

Minutes of the Meeting of the Academic Council  
Thursday, May 9, 2019

**Don Taylor (Chair, Academic Council / Sanford School of Public Policy):** Hello, everyone. Thank you for coming. I hope the semester has ended well for you. We have grant deadlines and stressful things as a faculty member but the other day I was sitting in the library and man, I do not wish I had to go back and take a final exam. [laughter] I'm glad that's in the past. So congratulations to all our students.

Today is the last meeting of the Academic Council for this academic year. Some of the members' terms are ending. I would like to thank our colleagues who have served on the Council and who are rotating off. Faculty governance is important, and that means some of us have to show up and be involved and I appreciate all of you doing that.

The ECAC election results. I'm pleased to announce the three colleagues who were elected to be members of ECAC next year:

Carla Brady (School of Medicine) [applause];  
Sherryl Broverman (Biology) [applause];  
and Marin Levy (Law School) [applause].

These three newly-elected members will be joining next year:

Victoria Szabo (Art, Art History and Visual Studies) [applause];  
Mark Anthony Neal (African and African American Studies) [applause];  
Ellen Davis (Divinity), who is in Jerusalem today, so that's a good excuse, [applause];  
Lisa Keister (Sociology) [applause];  
and of course Kerry Haynie (Political Science / African and African American Studies) who will be the Chair next year. [applause]

Thank you to all these folks who are going to continue, and thank you as well to our Council colleagues who were willing to put themselves up to stand for election. I also want to thank the ECAC members who are going to be rotating off with me:

Erika Weinthal (Nicholas School of the Environment). [applause] Erika is the Vice Chair and we've actually gotten to know each other and become good friends and she often would have an important word for me [laughter] if I was ever at risk of overreacting or maybe even underreacting. That was appreciated.

Larry Zelenak (Law School). [applause] Larry is one of those dangerous committee members – often he wouldn't say much and I would be looking over at him and wondering, "I wonder what he's thinking." Eventually it would come out and it would always be for the benefit of the whole, so thank you. [laughter]

Claudia Gunsch (Civil and Environmental Engineering), who served until midyear, when she took a post as Associate Vice Provost in the Office of Faculty Advancement. So I just want to thank these folks. [applause]

I should have mentioned: the Provost contacted me earlier today and something came up so she wasn't able to be here today, and Tallman [Trask, Executive Vice President] had to do something with the trustees. So they send their regrets.

**APPROVAL OF APRIL 18, 2019 MEETING MINUTES**

**Taylor:** The next item on the agenda is the approval of the April 18 meeting minutes. They were posted ahead of time. Were there any corrections or edits?

*[Minutes approved by voice vote without dissent]*

**APPROVAL OF EARNED DEGREES**

**Taylor:** Next, we are going to have a bit of ceremony that actually is an important thing. In accordance with the University Bylaws, we're going to call representatives from our various schools for recommendations of approved candidates for earned degrees. The list will then be forwarded to the Provost for approval by the Board of Trustees at their meeting tomorrow.

**The Graduate School**

<i>Dean Paula D. McClain</i>	
Doctor of Philosophy	199
Carolina Duke Program in German Studies - PhD	0
Carolina Duke Program in German Studies - AM	1
Master of Arts	147

Master of Fine Arts	9
Master of Arts in Teaching	0
Master of Science	256
DKU – Master of Science	22
Duke-NUS Integrated Biology and Medicine - PhD	11

**School of Medicine**

<i>Dean Mary E. Klotman</i>	
Doctor of Medicine	119
Master of Health Sciences in Clinical Research	18
Master of Health Sciences in Clinical Leadership	0
Master of Science in Biomedical Sciences	40
Master of Biostatistics	28
Master of Health Sciences	0
Doctor of Physical Therapy	76

**School of Law**

<i>Dean Kerry Abrams</i>	
Juris Doctor	218
Master of Laws	88
Master of Laws, International and Comparative Law	16
Master of Laws, Law and Entrepreneurship	8
Master of Laws, Judicial Studies	0
Master of Legal Studies	0
Doctor of Juridical Science	0

**Divinity School**

<i>Dean L. Gregory Jones</i>	
Master of Arts in Christian Practice	2
Master of Arts in Christian Studies	1
Master of Theological Studies	37
Master of Divinity	96
Master of Theology	5
Doctor of Ministry	23
Doctor of Theology	2

**School of Nursing**

<i>Dean Marion E. Broome</i>	
Bachelor of Science in Nursing	64

Master of Science in Nursing	44
Doctor of Nursing Practice	26

**Fuqua School of Business**

*Dean William F. Boulding*

Master of Business Administration	426
Master of Management Studies	125
Master of Science in Quantitative Management	136
DKU – Master of Management Studies	57

**Nicholas School of the Environment**

*Dean Toddi Steelman*

Master of Environmental Management	166
Master of Forestry	1

**Sanford School of Public Policy**

*Dean Judith Kelley*

Master of International Development Policy	31
Master of Public Policy	77
DKU - Master of Environmental Policy	9

**Pratt School of Engineering**

*Dean Ravi V. Bellamkonda*

Bachelor of Science in Engineering	284
Master of Engineering Management	47
Master of Engineering	34

**Trinity College of Arts and Sciences**

*Dean Valerie S. Ashby*

Bachelor of Arts	652
Bachelor of Science	640

**TOTAL NUMBER OF DEGREES EARNED:  
4230**

*[Candidates for earned degrees approved  
by voice vote without dissent]*

**Taylor:** Congratulations to our students.  
[applause]

***VOTE TO REAPPOINT PROFESSOR TOM  
METZLOFF AS FACULTY OMBUDS***

**Taylor:** The next item on the agenda is the reappointment of the Faculty Ombuds, Tom Metzloff. He just stepped out. He'll be coming back.

**Speaker:** We hope! [laughter]

**Taylor:** Tom is a Professor in the School of Law. He just completed his second year of a two-year term. As we mentioned at the last meeting, ECAC intended to put Tom forward for reappointment and that's what we are proposing here today. Is there any discussion of this? No one sent any questions or comments, but are there any questions or comments?

**Emily Klein (Nicholas School of the Environment):** I would just say that I think he has raised the Ombuds position to a level that we hoped. He has reconfigured things. I'm very pleased.

**Taylor:** Yes, ECAC has worked pretty closely with him. He has brought professionalism to this. Well said. May I have a second for the motion from ECAC to reappoint Professor Metzloff for a two-year term as Ombuds?

*[Reappointment of Tom Metzloff as Faculty Ombuds approved by voice vote without dissent]*

Also, I mentioned to you that we are going to appoint a second Ombuds in the School of Medicine. I had a communication with Ann Brown (Vice Dean for Faculty, School of Medicine) today. They are close to having a candidate to suggest and they are still trying to nail down some details. As I mentioned last week, the plan is for the Executive Committee to act on behalf

of the Council over the summer. It seems likely that another Ombuds from the School of Medicine could be in place by July 1. So there will be more coming about that later. We will welcome Tom back and we'll congratulate him and thank him. And then we will be going into executive session for Honorary Degrees for a brief period, so members of the press will need to leave for that. Tom, on behalf of the faculty and ECAC, we just want to thank you. The comments were that you've really professionalized this role and we appreciate that. [applause] I also shared with the Council that the School of Medicine is getting closer to identifying a School of Medicine Ombuds and I believe you've actually been talking with them about that, and I shared that with them. So, thank you.

*[Executive Session for the purpose of the approval of candidates for Honorary Degrees for 2020]*

*[Return to open session]*

**PRESENTATION FROM EXECUTIVE VICE PROVOST JENNIFER FRANCIS REGARDING DATA ANALYSES ON THE COMPOSITION OF THE FACULTY AT DUKE**

**Taylor:** Next, we're going to have a presentation from Executive Vice Provost Jennifer Francis on the composition of the Duke faculty. If you recall, Gavan Fitzsimons (Fuqua School of Business) chaired an Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Rank Distribution that the Academic Council created two years ago. We decided that we thought we should be able to count ourselves. It actually turns out that's more complicated than you might think. And if you were at our October 2018 meeting, we saw results

presented by Gavan and his committee. They both gave some numbers and they also talked about some worries and concerns about the data. In particular, there were questions about the rate of rise, or whether there had been a rise, in non-regular rank, non-tenure track faculty. There arose worries about how some of these titles were being used and some of them were being used in honorific ways when they may have sometimes showed up as looking like they were actually faculty members here. Jennifer has taken that under advisement, spent a lot of time, and she's now going to bring us a different way to count the faculty. ECAC talked with her about this and we actually think this is a better representation of who we are. It's probably not the only way to count us, but it's an improvement.

**Jennifer Francis (Executive Vice Provost):** Thanks, everyone. There have been discussions around the quality of the data, issues with the data, so I want to kind of turn to the data directly. This is just a little sample, if you will, of what the data looks like. [refers to slide] Our main data repository at Duke for faculty is called dFAC, data faculty. It contains a whole bunch of information for an individual faculty member and you can think of it as each faculty member having a row and a year associated with that. Again, think of this as just a small picture of it. What I want to point out here is where I think the problem comes about in using this database as a primary source or maybe even the only source for looking at the changes in the faculty, even though it might make sense at initial glance to use this. To show you this, I'm going to pick out a couple people here. This is Mary Smith. Mary Smith is a tenure track faculty. She's regular rank. Here's

Margaret Silver. Margaret Silver is an adjunct professor. She's non-tenure track and she's non-regular rank. With almost probability one, in fact I would say it's really close to that, Mary Smith is what we would call a full time equivalent (FTE). So this is her job. She's spending 100% of her time at Duke, working in some research, teaching, or service capacity. However, the likelihood that Margaret Silver is a full time equivalent at Duke is much less. It's possible that this adjunct professor is doing 100% of her time here, but it could be as low as zero. Because this is a faculty database that's a repository, so, for example, in some schools in some places they may have faculty who we call – they use the phrase “zero rate of pay.” Those people are put in this database and they may be affiliates, they may do other things, or they may just be coming in to advise students. We might have Margaret Silver maybe teaching one class for us. So Margaret is in there, but I don't think we would call her a full time equivalent. So the problem you have is when you think about each row of these as representing a faculty, you quickly get to a problem that you can see that you could potentially have many more non-regular rank faculty than you would for regular rank faculty merely because of this full time equivalency, and the fact that this database is cumulative. People keep adding to it. You rarely see people removing from it. It's highly likely you will have the appearance that non-regular rank has increased over time and regular rank, particularly tenure track, has not. So what we need to do is think of a different lens through which we can view the ranking data. I thought about that and I came up with the following way to see this. The view I'm going to present to you is, let's imagine the view that our students see. So our students are in the room and

they're looking at the person in front of them who is their professor, their teacher, their instructor, and basically, that person could either be a tenure track, regular rank, I'm going to call those “blues,” [refers to slide] they could be a non-tenure track, regular rank, “greens,” you can think of those as PoPs, just as an example within that. The person could be “orange,” non-regular rank. Think of that as adjunct, but we have a number of other titles there. They could be a graduate student or a post-doc or what we also call “exempt administrators.” We can talk about those last two but they are extremely small portions of our teaching as you are going to see. Really, all of the action, so to speak, is in the first three categories. The value of this analysis is that what we are going to be doing here is taking that dFAC database and we're going to mesh it up with our registration system with our courses. The nice thing about this is now we can really cut and splice, we can move this around any way we wish to look at undergraduate courses and graduate courses. We can look at this in any school. We can even look at it using demographics of the particular faculty member. I'm going to do this at the highest level, although we have dug a little bit deeper. At the highest level, here is what the data tell us about the view from the students' perception of if you're an undergraduate student, what this looked like over the past ten years. What I would conclude, my observation from looking at this graph, [refers to slide] is that very little has changed with respect to the blues. Tenure track faculty have accounted for roughly 47-49% of the undergraduate courses taught at Duke for about the past ten years. If you look at the rest of the graph though, if you see any movement, the movement is that the orange has gone down, the use of adjunct,

non-regular rank faculty has declined, and the undergraduate domain and the use of regular rank, non-tenure track has increased. So if anything, adjuncts have gone down, PoPs have gone up, is the perception. As I pointed out to you, the other categories are very small. I will note that we can do the same analysis but break it down by the schools that are within the undergraduate domain, A&S, Pratt, Sanford, and Nicholas, and you find the same general picture. If we look at the graduate space, again, not unexpectedly, we see a much greater percentage of the graduate and professional courses taught by tenure track faculty. Again, you can see an increase in the amount of regular rank faculty [refers to slide] and the orange, there may be an increase there, but that's probably just due to the very first observation. If you took that one out, I doubt you'd see much of a difference over time. I also want to point out the numbers at the top, N=3,200, just give you a rough idea of how big the number of courses is in each of those categories. One other thing that I thought might be useful is to go back to the undergraduate classes and ask, what's the size of the classes that the different groups are teaching? This first page here shows you all of the undergraduate classes at Duke where there is one student enrolled. There are 1,400 of those. The vast majority of those are independent studies. About 91-92% are independent studies. As you can see, they are primarily taught by tenure track faculty. There is a smaller portion that are taught by PoPs, and an even smaller portion that are taught by adjuncts. The mass of our classes fit into the realm of having somewhere between 2 and 49 students. As you can see there, we see the same pattern that we saw for the undergraduates as a whole, which is, if anything, orange has gone down, green

has gone up, and blue has stayed roughly the same. Our bigger classes, when we get to 50-99, again, most of those are being taught by tenure track faculty. When we get to the biggest classes, of which we only have about 70, for the class sizes that are greater than 100, again, most of those are being taught by tenure track faculty with regular rank following second. So, basically, if I come back to the first piece, I think the very first diagram here is very representative of what we see across the different schools at Duke. I have provided to the Deans of each school a separate analysis for each of their schools that they can take a look at. Obviously, if you're in a bigger school, these graphs don't jump around as much as if you're in a smaller school where there is fewer faculty you will see a little bit more movement, if you will, just because there is a smaller denominator. So, with that, any questions? What this misses, obviously, is the research side. However, I would say that if you look at the data, the vast number of people who are hired to do research tend to be in the non-regular rank category, particularly on the campus side. So, if anything, that's probably just to increase the non-regular rank pieces and not have much of an effect at all on the non-regular rank.

**Klein:** That's a fascinating analysis you did. I want to try to look at some of the things for my school. It flies in the face of what many of us think we know for our schools. It's surprising.

**Francis:** It's surprising but, as I said, there are possible ways it could differ, obviously, if you had a lot of research faculty who were doing something, they're not necessarily going to be represented.

**Klein:** For the teaching part of it, it is fascinating.

**Francis:** It's pretty stable, like I said, across the schools. I will say that Sanford and Divinity, because of their smaller numbers of faculty, the numbers can move around a little bit more year to year. So if five faculty do something different, you're moving the percentages much more significantly.

**Lee Baker (Cultural Anthropology):** Are the Deans pleased with this? And is the union pleased with this? And is Sally [Kornbluth, Provost] pleased with this? What has the reaction been? Are we heading in the right direction?

**Francis:** I've talked, obviously, with Sally about this and I presented at the Deans' Cabinet. I generally think when I look at this, I'm actually pleased that, if our concern was in the adjunct faculty and the growth in the non-regular rank, we're actually having more people who are devoting their full time to the mission of Duke University. That's what this tells me. Those full time have largely come about through a percentage increase in the PoPs, which has grown faster than the increase in the tenure track, which is why you're seeing this. But in all of these categories, the numbers have gone up, but it's just as a percentage of the whole. I see this as a positive. That's not speaking anything about the individuals, obviously, within those groups.

**Roxanne Springer (Physics):** Thank you for this. This is very interesting. One of the reasons that I think we requested to look at this data was not just the concern about whether or not non-regular rank versus regular rank were increasing, but because of – and Emily can speak to this

because she was the Chair of the Subcommittee in the Diversity Task Force – we were noticing the inconsistent distribution as far as demographics between non-regular rank and regular rank and adjunct. So I hope that this won't be the end of the analysis. I hope that you will continue to go in and dig into that data because, for example, we don't want a situation where we have many of the women, say, in the Sciences teaching one course – five of them teaching one course each and then the regular rank people being, as it is in some of the STEM departments, frankly, their husbands.

**Francis:** Roxanne's comment/question was, it would be very nice and very helpful and very important if we blended this and looked at some of the demographics of the underlying faculty here. We can absolutely do it. In fact, I started to do it, and then said, you know, I'm not exactly sure what the question we want to answer here is, so I thought it would be better to talk to this group and then think about how we wanted to do it going forward. Armed with this mix, we have a lot of information that we can utilize. We can not only utilize the demographics of the faculty, but now that we've meshed it with the registration system, we actually have demographics of the students that we could look at as well. There are lots of opportunities that we can do going forward. Also, the size of the database is such that we've got enough observations that a lot of randomness should just sort of move itself out and we should hopefully get some stable results.

**Springer:** And I do encourage you to look into the research side as well, because the same sort of phenomenon is happening from what we can see in the subcommittee of the Diversity Task Force.

**Francis:** The question was to look into the research side. It's a little bit harder because, again, we get back to this issue that we need a standard unit to be able to analyze and it's conveniently there in the form of a course when it comes to the teaching side. It's harder to know what that thing is on the research side.

**Taylor:** Roxanne, is the point you're making, if I recall this chapter from the Diversity Task Force was that in the professional schools, especially the rank of Professor of the Practice was more likely to be held by men and people who are white, and in Arts and Sciences it is more likely to be held by women and people of color? Is that the issue that you're talking about?

**Klein:** It's not necessarily that. That's not how the data necessarily shook out. But there were disparities, depending on the school.

**Springer:** What was most notable to me was in the Natural Sciences Department, where you had overrepresentation, if you will, of adjuncts who are women.

**Francis:** If I could just add one thing. I did have a conversation with Craig Henriquez, who is the Chair of the Faculty Compensation Committee, and so once I showed this to him, he was very excited about what they could do with this now-merged database. So we'll continue that conversation.

**Peter Feaver (Political Science):** I share Emily's reaction. I was surprised by this and I encourage you to do the reverse analysis from the student perspective of what percentage of their courses, as a graduating senior, what percentage of his or her courses were taught by what kinds

of faculty. I realize, on average, it will look the same, but, anecdotally, I've seen transcripts from students where a large fraction of their courses are taught not by regular rank core faculty, and that's what raised the alarm in my mind. So I wonder if what we'll see is that on average it's the same, but actually a split distribution. Some students getting lots of core faculty, some students getting lots of non-tenure track faculty.

**Francis:** Sure. There's no question this is an on-average result. As you start digging down further and further, you're going to see more and more heterogeneity at that point. Whether you get down to the department level, whether you go down to the major level, all of those, you're absolutely going to get that piece of it. As I said, I've taken it down to the school level at this point. I get a little worried when you start going down a little more, because you're going to get some small numbers that are moving around. But you could certainly do it.

**Billy Pizer (Sanford School of Public Policy):** I was just going to echo Peter's comment. Maybe just weighting it by the size of the class.

**Francis:** Same result.

**Pizer:** Same, overall, like it's balanced, but the numbers have to move around a little bit, because you were saying that single sized classes were more tenure track.

**Francis:** There are only a few of those. I take your point. I didn't bring the results here, but instead of calling it all undergraduate courses, call it all undergraduate enrollment. So basically like a weighted average that you're using of the enrollments and you'll find that

same pattern. The reason for that is if you go back and look at the data and the numbers, there aren't very many of the really big classes. Even though they're taught more by tenure track, there are fewer of them even when you multiply them out. Our biggest mass is sitting there between the 2-49.

**Pizer:** Presumably that would also get to Peter's idea, if you're doing it by seats, it would have to roughly work out to the experience of the undergraduate student.

**Francis:** On average it will. It won't get down to the heterogeneity that Peter is asking for.

**Klein:** Is it possible to protect anonymity and nevertheless allow those of us who might be interested to access the data?

**Francis:** I'll think about. Obviously I have given it to the Deans for their respective schools because they wanted to see it and they wanted to know a little bit more about it. As you can see, you can dig down to a very fine level once you've got these two things merged together.

**Trina Jones (Law School):** Thank you for this. I was also on the committee that ECAC actually charged to look at demographic numbers at Duke. One of the things that we were trying to understand, not only what Roxanne said about demographic distribution across ranks in terms of race, gender, and so on and so forth, was the sheer number of tenure track versus non-tenure track faculty at Duke. This does a good job of showing who is teaching, what type of person is teaching courses at Duke, but if I were teaching five courses, then this wouldn't necessarily reflect the number of tenure track professors at Duke. This doesn't

show us the comparison between tenure track versus non-tenure track, the rank distribution, which is what we were trying to better understand when we commissioned that committee.

**Francis:** I get it. The problem is, it's a really difficult thing to count the non-tenure track faculty for this reason.

**Jones:** The alternative that you're proposing doesn't necessarily count sheer numbers either, right? We get a better understanding of who and what categories are teaching students, but if I were teaching three students in the Law School as a tenure track faculty member, I would be counted three times if you were just looking for an absolute comparison. I'm not sure if I'm being clear in terms of what I'm trying to describe. That shows us who is teaching students but it doesn't give us any information, and maybe that's why I'm as surprised as Emily and Peter. Because this information flies in the face of what AAUP has and the demographic distribution in the Law School in terms of just sheer numbers and categories.

**Francis:** Again, if you looked at sheer numbers, I'm pretty sure you'd find a result more like this. Because if you have an individual who is teaching a single class and a typical faculty member's teaching load is three, you're going to likely see more of those people in the non-regular rank. Because there's no other way to mix them here. The only other thing I'll just note is, I haven't queried this across all the schools, but I bet, if anything, between this period and the current period, if anything, tenure track faculty members' teaching loads have declined, as opposed to having gone up. That's another force that's actually going in the opposite direction here in

order to do this. One thing, Trina, I could show you counts of full time equivalents, because then we've dealt with this problem. The number of tenure track faculty has actually increased over this time period by roughly 30-40, raw numbers. The number of regular rank, non-tenure track, the PoP category, has increased more and faster, which is giving rise to that increase there. The problem is the orange area. You can count it, but then you can't really compare it to the other two.

**Cam Harvey (Fuqua School of Business):** So I see that there's not much variation, 47-48 or 49 in this graph over ten years. I guess my question is, do you have any intelligence about the schools that we strive to be like? For example, Harvard or Stanford. Do they vary between 57-59? It's hard to know where we stand. Is this good or is it not good?

**Francis:** That's a really good question, Cam. We're looking now to see what data we can get from our peers, but right now these are not data that our peers are either producing or, for that matter, publishing. We're going to try to go through our normal process to see if we can start gathering these data and have them out there. But right now we can't see it for that purpose. What is interesting, though, I'll just say as an aside, when we finished this analysis just about a couple weeks ago, it turns out that our accrediting body, SACS, has decided that this is the way they want to see data from everyone within SACS going forward. So it's interesting that we sort of came to something that they decided at the same time. We're going to try because I think that would be really helpful.

**Josh Socolar (Physics):** With no particular expectation in mind, I'd be curious to see that broken down further in rank or age, if you like. If you broke the blue category down by assistant, associate, full, what would those numbers look like?

**Francis:** We could do that. In fact, that was recommended to do that with some of the data here about the size of the classes. You could absolutely do that.

**Feaver:** Mine is a two-finger following right up on that. I was struck by you lumping together 2-49. As course size, that puts together two very different types of courses. The small seminars, which are 15 and under or so, and then the workhorse courses at the 35-49 range. So for the next round, it would be interesting to look at that and see if the pattern holds across those.

**Francis:** Good point. I can't remember why we actually chose these. I think we were mostly interested in the small and the big. But, good point. We can break those down.

**Springer:** I want to push back a little bit on the "it's really hard" idea because issues of salary equity and rank equity are really important and I appreciate the problem because I know, even in my own department, we have people who have adjunct appointments and offices and I don't think they're paid at all and they don't teach. So I see that it is hard. But it concerns me that there are humans all over campus and somehow we don't know who they are, what they are doing, or how much they are being paid. I feel like this information is out there and I want to request that an effort be made to

figure out what everybody does and what they're being paid.

**Francis:** So I appreciate the question. Let me repeat the question if I can rephrase it. It's really around the concept of – and maybe it's just primarily in the non-regular rank area – the issues of humane pay, reasonable pay rates. I want to emphasize that this was not our focus in doing this analysis.

**Springer:** And the demographics.

**Francis:** I get that. But what I'm getting at is, one of the problems that we had is, if you wanted to try to get some equivalency here without going through the teaching function, when I put here that you'd be making some really big assumptions, [refers to slide] it's because you'd be looking at a person's – you'd be trying to look into a payroll system and try to look at a number and then make a guess about what the underlying contract was for that individual. Because this database doesn't have contracts in it. You're going to be making enormous assumptions if somebody has in here a salary – suppose somebody has a salary of \$25,000 in here. Is that for one class? Is that for two classes? Is that for five classes? We don't know. So what we're trying to do is avoid making those enormous assumptions by moving to a different system where we don't have to do that.

**Springer:** So if a person is on a research grant, we have to say what the FTE is. Does Duke not require an FTE designation?

**Francis:** Not in that FTE way. There's an underlying contract in, I would guess, one would hope, all cases with every faculty

member. But it's not specified as an FTE. It could be, I'm hiring this person to teach this one course and here's the salary amount. But we don't have that data that necessarily says it's one course, nor do we have a common rule of thumb what percentage, about how many courses make up a full time equivalent of somebody who is not necessarily engaged in research or service for the university.

**Springer:** The effort certification!

**Francis:** That does not cover nearly all of the non-regular rank faculty that exist.

**Springer:** Well, maybe it should, so we can count them.

**Francis:** All I'm getting at is, when I say it's hard, it's not that I don't want to do the work, it's that we'd be making really big assumptions here that I probably would have more trouble with.

**Springer:** I don't want you to make assumptions. When you say it's really hard, I think of things like my colleagues who have been able to find top quark mass. We're used to dealing with hard problems and we don't have to make assumptions. We just figure out how to solve the hard problems.

**Francis:** That's wonderful. We'll bring people in to solve this. Thank you for the comments and I think we can do a lot of what was raised here and I'm really excited about that and we'll work with Craig Henriquez on this.

**Taylor:** I will say, I was on the Board of Trustees HR committee for two years, and the trustees are completely baffled at how hard it is for us to count ourselves. If you have any questions that you want to

know, if you send them to us, we'll sort them into a list of questions. Actually, we have a new Master's of Interdisciplinary Data Science degree! [laughter] All the students have to have a capstone and this is a real world difficult problem to solve so maybe we can do that.

### ***CLOSING REMARKS / FAREWELL FROM CHAIR TAYLOR***

**Taylor:** So I think we're on track to have a fast meeting. The only thing left is a farewell speech of sorts. Although, I'm from the country and grew up in a Free Will Baptist Church so if you give too much time to somebody like that, it can cause trouble. [laughter]

The bylaws state that the Chair shall report on the activities of the Council at the annual faculty meeting held each March. Following the custom of recent Chairs, I delayed doing this until the last meeting when I was Chair, so this report is in the form of a farewell address of sorts.

**Honor.** It has been an honor to serve as Chair of the Academic Council the past two years. And it really is a joy to be a part of the community that is the Executive Committee (ECAC). Sharing the experience of eight individual faculty members from disparate parts of the University being formed into a team that tries as best they can to put aside their own disciplinary and department perspectives and to take a "big Duke" look at the University. The job of Chair is time consuming and at times exhausting, but I will miss the rhythm of knowing I would be with the members of ECAC each Wednesday. It really kind of anchored my week and I think when people get driven

together by difficult things, they become close. So I'm going to miss that.

Early on as Chair, you realize the concept of "speaking for the faculty" is an impossibility. As I sometimes say, if you have 10 of us gathered somewhere, we will have 17 points of view on any given issue. And the points of view will seem to change even randomly in unpredictable ways. But, in honesty, what an honor to try and represent what I think of as the heart of the University—faculty teaching students and doing research. And for how much we have talked about bad behavior by faculty members since I have been Chair, and that's been something that we've needed to do, but my enduring image when I've gotten to talk with many of you and meet people from across the university, is of a committed faculty pursuing their intellectual passions. It has been an honor.

**Thank You.** The Chair of the Academic Council gets too much credit for success. Sandra Walton, Coordinator of the Academic Council, is the single best Duke employee with whom I have ever worked—she does her job better than anyone that I know. Her care for the institutions of Duke, and especially for the Executive Committee and the Academic Council and the concept of faculty governance, her care for that is acute and it shows. We describe the university as being faculty and staff, but the truth is, there are thousands of professionals who are among us who, if they suddenly disappeared, this place would not function.

**Thank you** to the ECAC members with whom I have had the pleasure of serving. Ellen Davis, Claudia Gunsch, Lisa Keister, Mark Anthony Neal, Victoria Szabo, Erika

Weinthal, and Larry Zelenak this year. Last year's ECAC members Gráinne Fitzsimons, Mari Shinohara, Andrew Janiak and Kirsten Corazzini. I am not leaving Duke so will see all these people but I also know that it will never be exactly the same as it was on ECAC. I'm going to miss that. That seems sappy. It didn't seem as sappy on paper. [laughter]

**Unease.** I think the most important task of leadership is to correctly define reality. I would be dishonest with you if I did not share with this Council that for all the great things at Duke, I have a sense of unease about our shared future. If I had to summarize it, I would say I fear that Duke is stalled and drifting.

I want to be clear that Vince Price did not bring this from Philly. The seeds of where we are today have been germinating for each of the 22 years that I have been a faculty member at Duke.

Duke weathered the financial crisis of 2008-09 as well as we possibly could have from a purely financial perspective. However, Duke as an intellectual community has not adapted to the changed financial realities of the past decade. I would summarize that new normal as lower rates of return from our investments due to global economic conditions, coupled with large increases in commitments to Duke's undergraduate need based financial aid program.

For the 20 years prior to the financial crisis, DUMAC had spectacular returns. They always said things like, we don't know if we can do this every year, in fact, we can't do this every year. But you come to expect that if it happens year after year. And when DUMAC's warning that someday there would be lower rates of

return came to pass on the backside of the financial crisis – and this is not just a Duke thing, all endowments have had this issue – there was less money for everything. At the same time, we made this huge investment in need based financial aid to match our peers in meeting all demonstrated need. This has paid great dividends: our student body is much more economically diverse than it was before, and we are rightly proud of that. But, you cannot spend the same dollar twice. So as we have had less money coming in, more money going out for need based financial aid, that has meant that money has been tighter for other things that we might do.

Duke is one of only 6 universities to have been ranked in the top 10 for each of the past 30 odd years that U.S. News has been doing its rankings. And while there are known flaws in such efforts, the other 5 Universities are the ones we lay claim to as peers. However, our status even in the top 10 is tenuous. The last 5 years, Duke has been ranked 9<sup>th</sup> four times and 10<sup>th</sup> once in the U.S. News rankings. The size of our endowment is often used by members of our community as a self-evidently obvious reason that we can easily invest in a given priority. However, our nearly \$9 billion dollar endowment is just the 14<sup>th</sup> largest among US Universities and is one third the size of the third ranked endowment (Stanford).

Based on resources alone, it is more likely for Duke to settle out at 14 in the rankings than it is for us to rise again and stay at 4. Make no mistake, almost any University in the world would love to have our financial resources, but we covet the spending rate of Universities with far larger endowments, and we have long over-performed what finances alone

would predict. I believe that we can continue to do so, but it will require some changes in our community.

We do not need a more clever strategic plan, nor do we only need more money, though we do need more money given the reality of the modern research university. We do need to take a deep breath and look inward. My diagnosis of our elemental problem is that Duke *writ large* has a culture that is too opaque and needs to become more transparent at just about every level. And we have to stop believing our own press. I fear that pride keeps us from plainly seeing reality. If you don't see where you are, it's hard to figure out how we're going to go forward.

I am going to become the director of the Social Science Research Institute on July 1, 2019 and trust me that if you encounter me in that role I will be telling you about all the great things that we can do together. I'm going to tell you that I think Duke can be the best in the world in practical analytics joined along with health research and understanding how social determinants of health affect people and what we can do about it. I actually believe that. And I will mean it!

The outrageous ambition that President Terry Sanford declared in the 1970s is a crucial part of Duke's culture, but we need to have a clear-eyed understanding of where we stand, and we have to stop relying on the truth that no University has risen as far and as fast as Duke. That story is true. But it is now old news. We have to write a new story.

Vince Price, Sally Kornbluth, Gene Washington, the Deans and Chairs are our primary leaders, and we need them all to succeed. The faculty are crucial in this

shared success, and we are going to have to work together to chart Duke's course to a future that I am confident will figure this out but it's going to take a lot of work. Who are we? What do we want to do together? We need to take some time to reflect, talk, answer and act.

In conclusion, I want to say that I love Duke and stand ready to join you all on the journey. Best wishes and Godspeed. [applause]

### ***TRANSFER OF POWER TO ECAC FOR THE SUMMER MONTHS***

**Taylor:** The Christie Rules discuss that administration should consult with the faculty on important matters of the university. The Christie Rules provide that at the last meeting of the Academic Council in any academic year, so, today, 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. Normally this will consist of members of the Executive Committee of the Academic Council if they are available. ECAC therefore 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 a committee, once formed, would remain in operation until the first day of the fall semester of the 2019-20 academic year. If the crisis that causes this to happen, happens before June 30, it will be the old ECAC with Professor Haynie fully involved as he has been in everything since spring break, and if it happens on July 1, I'll be playing golf. [laughter] Since

ECAC is presenting the motion, I only need a second.

*[Transfer of power approved by voice vote without dissent]*

As I declare us closed for this year, several of us are going to the Devil's Kraft House. We've ended a bit early to have a drink so if you're interested, we can go across together and have a drink together. We are adjourned. Thank you. [applause]

*[Meeting adjourned]*