not fill their open seats. I must admit that in the solitude of my office, these numbers are discouraging. Yet, each month, when we gather here, when the optimists, the choir, the Eagle scouts, are gathered, it is hard not to be encouraged. As clearly evidenced by the statements of the past chairs, we have accomplished much. And I am extraordinarily proud of the work of this Council during the past two years. But in this conversation on faculty governance, we need to ask ourselves this hard question: is this service valued by our colleagues? Is this Council valued by our colleagues? 5) All of which leads me to my final point on this subject: a conversation on how we govern ourselves needs to include a discussion of our collective ownership of governance. Faculty governance will not work unless all faculty have faith that it does. It does not work just when the vote goes your way; it is not broken when the vote goes the other way. It works if there is ample opportunity for deliberation, if all voices are heard, and if there is a fair vote when and where a vote is warranted. When I step off this campus, I hear from different quarters a fair degree of admiration for our faculty governance here at Duke. There can always be improvement, but it seems to me, in the words of Joni Mitchell, "You don't know what you've got 'til

it's gone" (laughter). From my vantage point, all of us, and not just those of us in this room, serve the faculty and University well, if we take ownership of and pride in our faculty governance here at Duke.

A second suggested conversation is one on faculty diversity. My twenty years here at Duke have coincided almost exactly with the 10 years of the Black Faculty Strategic Initiative and then the following 10 years of the Faculty Diversity Initiative. I have listened for many years to these reports to the Council and I must admit that I have grown a bit uncomfortable with the dynamic that has developed around the issue of faculty diversity. As faculty we conduct the searches, we vote on whom to hire, we report the results of our searches to the Provost's office, and then every two years when the Provost reports back to us what we have reported, we wonder why we are not making greater gains. With this dynamic, we distance ourselves from the challenge and the opportunity of more fully diversifying our campus. The Faculty Diversity Initiative is at a ten-year mark, a decade of hard work by some, most notably Nancy Allen, Vice Provost for Faculty Diversity and Faculty Development, and Jackie Looney, Associate Vice Provost for Academic Diversity, but has it really been a decade of hard work and reflection on the part of the faculty? U.S. Senator William Cowan of Massachusetts, a 1991 Duke graduate, delivered the keynote address at an event commemorating 50 years of black undergraduate students at Duke on a Saturday afternoon a few weeks ago in Page Auditorium. Senator Cowan asked those of us assembled: 50 years after desegregating Duke, are we where we want to be? He answered his own question affirmatively. He said that we are where we want to be because at Duke we can now have open and honest conversations around issues of race. I want to believe Senator Cowan. And surely all of you do as well, but is it really true that we

are having open and honest conversations about diversity when we discuss hiring at our faculty meetings? I'm not sure, but I do know that moving forward this University is best served by faculty conversations that will shape faculty diversity aspirations. Those conversations could begin with questions such as these: 1) Our past focus has been primarily on black and female faculty. Moving forward, how do we define diversity? 2) Do we adequately understand the role that selection bias plays in our faculty hires? Do we accept that all of us carry cultural biases regardless of our race, ethnicity or gender? 3) Do we understand that we have a shared responsibility to expand our talent pool? Black faculty should not be the sole advocates for black faculty hires; women should not be the sole advocates for the hiring of female faculty and Hispanics should not be the sole advocates for Hispanic faculty and so on. 4) Do we understand why some units have been more successful than others at creating a more diverse faculty? What micro-cultures have been more conducive to diverse hiring? What leadership has been more effective? 5) Should those departments or schools, where lack of faculty diversity is blamed on the applicant pool for hires, be expected to help diversify the pool by creating a diverse graduate and/or professional student population? 6) And finally, what is the end game? Is there one? At the intersection of this 10-year mark for the Faculty Diversity Initiative, the 50-year mark for the de-segregation for our undergraduate body and the 50-year anniversary of this Council, it seems entirely appropriate for the Duke faculty, through a study group working with and through the Provost's Faculty Diversity Standing Committee, to formulate how the faculty want to approach the challenges and opportunities of creating a more diverse faculty. To answer, in essence, "Where do we go from here?"

My third and last suggestion for a conversation is one that takes up the challenge given to us by the President in his annual address to the faculty in March when he said to those of us assembled here: "You and I have work to do making Duke live up to our ambitions. But we also have work to do voicing a fuller vision of education to a culture where such voices are currently little heard. Nowadays, part of the work of educators is working to remind ourselves and others what, in the deep sense, education could really be. We have work to do." We spent time during our March meeting focused on how education has evolved over these past fifty years, now we need to continue the conversation on what education can be here at Duke. That conversation could begin with these two questions: 1) This campus used to be the world to Duke students, but now Duke students are around the world, physically and virtually; and we can only imagine that this reach will extend in the years to come. How do we best incorporate their global reach into their campus instruction? Into their Duke community? 2) The rapid pace of change in higher education, driven by factors such as technological innovations, new online platforms and global educational opportunities, presents us with a dilemma: how do we evolve, yet preserve the best of a Duke education? This question challenges us to ask and answer another: what is the best of a Duke education? What do we preserve? And this question I thought of when Anthony gave his remarks, do we stay in Detroit or move to LA (laughter)? Maybe we just move to Indiana instead (laughter).

These conversation topics are simply suggestions. I am more interested in conveying the importance of this Council as a vehicle for conversations, as a collection point for faculty voices, than anything else. I am more interested in what we can accomplish with that collection of voices. You see, I believe that though we clearly fulfill our responsibility to

engage meaningfully in the intellectual life of the university through our individual research pursuits and instructional endeavors, it is through faculty governance that we collectively fulfill the obligation of the faculty to impact the aspirational goals of the university. It is easy to forget about aspirational goals and about the tremendous privilege we are afforded of educating the next generation at this university when we occupy our time in this room with one report after another, one presentation following the next. Instead we need to take time now and then to talk about those aspirational goals, to give voice, to listen to the other voices, to converse.

With that thought I will conclude with the first poem that I shared with all of you in September of 2011.

When I Heard the Learned Astronomer, by Walt Whitman

When I heard the learned astronomer,
When the proofs, the figures, were ranged in
columns before me,
When I was shown the charts and diagrams,
to add, divide, and measure them,
When I sitting heard the astronomer where
he lectured with much applause in the lecture
room,

How soon unaccountable I became tired and
sick,
'Till rising and gliding out I wandered off by
myself,
In the mystical moist night air, and from time
to time,
Looked up in perfect silence at the stars.

It has been a pleasure to serve you these past two years, a pleasure to listen to your voices, a pleasure to share this amazing night sky that is this University. Thank you (applause).

Executive Session: Honorary Degrees for 2014

Lozier: I will now call our meeting into Executive Session for our next agenda item. All those present who are not members of the faculty, I kindly ask you to leave our meeting. But you will be invited back in about 3-5 minutes, so do not go far. I actually see some faculty leaving (laughter) And as a consolation prize, you may help yourselves to refreshments in the hallway. We will ask that you return shortly. This will take less than five minutes.

[Executive Session for the purpose of considering approval of honorary degrees for the 2014 commencement]

APC and UPC Update

Lozier: Thank you all for reconvening. As many of you know, the end of the academic year brings a number of reports from the chairs of some of the university committees considered by ECAC to conduct business closely aligned with the business of the Council. Due to the addition of our Council Conversation for our meeting today, ECAC asked that the reports for the Academic Programs Committee and for the University Priorities Committee be submitted in advance – I hope everyone was able to read over those reports which were posted with the agenda. Scott Huettel (Psychology and Neuroscience) who served as chair of APC and John Payne (Fuqua), chair of UPC, are here to answer your questions. Are there any questions? If not, I want to thank both Scott and John for their exemplary service this year. Both APC and UPC met twice per month throughout the academic year and we appreciate the time and effort they and their colleagues put toward the work of these committees (applause).

DKU Update

Lozier: Moving on to the DKU update: You were provided information with your agenda for today's update. Nora Bynum, Vice Provost for DKU and China Initiatives, is here to answer questions you have on the information in either document. Nora provided us with two documents: one was a general DKU update the other one was on DKU site conditions, and that document was prepared specifically to address questions that this Council had in the February meeting when the Provost last updated us on DKU. Are there any questions for Nora? If not, Nora, thank you for the report. Nora came to ECAC and I've meet with her separately, and I just want to acknowledge how much work she has done on looking into the DKU workers' site condition and I really appreciate the diligence you have performed and how responsive you've been to our queries. So thank you (applause).

Next, as you may recall, because of the delay in the opening of DKU, ECAC asked Jim Roberts, Executive Vice Provost for Finance & Administration, to provide an update on the DKU financial projections and risk analysis. I have asked Jim to be brief today because of the number of items on our agenda, and so his presentation is but a short summary of the information he has prepared but I want you to know that there is a lot more information that has gone in to the analysis he has provided and I appreciate all the information you have given us.

Jim Roberts (Executive Vice Provost for Finance & Administration): Thank you. I've had a great opportunity to work with Susan and John over the last couple of months to update the figures we showed you in February of last year, so this is about a 14 month lapse of time. And a kind of an underlying

premise is that in the early phases of DKU, it will be necessary to provide some form of operating subsidy. World class education is never funded by tuition alone, and as DKU grows and diversifies its resource base, the subsidy will decline and we hope at some point not be necessary. So the variable of interest has been for the last couple of years what will the subsidy be? And we've established a target. We and our partners are working very hard to maintain this target subsidy that is to be shared between Duke and the city of Kunshan on a fifty-fifty basis roughly. So we have a financial model that includes year by year, program by program. What we're going to give you is a really big summary of that work today. Again, I thank John Payne for coaching us. So this is just a reminder of what the program line up is for DKU currently. It's changed a little bit, because we've had another year of planning and you see that the Masters of Management Science, and the Masters of Science in Global Health were formally approved, last academic year. The Masters in Medical Physics is a new program, but it has just been approved by that faculty so it will go through the committees the next academic year, and we are assuming that two other Masters level program will be formed. There are conversations underway, and I think there are three possibilities, so I think this is a good bet. At the undergraduate level there's been an expansion of the program concept to the global learning semester. Nora Bynum and Dean Laurie Patton and Mary Bullock have worked very hard to broaden the engagement of Arts & Sciences faculty in a robust semester away experience for both US and international and Chinese students, and then we have a Global Health Research Center with English as a second language and executive education, by which we mean not just business education necessarily but perhaps higher education and other forms of executive education at the DKU conference center.

So here's the main slide. This is the variable of interest, which is the projected subsidy that Duke will provide over the Phase I of DKU. Phase I is now eight years rather than seven years. So when we often say that not much has changed you can see that the expected subsidy level is more or less the same, we've just added a year to it. We're expecting that Duke will invest as our half about 38.4 million, that's what we said about 14 months ago, now we're saying it's about 40.3 million but another year has been added. Inside the model though, a number of things have changed. So if we go up here, we can see that our expectation of total net revenue has increased from about 82 million dollars to 113 million dollars. That's because we've added programs, we've added more time for the programs to reach their steady state, and particularly the undergraduate program is more robust. The costs have also increased and so the required subsidy to fulfill the gap has gone up moderately and our share is proportional at 50%. Now we've done Monte Carlo risk analysis at the request of the Board of Trustees, and again with John's tutelage, we have looked at 13 variables in the probability of distribution around them. I think many of you are familiar with Monte Carlo analysis. It's a way of combining all the possibilities of these variables, and we show here at the bottom if things went poorly for us and we looked at the negative tail, what would the projected subsidy become? You can see that our downside risk for DKU is now about 56 million dollars over that eight year period, and it was about a little under 50 million dollars. John, to stress test the model, asked us to make some assumptions that were even more conservative than our initial assumptions, and you can see the second value is a little bit more conservative and those reflected some of the suggestions that John made. So we feel like we are at this point very much on track to manage DKU and to watch DKU at

the level of investment that Duke has been planning on for the last couple of years. Obviously there is more to learn as we begin to market and actually launch the programs which are expected to begin in the fall of 2014. That's really the essence of the report.

Questions

Emily Klein (Nicholas School of the Environment): So that's some good projections on the revenue side and you mentioned that, for example, it includes a greater ramp up of undergraduates. When you're talking about undergraduates, how long are we speaking of likely just Duke undergraduates there as opposed to another population?

Roberts: The structure of the undergraduate program in Phase I is a semester long non-degree but for credit program. The target is to have 50% participation from Chinese universities and 50% from the US, including Duke, but not exclusively Duke. It could also be other international students. We are trying to structure that as partnerships between DKU and other Chinese leading universities, so that it's almost an institutional cooperative agreement, rather than individual students sort of freelancing them.

Klein: Okay, so it's not totally Duke students?

Roberts: Not at all.

Klein: My follow up question was, so the revenue goes up on this bottom line but the question is if there are Arts & Sciences students and their revenue is allocated to this budget sheet, does it come out of Laurie's (Patton) here?

Roberts: Well it would be like study abroad.

Jesse Skene (Neurobiology): Just under analysis, I see you got a 90% chance, if that

goes to 95% or 99% just wondering what the tail is shaped like? Are there low probability but real risks that make it quite large for potential losses if you go out to lower probability and sort of related to that, what are the variables?

Roberts: Well keep in mind our caveat here is that risk analysis assumes that we don't react to manage the risk but I mean it's a fairly normal distribution so probably the tail goes out to 60 million or so if we don't intervene. The single biggest factor is not surprisingly going to be the enrollment times the tuition and we do have a better handle on the tuition then we had a year ago. We're assuming basically that the published price of the programs is the same as Duke, so currently about \$44,000 but there will be a scholarship program that is differentially supportive of PRC students compared to international students, probably an average discount of about 50%. So they will pay net about \$22,000 for a Master's degree from Duke.

Lozier: There is actually more information on the Council website. It gives you the full distribution of the Monte Carlo analysis. I will take one other question.

Warren Grill (Biomedical Engineering): In regards to the operational subsidy, I'm wondering if you can talk about the capital costs, and how those have changed over the course of the project and where they are now.

Roberts: The other investment Duke is making is in the master planning which has done the design of the campus and construction oversight and that's Tallman's area, he's not here today. But with the delay, it's going to go up some. It was last reported at about \$8.5 million. I don't have a firm number to provide to you, it's going to be somewhat more than that though because of the extra year. We've also intervened by putting our own Duke

employee there, and we think that's going to allow us to reduce some of the consulting, so the net of that, is still being figured out. But our guy on the ground, Dudley Willis, got there at the end of January, so he's still working out what sort of resources are still going to be needed to bring the project home for opening in Fall 2014.

Annual update from the chair of the Global Priorities Committee, Professor Jeff Vincent, Nicholas School of the Environment

Lozier: We can get those. We can ask Tallman to provide them to the Council. Thank you Jim, we appreciate that information. I'm now going to call on Professor Jeff Vincent, from the Nicholas School, to provide an update on the work of the Global Priorities Committee this past year. Just a few words before I turn the podium over to Jeff: As many of you may recall or now know from Craig's haiku, the Academic Council endorsed the creation of GPC in November of 2010, at the request of ECAC. The intent in creating this committee was to have a faculty-led and faculty-filled committee more actively involved in setting global priorities. I think Jeff you're going to talk about the charge to the committee, so I'll leave that to you.

Jeff Vincent (Nicholas School of the Environment): Thanks Susan. Susan didn't tell me that I had to report to you in verse (laughter). Probably wise, she's the poetic, physical oceanographer in the Nicholas School; I'm just one of the dismal economists that are there. However, now that Craig has immortalized the GPC in his haiku trilogy I feel empowered to take a stab at saving us some time by summarizing my report in a near haiku (laughter). So here is goes:

Three campus vision
Four guiding principles for global Duke

Sound okay? (laughter).

That's a near haiku because of the extra syllable, but I didn't have much time. (laughter and applause).

Lozier: I think that's pretty impressive on the spot. So the GPC report was issued to all of you, I'm not going to ask for a show of hands of how many of you read the report, but I'm assuming you did read it, so I will open up this time for questions.

Vincent: Maybe I'll just say one more thing, just to clarify. I encourage you to view this report as a distillation of what the GPC has learned during the last couple of years, it presents our vision of what a global Duke should look like, some principles for guiding us as we work towards that vision. It does refer to three campuses, but I emphasize that the vision really stresses the integration of the global activities on the home campus, activities at sites abroad, what we call the world campus and activities in the digital domain, with the goal of managing this whole process to really strengthen the whole campus as the iconic center of Duke. The last section of the document presents a series of questions that I think are important ones that GPC should raise as it reviews new programs. It also lays out a series of issues that we don't have good answers to at the moment, but we think are important ones that need to be considered in the years ahead. The last thing I'll do is to thank those who helped prepare this. I had a great committee: Susan Alberts (Biology), Gary Gereffi (Sociology), Ian Baucom (English) and in an ex-officio capacity, Mike Merson and Nora Bynum from OGSP. We received comments from dozens of reviewers, mostly faculty members. We plagiarized much of what they wrote in their comments—thank you for saving us some word-smithing. We received wonderful feedback at APC and ECAC, and the document that was distributed for this meeting was much re-

vised relative to earlier versions thanks to that input. And I will stop now because what I really wanted to do was get your feedback.

Lozier: They loved it (laughter).

Vincent: Nothing like a haiku by an economist to stop you in your tracks (laughter).

Lozier: I do want to say that GPC's charge is with developing and refining Duke's global strategy and assessing university and academic programs and activities operating globally, both when they are being created and in monitoring ongoing performance. Under Jeff's leadership, GPC has done a fabulous job. I have sat in those meetings for two years, Jeff really started it with the GPC as a brand new committee, and they have worked hard producing this report and looked for consensus opinion and have really done a review of the program. And I think the committee has added substantially to faculty's understanding of the global priorities here at Duke. If there are no other questions we will move to the next one, but please join me in thanking Jeff (applause).

Salary Equity Report Presentation – Professor Merlise Clyde, Statistical Science

I now call Professor Merlise Clyde, from the Department of Statistical Science, to present our last item, which is the salary equity report. This report has traditionally been given to the Council every two years. However, with the economic downturn in 2008 and the freeze of faculty salaries for two years in a row, the report was postponed until the data warranted a new report. Last spring, I approached the Provost and asked if this time around, the salary analysis could be performed by a faculty committee and he agreed. And since last fall, a subcommittee of the

Faculty Compensation Committee has worked on this analysis. Merlise has done the primary analysis, in close association with Professor Dalene Stangl, also from Statistical Science. Other members of the salary equity subcommittee are: Julie Britton and John Payne, both from Fuqua. I would also like to note here that Rochelle Schwartz-Bloom (Pharmacology & Cancer Biology), chair of the Faculty Compensation Committee, has played a key role in producing this report. Merlise and Dalene were given access to all de-identified salary data by David-Jamison Drake from the Provost's office. During this past year, David has been remarkably responsive to faculty requests, and remarkably insightful about the data and its analysis. This analysis has clearly been a team effort between the administration and the faculty.

Merlise Clyde (Statistical Science): Maybe the diversity committee needs to consider height (laughter). This is a summary of the statistical analysis that we've done over the last year, and is based on 946 individuals in tenure track positions. We've removed all the faculty who were in primarily administrative roles or had left the University during the year. All the salaries are based on nine month salaries or have been converted to the equivalent for people in the medical center, basic sciences as well as part-time faculty. This excludes all the supplementary pay that might be received by department shares. We have a separate analysis for assistant professors, associate professors and the full professors. Variables that are used in trying to explain differences in salary: departments are probably the most important, we also consider the time and rank. We have added a new variable, that is the rank at hire, to see if there are any differences that might be attributed to individuals who have been moved from say research track or professor of the practice into the tenure track. Department chair is an indicator, and also distinguished professor is

an indicator that is used in the analysis of all the full professors. Of course the goal of this committee is to identify or to examine if there are any differences to gender or to race. For this analysis we've collapsed race based on Caucasian versus non-Caucasian and that is defined as Asian, Black, Hispanic or two or more races or ethnic groups. And part of the reason for that is because of the small samples, especially when we break things down by the departments, and also just for comparison with the previous year's analyses. Statistical models have primarily been based on linear regression using a log transformation with the salary, and as many of you know faculty are not necessarily normal (laughter). So when looking at this idealized model to try to explain salary based on these variables we often find that there are outliers: both individuals who earn more or less than what might be expected based on the normal distribution. And so one of the processes is when we go through and look at outliers, if we remove both high and low, it becomes similar to Fantasia's broom in that there are other individuals who appear who happen to have larger or lower salaries than expected based on normal models. And so for this analysis we've actually introduced a robust regression method, again using the log salary as a way to automatically account for these non-normal faculty. To present results for the assistant professor, we actually have a total of 167 assistant professors. The variables here then again are the department, rank and hire, race and gender. The model, as one might expect, is driven primarily by market forces. 95% of variation in salaries can be explained primarily by the department. Median salaries for Caucasians were 2.5% lower and of course this is kind of an idealized model, there is uncertainty and so to reflect information about the median salaries we computed intervals that reflect that the range may be as low as 4.59% lower to .14% higher from the non-Caucasian. Basically if these in-

tervals include zero, there is no statistical significance in those results, and so we can interpret this as there being no difference between the Caucasians and non-Caucasians. Similarly if we look at the analysis for gender, median salaries for males were 1.68% and again this interval estimate includes zero, and again you can see that there is really no difference between males and females at the assistant professor level. So to summarize, neither gender nor race are statistically significant predictors after we adjust primarily for the department levels. This next plot is going to show you the time trend based on our previous analyses that have been done. And so every two years there's been a salary equity study. You can see the gap here, 2010, where no study was done. Each of these points is reflecting the median salary difference between Caucasian versus non-Caucasian, and the bars here are reflecting our uncertainty. And the main point from this is that this horizontal dash line represents the point of having no difference between Caucasians and non-Caucasians. What we see is that there is fluctuation in the numbers over time, but there really is no difference here between the Caucasians and non-Caucasians. If we look at gender, what we see is that, again similar trend, while here we have a result where males are earning slightly more than females, all of these intervals again include zero.

For associate professors, we have 230. We've added an additional predictor, which is the time and rank because again this is a larger cohort, and so over time additional variability accumulates. This model explains 77% of the variation in salaries, and so we're starting to see more of these types of differences in say productivity, or other factors that affect individual salaries. Median salaries for Caucasians were 2.78% lower than non-Caucasians. Salaries for males were 3.7% higher than females. In both cases neither

gender nor race are significant predictors of salary after we've adjusted for the department, the time and rank, and again the rank at which they were hired. And so if we look again, at the time trend, what we're seeing is—here's our horizontal line at zero, all of these intervals do include zero—and again these are fluctuating and if anything it looks like there has been slight improvement in terms of differences between Caucasians and non-Caucasians. For gender, again the intervals all include zero.

For full professors we have 548. This is the largest cohort. Additional predictor variables that are included are the department chair and whether or not an individual is a distinguished professor. This model explains about 70% of the variation in the salaries. Median salaries for Caucasians are .77% lower, and there is no statistical difference here. However, at this point when we look at the median salaries for males compared to females it is 4.45% higher, and this interval actually does exclude zero. It's marginally significant, and I'll come back to some of the possible explanations for that. So race is not a significant predictor of salaries after we've adjusted for all of these other variables. However gender does appear to be significant using this robust regression analysis, and what we've found in doing this analysis is that there were a number of outliers—individuals who have had much higher or much lower salaries if one removes those from the analysis. Again there are additional observations that still have more extreme values than one would expect. So the robust analysis actually gives a slightly different result than what we get when you just do an ordinary regression and do not take into account those extreme points, and so just to show the trend for race with the robust regression. This is the results for ordinary squares, just the linear regressions methods. These are very comparable. The robust re-

gression might have a slightly narrower interval in this case but they more or less agree. If we look at gender, this is where we see a slight difference. There are individuals—again based on these kinds of extreme points—there are additional males who had much lower salaries than expected. Some of those we were actually able to go back and identify as having gone to half-time salary or quarter-time salary and have replaced that. There's still some other individuals in there that were uncertain of whether they had their full salary in there, and so that's one of the issues with using just ordinary squares as a method—we're unsure of whether we have their full salaries. We don't want those individuals to influence the analysis, so the robust method automatically down weights any of these extremes at both the high side and the low side to get a more efficient estimate of what the differences are. If one just removes some of the individuals and throw the data away, the results in these linear regressions are kind of intermediate to this.

One of the questions that the committee posed is: we have this very large cohort now of full professors, could we look at the difference between distinguished professors—what are the differences at that level or at the full level of non-distinguished professors? So we went back. There are 212 individuals who are distinguished professors. This model explains about 63% of the variation in salaries. If we look at the median salary for Caucasians, again it's 4.8% lower but there are no statistical differences at this point. Also reassuring when we look at the median salaries for males compared to females, they are 3.23% higher, but there is no statistical difference in the distinguished professor cohort. So neither of these variables would be considered statistically significant after we adjust for all these other effects.

Now for some comments on this data. Some of the difference for full professors, if we remove the distinguished professor cohort, could be promotions. And in previous salary equity studies, one of the issues that arose was the time to promotion. In my understanding, the administration has taken a very active role in trying to make sure that women, who had not necessarily been promoted at the same rate from associate to full, were being considered for promotion. So what they've been trying to do is decrease that time to promotion. And what we see when we go back and look at the current discrepancies from the model is that there appears to be this cohort, sometime after 2008, where we have the number of individuals who have been promoted to full professor—there looks like there may be a larger proportion of women—where the model is over predicting what they should be earning. So again, during this period, there's been limited time for raises and salary increases. So again, the differences are primarily in female salaries after 2008. There have also been a number of female professors who have been promoted out of the full professor cohort into the distinguished professor cohort. So it's this movement of different groups, and perhaps the limited salary pool that may be leading to this difference that we are seeing in the full professor cohort, when we remove the distinguished professors.

So the next step is a predication model that is based on using only the male faculty salaries at each of the separate ranks. This is used then to identify cases where there may be potential inequity in salaries. When salaries are lower than expected, this list of individuals is provided to the Provost, so they can, by individual cases, consider other factors that may be reflected in the actual individual salaries. Again this is a statistical model, it's an idealized model to try to look at how salaries might be set based on which department

you're in and your rank, and so we need to take into account these other factors, such as productivity, sub-rate compression from recent hires and other aspects that may be affecting individual salary (applause).

Provost Lange: I'm happy to answer any questions.

Lozier: Okay, thank you. I first want to thank Merlise. I did mention earlier that this analysis has been a team effort. I would be remiss if I did not emphasize the tremendous amount of work that Merlise has put into this analysis on behalf of the faculty. During the past year of working with Merlise, I have been so impressed with her expertise, her sense of humor, her responsiveness to faculty inquiries, and her commitment to looking at the data objectively.

Costanzo: I noticed that as you go through the ranks the amount of unexplained variables increases with rank. What do you attribute this to? Is it the great diversity at different ranks and in terms of productivity versus starting salaries?

Clyde: There could be a whole range of things. I mean in some sense the market forces may be primarily driving at the assistant professor level, and so you've got people who are coming in competing for the same jobs, and there might not be a lot of room for variability at that point. When you get to higher ranks of course, there are a number of other factors. It could be productivity, it could be differentials in who is going out to get outside offers versus not. One of the questions, particularly at the full professor level, is individuals who may have been an administrator, and so have retained perhaps supplements, even though they are no longer an administrator. And again some of the variation that we are seeing here, particularly in the basic sciences, is the coding of the data. So we don't

know if we have their full salaries, or if there are other clinical supplements that haven't been coded or that are not reported here.

Klein: It was a wonderful presentation analysis. So I realize that in statistics, small numbers are worrisome but did you dive into non-Caucasian and parse that at all?

Clyde: We did actually go back and look at that. If we bring it in for each of the separate groups, there really is no difference there. So the problem is that when you start to get into some of the larger groups, and you look at interactions that you just can't estimate some of those conditions. But there doesn't seem to be any evidence.

Michael Gustafson (Pratt School of Engineering): Given the increased, and increasing numbers of non-tenure track regular faculty is any similar study proposed for creatures such as us?

Clyde: Yes, so we actually have the data for all the Professors of the Practice that is on our radar screen. Dalene Stangl has started to do some preliminary analyses with the PoP data. And research-track faculty would be another area where we should look at these models, and so one question is should they all be pooled together or should we do separate analyses?

Provost Lange: Let me just say one thing on that. Research-track faculty would be way more difficult to do than the Professors of the Practice because the PoPs are basically on hard money, whereas the research professors are very heavily on soft money, and that external environment would drive those salaries very extensively. But for the PoPs we absolutely want to do that.

Richardson: I was just curious how did you fit age into this?

Clyde: So we've not included age as a predictor here. They are actually in the data set that was provided. We do have the date of birth and so one could put that in there. More or less we are looking at the time and rank and so the idea is, not necessarily from the time that you got your PhD, because some individuals may do post docs for a couple years. Some people may go straight from their PhD into a faculty position. So we're really looking at the time from which an individual started in that particular rank. Assuming everything else is all equal based on that.

Richardson: Well there would be a difference if you looked at the time when they started as a professor at all. That might be interesting.

Clyde: That's another analysis that they actually did conduct. Michael Lavine looked at that. So looking at the time to promotion and considering whether or not there was a difference between individuals who started at Duke, at what time were they then promoted from associate to full.

Lozier: Please join me in thanking Merlise (applause). At this point in our meeting, we need to transfer power to ECAC for the summer months. Our bylaws state that the Academic Council meet monthly during the academic year from September to May, and at other times beyond this time frame as the Chair or ECAC (or ten members of the Council) may call. In recognition of the fact that it will likely be difficult to convene a meeting of the Council during the summer months, 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 will now introduce a motion that asks that this Council give ECAC that authority:

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 2013-2014 academic year.

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

(Approved by voice vote with no dissent)

Because, as the 20th century English novelist, G. B. Stern, once remarked: “Silent gratitude isn’t much use to anyone,” I would like to take this opportunity to voice my thanks to:

Reed Criswell, for his help every month with our sound and video here in this room. Sometimes it seems to me that Reed is the only one who knows how to advance power point slides, but thank you Reed (applause).

And my next and last thanks is to Sandra Walton. Every month for the past two years I have been propped up here by Sandra’s hard work and her attention to detail. In addition to her invaluable service to me, Sandra admirably serves this Council day in and day out, throughout the year. Please join me in thanking Sandra for her dedicated work to this Council (applause).

The May Academic Council meeting is now adjourned—I wish you all a restful summer, but before you rush off to those summer days, please join me for a reception just outside the doors. Thank you.