

# Duke University

DURHAM  
NORTH CAROLINA  
27708-0928

ACADEMIC COUNCIL  
304 UNION WEST  
BOX 90928

phone (919) 684-6447  
e-mail [acouncil@acpub.duke.edu](mailto:acouncil@acpub.duke.edu)  
fax (919) 681-8606

## Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Academic Council

Thursday, November 17, 2005

Paul Haagen (Law, Chair of the Council): The first item is that with the calling of the meeting to order the *consent calendar* item is now approved. This is our new way of dealing with issues unlikely to provoke debate by the Council.

The next order of business is the approval of minutes of the October 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting. I have a motion to accept the minutes as written. [The minutes were approved by voice vote without dissent.]

### *Announcements*

Haagen: The first announcement is that there are no questions for the Provost or the President today. The second announcement is when I took this position, I vowed to be as careful with your time as I can be. That means, once again, we have a relatively short agenda. I will not be able to keep that up next semester.

### *Proposal for a Doctor of Theology Program in the Divinity School*

The first substantive item on our agenda is a proposal for the new Th.D. program in the Divinity School. Dean Greg Jones will present this proposal. This is a two-meeting issue, which means that this is presented today, we will discuss it, ask questions, raise matters today, but there will be no vote. The vote to approve or disapprove this proposal will be at the December meeting.

Gregory Jones (Dean of the Divinity School): Thank you, Chair Haagen. Let me just go through a few things by way of background and interpretation of the proposal that you have before you, to help give an overview of it. I'd be happy to answer questions or entertain discussion. But at the beginning, let me acknowledge my colleague Richard Hays, George Washington Ivey Professor of New Testament of the Divinity School, who chaired the committee that produced the proposal. Sitting in the front row as well is a member of the Academic Council, Mary McClintock Fulkerson, who served on the committee.

Let me just say a couple of words of background about the Divinity School, just by way of information, since some questions emerged in both APC [Academic Programs Committee] and ECAC. The Divinity

School is a professional school that prepares people for Christian ministry. We do not ordain anybody to any particular positions, even though our central degree program, the Master of Divinity, is the necessary credential for those accrediting and ordaining bodies in various denominations. We are affiliated with the Methodist church, but we have students from about 40 different Christian denominations. Roman Catholic students are the most notable exception: if they graduate from Duke Divinity School they are not eligible for ordination; they have to go specifically to a Catholic seminary.

The Master of Divinity is our central degree. We



have three other masters programs, and we also share the joint Ph.D. program that's administered through the Graduate School. It's a separate program, the Graduate Program in Religion, that is comprised of faculty both from the Department of Religion and the Divinity School; but by no means all of the Divinity School faculty participate in that program.

What we are proposing here is a professionally oriented doctorate similar to what might be found in other professional schools — for example, the doctorate of Business Administration that's offered in a number of business schools, the doctorate of Journal Science in the Law School, and there other professionally-oriented doctorates in other schools. The Th.D. degree is approved for accreditation by the Association

of Theological Schools in the US and Canada. It is understood to be a degree comparable in rigor to the Ph.D. degree, but focused specifically on theological work and, in our proposal, focused on the practices and ministries of Christian communities.

The Th.D. degree is offered at a number of our peer institutions. As I indicate in the proposal, it's offered at Harvard, at Boston University and at Emory University; it's also offered at the cluster of theological schools in Berkeley, California, as well as at the University of Toronto.

Our program builds on those Th.D. programs and moves, I think, in some creative ways, building on our own programmatic initiatives. There is an important demand in terms of the market. The committee looked at that and we both have experienced it in the Divinity School. Theological schools across the country have experienced an acute shortage of people being prepared in what are often described as the traditional areas of the practice of ministry: fields like worship and preaching, Christian education, and the like. In addition to that, we have been developing programs in the Divinity School and connected across the University, most notably several years ago the Institute on Care at the End of Life, that works with the School of Medicine and the School of Nursing, as well as faculty from other schools, including the School of Social Work at the University of North Carolina. There's been developing intellectually significant thinking, as well as faculty and programmatic outreach.

More recently, we've developed the Center for Reconciliation that focuses around issues of peace-making and reconciliation that we envision will have a significant trajectory as we move into the future. So, both in terms of the market and in terms of the intellectual need, we think that this is a compelling proposal. The question might be raised, and has been raised, and we've discussed it with both the Department of Religion and the graduate program in religion executive committee, about how this program will relate to our very strong joint program, the Graduate Program in Religion. That is a hallmark program that has existed at Duke. It has been a shared program for a long time, it has flourished, and we're committed to its continuing to flourish. But simply that the kind of work and the areas of research that need to be focused on the practices and ministries of Christian communities would stretch the shared programs in ways they ought not to be stretched. And so we envision this as a complementary program. There have been questions about areas of potential overlap, some concerns about issues of funding, and space for the graduate students in the Graduate Program in Religion, but through conversation and in the proposal that you have before you, we have addressed those concerns and are continuing to work together to preserve both the integrity of the shared Ph.D. Program in Religion and the integrity of the Th.D. program. We believe both of them can be leading programs, nationally and internationally.

Let me give you just a few examples of the kind of research and dissertations that might be offered through the Th.D. program. Let me refer to the projects of three of my colleagues who will be very involved in the Th.D. Mary McClintock Fulkerson has a forthcoming book that deals with ethnography and looking at the ways in which actual Christian communities deal with issues of gender, justice, and redemption. It is an exciting book that will be coming out in 2006. Another example: our colleague Ellen Davis several years ago published a book called *Imagination Shaped* that looked at the intersection of the study of *The Bible* and preaching in the Anglican tradition, focusing on the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries, looking at people like Lancelot Andrewes and John Donne, how their rhetoric influenced their identity also as preachers, and how that might shape conceptions of the use of the imagination in the task of preaching. Or, our colleague Greg Lischer, in a groundbreaking study on Martin Luther King called *The Preacher King*, that looked at the role of his work as a rhetor and as a preacher, and its intersection with the role that he played as a civil rights leader in American culture.

Other types of topic that might be undertaken would be to look at patterns of the early church in the ancient era and its implications for how people envision the task of Christian formation in parish life today, something that's a hot issue in Roman Catholic parishes; in the rite of Christian initiation in adults. Or for example, in our Institute on Care at the End of Life: we've had several major programs dealing with African American themes. A program we've taken across the country is called "Crossing Over Jordan"; it looks at the practices of African American churches in the African American community, practices that are often in tension with the way hospitals understand how people ought to be cared for at the end of life. The churches want everybody to gather around and to sing to people through their dying moments. In fact, a retired professor from UNC, a Kenan Chair in Public Health, was at one of our gatherings and he said with great sadness that his greatest fear was that his kids weren't really equipped to sing him over Jordan as he looked toward the end of his life. But to do a thesis that looks at the practices of African American communities as it relates to end of life care has great and significant potential, or to look for example at leading institutions and the shaping of how the Hospice movement developed over the last half-century, or something like Habitat for Humanity — it's sometimes hard for us to remember that a half-century ago, neither Hospice nor Habitat even existed. How did these organizations take shape, how have they been sustained, and continued over time? Or to look, for example, at Christian peace-maker teams, that are at work in Baghdad and many other places. Are they effective, what are their assumptions, what are their methods, their strategies, how do they work?

The last example is to point to the kind of student that we would hope to attract. For example, we indeed

received an inquiry from a Mennonite who is currently serving as the leader of a Christian peacemaker group in Baghdad. He sent an inquiry because he heard a rumor that we were starting a Th.D. program that might have one area of focus around issues of peacemaking and reconciliation, and wondered if this was in fact the case. He sent a copy of his CV; he is already fluent in three languages, including Arabic. He has two published books and a whole series of published articles, but he thinks that he needs additional study and would like to come to Duke because of the reputation of our faculty who work in this area. When I described him in the Academic Programs Committee, somebody asked are we hoping to recruit him to the doctoral program or to hire him to the faculty!? We've also received inquiries from medical doctors to this developing program, who are interested in doing further theological study to connect their work as physicians. The demand and the interest, even when it's just been at the rumor level, has been quite high.

Lastly, I'd simply note that the funding we propose for the Th.D. Program is based on what we already have secured and does not depend on any university funding. We think that it can be self-funded through the resources of the Divinity School in ways that will not compromise the Graduate Program in Religion in any way, or any of our other degree programs, but will provide a significant possibility for us to advance this strategic directive into the future. The proposed program has been overwhelmingly endorsed by our faculty. It has generated great enthusiasm both within the school as well as from various people who are inquiring about it, and we hope that it will be approved by you so that we can continue to build on the existing momentum.

Paul Haagen: I'd like to note that Dean Jones and Professor Hays brought this to Academic Programs Committee, and then to ECAC; it also had a second hearing in front of the Academic Programs Committee, and comes with the endorsement of both groups. Dean Jones can answer any questions, and Professor Wesley Kort is here from the Religion Department if there are any other matters that people want to ask about.

### *Questions*

Mary T. Boatwright (Classical Studies): Can you explain a little bit more about the funding and the distinguishing features of the Divinity School? I would like very much if you gave a little more explanation about budgetary implications.

Gregory Jones: We're one of the professional schools of the university so that our budget is subject to the Provost Area Management Center. I have to present the budget to the Provost each year for all our programs, and then we pay the allocated costs. We also allocate funds to the Graduate Program in Religion that is actually administered by the Graduate School. Thus, the budget for the Graduate Program in Religion is administered by the Graduate School, but

we make contributions to that program that we'll continue over the long-term. The model for our funding of this program depends on some fellowships that already have been approved by an external foundation, and then what we presume (at least based on interest) is that there will be some people who are willing to pay tuition to come, which we'll recycle to support the people who will be given scholarships with full tuition and with stipends. We hope that we'll be able to do some external fundraising over time that will increase the proportion of fully-funded students. But the indications that we've had thus far, and indeed the demand for some of our masters programs from some physicians and other practicing professionals, is that they often find their own external funding because they're already engaged in professional work. And so we're confident that we'll be able to fund this and to try attract high quality students who are able to pay tuition for the program.

Michael Lavine (ISDS): I'm curious about the connection between the Divinity School and the Methodists... What is the connection between that affiliation and your academic program?

Gregory Jones: Well, there's a long answer to that, but let me try to be brief. We are formally one of the 13 schools of the United Methodist Church, which means that we are subject to guidelines that they provide, and they also provide us with about a million and a half dollars a year in funding support. Some of those guidelines include courses that we're required to teach in order for students who graduate to be eligible for ordination in the Methodist Church. But just because someone graduates from Duke Divinity School with a Master of Divinity degree does not by any means guarantee that various Methodist conferences around the countries will or won't ordain them. They're subject to a separate, independent process of adjudication. We have a Baptist Course of Studies in addition, that has less funding but works with some Baptist congregations.

The Methodist Church is what founded Duke University and Duke Divinity School. It is our heritage, and we've had that continuing affiliation and it provides financial support. We are subject to being accredited by the United Methodist Church, as well as by the Association of Theological Schools, as well as participating in the university's accreditations by SAC's. So, it's an ongoing process but it's mostly a congenial one.

Christopher Counter (Pharmacology & Cancer Biology): You mentioned external funding. I was just wondering, what is the relationship of the external funding foundation to the academic mission? You also mention in here that they'll continue funding if you're doing well; and what metrics are they looking at?

Gregory Jones: It's a typical grant process where they approve, we ask for an initial commitment of 3 years worth of students; that is to say, the funding actually has to stretch out over 7 years in order to carry

the people through 4 years worth of funding for the third class of students who would be admitted. On the whole, the basic principle that we've adopted thus far with them was that we have an actual program that's up and going and attracting quality students.

It hasn't been formalized into metrics because they didn't yet know what the program looked like. I'm actually pleased that they were willing to approve this when it was in a hypothetical phase. But if we are able to show that we're able to attract students that have quality and are doing quality dissertations, they will continue to fund it. They have it tentatively in their long-term budget to continue funding, but they weren't going to promise anything until they saw what the program actually looked like. It was a competitive process: they were going to fund one or two programs across the country, and we were one of a number of schools that applied. The other schools all had their programs already up and running, and ours was a hypothetical [one], but we were one of only 2 schools that were actually selected, which was a strong vote of confidence, which surprised me.

Christopher Counter: And the relationship of the academic mission of the programs to the external funding agencies?

Gregory Jones: There are no restrictions or presumptions. It's similar to what we deal with in lots of grants that we get. We make a proposal and they approve it.

Lee Baker (Cultural Anthropology): Your masters program is a very diverse program, in terms of student body, and I'm curious if you've thought through the strategies to make sure the Th.D. program is equally diverse. Is that part of the mechanisms in place? Have you thought through that? And not just in terms of African American students and other racial minorities but also in terms of different languages, specifically Spanish-language churches in the United States?

Gregory Jones: My presumption is actually that this is going to be easier to be more diverse, in a variety of ways, including backgrounds, because I think that we're going to be attracting people whose interest comes out of medicine and nursing. We're going to be attracting people who've come out of peace-making groups and other sorts of things, and those sorts of ways. In the proposal itself, when we come to languages, one of the distinctions that we've actually wanted to emphasize is that we're not going to make German and French the two default languages (as is typical in the Ph.D.). One of the struggles we've had is how to deal with Latino Christianity, because it's been such a rapid emergence, and there are not many relevant faculty, particularly Protestant faculty, but we want to be attentive to that. So Spanish, I hope, will be a very key language. I can envision people who would apply to our program who would want to do ethnographic work in the emergence of Latino-Christian communities in a variety of settings across the United States. That's one of the things we've dis-

covered with the Institute on the Care at the End of Life, where we've done a lot of things — a symposium on Jewish practices, one on African American practices, and there are many interesting issues related to different Latino cultures, and sometimes conflicting presumptions about how you care for people at the end of life — where language matters.

A funny — well, it's funny in one sense, and tragic in another — example: A Hospice has memorial services periodically and was doing one intentionally in Spanish for the Latino community in Miami, and they sent out an invitation. Trying to be culturally sensitive they had somebody draft the invitation in Spanish. But after the invitation went out, on the day nobody showed up for the memorial service — for people they cared for. This had never happened before, and the Hospice people were baffled until they discovered that in the dialect that they had used for the invitation had in effect said “come and remember your stiff”! Naturally the people were offended and insulted by a derogatory reference to their loved one — and so no one showed up.. This illustrates the complexities that you deal with even when well-intentioned people try to gather people together for memorial services. In answer to your question, I think diversity is going to be a very important, and it's going to be complicated in ways that I imagine we haven't even begun to anticipate.

Kenneth Spenner (Sociology): Are there any critical risks associated with starting the new program? For certain projects and dissertations that you mentioned, it would seem there are Humanities and social science faculty, and others on campus, who could be very helpful. Do you plan to include such faculty?

Gregory Jones: Let me take the 2<sup>nd</sup> part first. Absolutely. And in fact, that's going to be a key element. A hallmark of the Graduate Program in Religion has been to encourage students to have a minor somewhere else in the university, and I think it's going to be absolutely pivotal, and we hope to really enrich that, and in the proposal say that we envision ways of continuing that and hope it will really strengthen the inter-school dynamics in a variety of ways, both humanistically and in terms of the social sciences, and in terms of some of the issues around medicine, but the hard sciences as well. That includes also the issues around reconciliation, there's interesting work around issues of the land and the environment. In the Nicholas School of the Environment, we shared a joint faculty member, a visiting faculty member last spring who'd be key to this kind of work, and brought people who otherwise don't spend a lot of time talking to each other in a rich conversation. So, absolutely.

The critical risks, I think that the greatest one that we've struggled with is that there is this phenomenon out there called the Doctorate of Ministry Program that has been a cash-cow for a lot of weak schools. And if we didn't develop this program with sufficient rigor, so that it became a glorified Doctorate of Ministry Program, rather than a serious doctorate, I think it

would weaken our reputation as a theological school. The best theological schools have resisted the Doctorate of Ministry degree for good reason, and we have as well. But we have to ensure that the dissertations are at the highest quality and that then, therefore, people will see the Th.D. as comparable in rigor and quality in terms of the candidates to the Ph.D. program. I'd say that's the greatest risk that I see, down the road.

Felicia Kornbluh (History): You said that some of the people that you'll train will be faculty members from the Divinity School, but will some have leadership positions in the church? What kinds of positions are those? What do people do practically in the world with a Th.D.?

Gregory Jones: Well there's a phenomenon that a lot of churches that are close to campuses really want doctorally trained pastors, and there's a tradition of that. And as the strong Ph.D. granting programs have become more diverse and in some sense often smaller, it's meant that the only people who would be in a pool, for example, in a call system, [come from] large churches near a campus and have been trained at some of the more conservative fundamentalist schools. That has a pretty negative impact where the doctoral education is of a different sort, but there's still a huge interest and demand and expectation for that among pastors, but also there's a keen interest in people who have these kinds of doctoral degrees for positions in publishing houses, for doing work in think-based social justice kinds of institutions that would have more specific training.

You notice that one of the examples we talked about is the practice of leading institutions. I actually think that's an issue where religious bodies have been influential over a long period of time in founding institutions and trying to strengthen them, but we haven't done a very good job of critically reflecting on those. So you often have people whose doctoral education is essentially unrelated to what they're now actually called to engage in. For example, I'd love to see some dissertations written on the development of Hospice, the development of Habitat, how did that occur, what kinds of skills do you need to be thinking about for the creation of institutions, for the preservation, for the healing of them? We took a group, we work with in the Great Lakes region in Africa, one of our reconciliations issues in Uganda and Rwanda. I was talking to the Catholic Cardinal of Uganda, and he said, "Do you have anybody that you could send me who could help me think about when and where I need to start schools in Uganda?" It's a really interesting intellectual question about when do you start new schools and when do you deepen the resources of the schools you already have. Well there's a lot of wisdom, I think, to be gleaned. I hope some of the conversations can help prepare people to be resources in those sorts of settings. But they're a variety of ways in which people would be employed.

Paul Haagen: Any other questions? Thank you, Professor Jones.

## *Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee Report*

The final item on the agenda is the annual APT report, which Provost Peter Lange will present.

Provost Lange: Good afternoon. This is the annual provostial juggling act that I try to manage by overheads. This is an annual report. It's designed to assure that the faculty understand how the appointments, promotions, and tenure processes work at Duke — what some of the outcomes are — and thereby to help communicate the kinds of values that we're transmitting through how we conduct the promotions and tenure process.

So let me give you first an overview and then I'll review the individual data with you. First of all, this year we reviewed about the same number of cases at the Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure level, which reflected about the same number of internal tenure cases and external tenure cases as we've had in the past 8 years, so we're on average. No big changes. Over that 8 year period, I would say there's been a slight decline, the schools were not growing as fast in the period that was producing these cases in the late 90's and therefore the number of cases coming forward is a little low, but the numbers are basically in the same family. A somewhat higher number of those who were eligible to be considered for tenure this year withdrew before the process closed, but you have to understand that, as you'll see when you see the numbers, higher or lower here means 2 cases more, 2 cases less on a base of 6, 5, 4 cases. So these fluctuations are not statistically significant. Whether they have any significance is a matter we can discuss.

There was about an average number that received negative votes from their departments or schools. If you look at the pattern of the last several years, what you would see is that the pattern that we've seen reflects success in our efforts (which we've been making since I became Provost) to push down responsibility more to the units and deans for making the critical decisions on tenure, with the expected effects on candidates evaluation of their own progress. Seven or 8 years ago we had too many cases that were not strong cases being brought forward from departments to deans, and from deans to the APT committee. There are various interpretations of why that was happening, but it's not really a great process in which this committee made up of 13 faculty from a very widespread number of units is called upon to make decisions that should really be made in a critical and firm way by the units where there's much more concentration of relevant expertise. So, when I became Provost I began to try to push down that more critical judgment would be made at [the lower levels].

The first stage of that was that we started getting more critical votes from departments, more decisions: not a big number, but a little bit more thoroughness and critical capability was being exercised at the departmental level. Now, as you can imagine, word gets

out about what is happening, so you get more candidates starting to think, “well, I’m not really going to make it through the process, why put myself through it?” The result is more candidates withdrawing. Now, the other side of that number, which you need to be aware of, is that if you get more candidates withdrawing before they come, you’re going to get departments making fewer negative decisions because the weaker cases are probably removing themselves from the process, and you’re going to have fewer votes of a negative character at the APT level because you’ve got all that filtering up. And, as you’ll see, that’s in fact what’s been happening.

We made some changes to the APT process 3 years ago as a result of a full review by the Holland Review Committee, and those changes seem to be working quite well. Basically, they made it easier for us to deal with cases in an expeditious manner and therefore for the committee to focus its attention on the cases which really required more concentrated attention, and that was a good thing.

We had such a bureaucratic and equity-driven procedure for handling every case, that a person who was a potential Nobel Prize winner and somebody who was probably not going to remain on our faculty were reviewed with exactly the same attention to detail, which was not a good idea. However, this year I am instituting a mini-review of the APT criterion procedures as part of the planning process, to try to assure it that these criterion procedures, as implemented, are in conformity with our strategic priorities in these three areas: interdisciplinarity, collaboration, and knowledge at the service of society. These are themes that are emerging as parts of Duke’s core strategic identity and we need to be sure that our appointment, promotion, and tenure process in fact reflects those values.

It’s one thing to reflect them in words, and another to reflect them in how the process is actually working. So I just asked two deans and three former faculty chairs of the APT committee to conduct a review around these themes. They will report back and we’ll fit that into the planning process, and if we find discrepancies we’ll discuss with ECAC and with the Council whether further changes should be made in the procedures. I suspect we won’t find a lot, but I’m not sure. Before I turn to the data I want to publicly acknowledge the excellent service of the members of the committee. There are members who have just rotated off, there are 5 of them, each of them served for 3 years and did yeoman’s duty. This is a very interesting and intellectually stimulating committee. It is also a committee which takes a lot of time. Herbert Edelsbrunner from Computer Science, David Hsieh (Fuqua), who completed not only a 3 year term but served two years as chair and just was an outstanding chair, Dan Keihart from Biology, Cynthia Kuhn from Pharmacology and Cancer Biology, Paula McClain from Political Science, who did a three year term, during one of which she was chair, and Loren Nolte from Electrical and Computer Engineering, who did a three

year term. In addition, Linda George of Sociology served one year, and then one day Linda woke up, you should know that Linda also won the graduate mentoring award and various other things, and I think one morning Linda woke up and said holy schmoly, I am on APT, I am the head of the IRB for the campus side. That doesn’t compute. Okay? And so she said which would you prefer me to do? Step down as chair of IRB or step down from the APT committee? And even the Provost can do that rocket science. And so, Linda stepped off after one year of service. And I also want to thank Rick Lischer from the Divinity School, who served a year as a substitute during another member’s leave, and George Tauchen, who did the same. I also, as I said, want to acknowledge David Hsieh for his 2 years of leadership.

And let me also heartily acknowledge the superb assistance of the committee that I receive, and that all of the faculty really receives, from Jeane Bross and Robert Russell. Jeane Bross will be retiring in December, and I think this is an appropriate time for us all to recognize her wonderful service to the university, and to ensuring that we evaluate our faculty in the most scrupulously, equitable, and thorough way for many, many years. I’ve asked Jeane to come today and I’d like to ask her now to stand, she’s all the way in the back. [Council applauded Ms. Bross.]. It would be impossible for me to describe the number of errors that Jeane has prevented me from making.

Let me now turn to some data. This first slide is a little complicated. This slide reflects internal promotions to tenure and it summarizes by school. In the rows, you’ll see the Law School is separated out because the Law School does not go through the APT committee — but cases *are* reviewed by the Provost. And I’m going to draw your attention to various other columns. So, this year, as you’ll see, 17 cases, right here, were required. That is, people had reached the end of their term, and had to be reviewed by APT. There were 11 such cases last year. In addition, as last year, 9 cases were brought up for early review. 5 candidates, as contrasted to 4 last year, withdrew, and there were 2 negative departmental decisions. In all, therefore, APT had 18 cases to review, as contrasted to 14 in the preceding year. As I said earlier 18 is not significantly different from the average over the last several years. This slide reflects what happened on those internal promotions to tenure cases, once they reached the APT committee. You’ll see that the committee, as I’ve said already, reviewed 18 cases, and approved 16, and was non-definitive in one additional case.

You’d like to know that ‘non-definitive’ means I’m sure. The rules of the APT committee require for a definitive recommendation to be made to the Provost, that there either be an absolute majority in favor, or an absolute majority against. There can be cases, especially when all of the members of the committee are unable to be there for the meeting, that you will get a number of those in favor or against it but be short of

an absolute majority of the full membership, so short of 7, for instance. So you could have a 6-5 vote, for instance. That's a non-definitive vote, and it throws the case without prejudice to the Provost.

I should tell you that I sit in on every one of these discussions. So I reviewed 19 cases because there was one from Law, and I approved 18 of the 19, and I overturned APT in one instance. Hence tenure was awarded in a strikingly large percentage of cases: 94.4%. That would seem to be a rather high number. I would remind you, though, of the significant number of early tenure cases in the pool; early tenure cases tend to be brought up only when the units feel there is a very high probability that they'll get through, and that tends to push up the percentage. Five candidates withdrew without tenure review, and 2 were turned down initially at the departmental level. As we'll see later, that brings the actual success rate of this cohort quite back down towards the normal. Nonetheless, I would say therefore chances of success this year were toward the high end of the norm, as you'll see later.

On this slide, you'll see the percentages related in different ways. What you see here is that 68% of those who were eligible internal candidates, excluding Law, received tenure. That percentage is very much in line with the normal, as you'll see. So how did the APT vote on these cases? Well this is all on the slide, because it shows you something about our process. So, on this slide, you see that in 15 of the 18 cases for tenure that were voted on by APT, the votes were unanimous or unanimous but one, which means that the cases had a very compelling character once they reached committee, which also of course means that in those cases the Provost would have had to overturn a unanimous or close to unanimous committee had he chosen to do so. This has pretty much been the pattern in recent years. There were about the same number of mixed votes here as in past years (that means votes that were definitive, but in which more than one person voted on the other side, in the minority). Note that there were no unanimous or unanimous minus one negative votes. Now you might say, "well, of course there weren't." But in fact, in the past, now becoming more dimly in the past, there were in fact some cases that were brought up from departments when APT voted, they voted unanimously to overturn the department, which is an extremely odd outcome.

This next slide is in some ways the most meaningful thing we can say, because this is the measure of the faculty we brought 7 or 8 years ago, how many of them survived or succeeded, how many of them succeeded in achieving tenure, compared to wanting to go to other institutions, and how well their work matured so that by the time they came up for tenure they were strong enough to get tenure. What the slide shows, and these data are only for Arts and Sciences because it's the only school with enough cases to make a meaningful analysis. We could group all the other schools in one block, but it's not very meaningful in some ways, not from the point of view of what we're

trying to show here. So the Arts and Sciences is our largest hiring unit by far, and the only one, as I said, for which the N is large enough.

So these data are presented in 2-year cohorts. Again, to increase the numbers enough because in one year you don't get many cases. What you'll see here, is that of the 1997-1998 and 1998-1999, assistant professors who began at Duke, 20 of the 27, or 74%, achieved tenure. There were two who are not included because they had no decision yet. You say how can that be, well the reason they have no decision yet is that for one reason or another under our rules they were able to get tenure-clock relief, which pushed them out beyond the cohort date. Now, this 74% is above, as you can see here, the 12 year average, okay? We don't know, though, what the fate of these two will be. Given the small numbers, depending on how those 2 cases come out, that percentage may either drop dramatically or rise substantially. We'll have to wait and see.

I'm going to turn now to two areas which may be a little less compelling. What you'll see is internal promotions: As you may recall, three years ago, based on the report of the Holland Committee, and the discussions of the Academic Council and others, it was decided that promotion to full professor would require excellence in two of the three areas, research, teaching, and service, and good performance in the third. So you could get promoted to full being an outstanding teacher and doing a lot of service for the university and not having, however, an outstanding research record. I have to tell you, that in implementation what this has generally meant is that it takes substantially longer to get promoted to full professor with that kind of portfolio than with a very strong research portfolio. As you see, we had a pretty high percentage of approvals. One case, however, was not approved for promotion to full and in that case it was because the teaching record was inadequate, in the committee's view. And so in that case the person was not promoted.

External recruitment with tenure: Finally, these are the cases of external recruitments. We had 26 cases that APT reviewed last year. There were 28 the preceding year, and these are recommendations from departments and schools, and there were two additional ones for the law school. That's why they don't appear in this column because they were not reviewed by APT. Of the 26 initially reviewed by APT, 3 subsequently withdrew. This is, of course, always the situation. You're trying to honor someone, you want to know whether they're going to be, given tenure if they come. You put up the case, and then of course, even though it might well look like they're going to be hired and get tenure with their hire, nonetheless they get an offer from somewhere else or they decide to stay at their own school. So, these withdrawals should not be taken as anything except the fact that at some point the candidate decided that he or she didn't want to come to Duke after all. Of the 23 remaining APT

positively recommended 21 and voted non-definitively on the other 2. Ultimately, 23 cases were approved by me for recommendation to the board plus the 2 from law.

Let me draw some of these data together. This is a historical overview. These are only tenure reviews, the internal reviews of tenure. This shows the year, the number of reviews that were required, the number of candidates that withdrew, the early reviews requested, negative votes of the department, eligible candidates, APT reviews. And what you'll see is that this was a pretty average year, but as I said, we had more withdrawals, and a slightly lower number of negative votes than in the past. But overall what you can see was a pretty normal year. We had different numbers of cases, that's really reflective of the number that were hired and the number that succeeded in getting through the process at that point. As I've said, the 'withdraws' are going up a little bit, the early reviews have come up to a level which is a little higher than it was in the past, but not particularly out of line. The last 3 years we had 9, which would be above the average of the preceding years. The negative votes fluctuate. This gives a workload at this level of a fairly normal number of APT reviews. Of course, that's dropped a little bit in the last few years for reasons that I was stating earlier.

This is the last slide; it reflects the summary percentages of candidates reviewed and recommended by the APT committee and the Provost, and it reflects the percentage of eligible candidates that received tenure, which is in some ways the most relevant number? Because there's always this kind of interaction between how many candidates fall out before they get to the APT Committee and the Provost and therefore how many will actually be elected to be approved. And what you'll see here is the percentage of eligible candidates who receive tenure has been trending down a little bit, and it's in the normal level again this year, around 68%. One year it was 58.3 before I became Provost, and then 68 is the second lowest level since I became Provost. So that gives you a picture of where we are with this and I'm happy to take any questions. Are there any questions.

### *Questions*

Marjorie McElroy (Economics) asked a question...

Provost Lange: The year before? The year before they would not be on that list.

Marjorie McElroy followed up with a question about women and tenure.

Provost: I could break down any of the slides by gender. I didn't do it today. I'm not sure the recollection of the data we showed is correct, but it might be. Michael, I don't know if you remember, is that correct?

Michael Lavine: We reviewed the time from becoming associate to becoming full.

Provost: That's what I thought. There was no review in that.

Marjorie McElroy: What I thought was that somewhere last year we saw a slide that basically showed the number of assistant professors who had been women.... The basic problem, I thought, was that we weren't hiring enough assistant professors who were women, or we were below the national average.

Provost: Let me suggest we not do this here. It is perfectly clear that the probability that a woman who enters as an assistant professor at Duke or anywhere else, the probability that a woman will reach full professor is lower than the probability that a male will reach full professor. There are multiple reasons for that, of which the APT process is probably one of the less important. Much more of it has to do with so-called 'leaky pipeline', and that is with women who are withdrawing from full-time academic research careers at various points along the way, not necessarily in that tenure year and in fact often not in that tenure year, but they may again withdraw or remain withdrawn in years before, or they may go to a lower level of activity or things like that. So there is no question, that continues to be a concern of ours, and Nancy Allen and I will be discussing some of those data with the Council in December? But I will stress is that I do not believe, in a multi-causal world and in a multi-causal model, that negative decisions at the APT level are a major cause of the overall difference in those outcomes, because I think there are many other factors. They could be considered part of the APT: are we mentoring women faculty properly and appropriately, are we providing a benefit structure which allows them to pursue their careers and yet also do some of the other things that women seem to want to do more than men — and I'm not saying that in a negative way, I'm saying that actually in a positive way. So those things all come together, and we will be discussing that. We're also going to recommend a few tweaks for to our policy.

Lori Setton (Biomedical Engineering): So looking at your two year averages in the last two years. Am I correct in seeing that there were 9 that withdrew over the last 2 years, which is substantially higher than any other 2-year interval? So do you do some type of exit interview or follow up on those interviews?

Provost: Yes, I'm glad you asked that question.

Lori Setton: So can you comment on whether or not there are other leading institutions that are doing that?

Provost: We do, as a conclusion of the Women's Initiative, we have been conducting regular exit interviews and in the December meeting, Nancy [Allen] who is my special assistant on these matters will be reporting on the outcomes of those exit interviews. And one of the things we're looking for is in fact what people left to do. And obviously I can't explain this, it would require judgment on my part.... That I can't comment on, unless they tell us that.

Lori Setton: Do you have any data yet from the departments as to what the those 'withdraws' were about?

Provost: I have them but I don't have them all in my head. That's what we're going to have at the December meeting; we're going to discuss the whole thing and faculty-development issues...That's already on the agenda.

John Staddon (Psychological and Brain Sciences): You started out by talking about this committee of chairs that you're having evaluate the current process in light of the various themes of the university, things like interdisciplinarity, etc. How would this affect the tenure decision of a particular individual?

Provost: Let me take two different kinds of cases that I have some knowledge of already. As to interdisciplinarity: let's say there's a professor who really does work in two fields, say. The question is when that person is reviewed annually, is there input from people who have some expertise in both of those fields. When a person comes up for their midterm review, at the end of their 3<sup>rd</sup> year of their first contract, is there input from both units or from groups of individuals who have knowledge in both fields and informs the decision at the department level and the deans' level. When they come up for tenure, the same kind of thing. So do we have procedures in place that ensure that a person who is working thoroughly in two fields, or you know, in a significant way in two fields, will actually get appropriate review of their materials reflected by people who have knowledge.

The other issue which has come up a lot is collaboration. I think anybody who's on APT will know that we're getting more and more cases where there are more and more where the publications of the individual are collaborative, and aside from the issue of knowing what the order of names is — which as it turns out varies from one discipline to another, and therefore the same order of names in two disciplines may have totally different meanings. Setting that aside and saying can we review that which isn't a very practical issue, there is the issue of how you measure independent and outstanding intellectual contributions to those papers. So the question is do we actually get the appropriate kind of input to evaluate that issue? And I will tell you that the committee has, at times, sent out for new letters or additional letters because they, in fact, did not feel that the file reflected a careful enough evaluation with appropriate kinds of sources about what leadership role the candidate may have played. Now, you know, as you gain experience, you can start to tell, right? So, for instance, a person may have been the collaborator with their dissertation adviser, and by the end of their 7 years, they may be collaborating with their dissertation students. Okay, that's a shift that indicates an evolution of the person's intellectual status from following the leadership of his or her mentor to becoming a mentor to someone else. But you want to make sure that our process is able to capture those things, because we don't want to penalize some-

one simply for collaborating, because in some fields now if you don't collaborate, you can't do cutting-edge work.

Susan Schneider (Nursing): In previous years we've had a report from the Medical Center as well, about promotion and tenure.

Provost: Not from me.

Susan Schneider: No not from you, obviously. I was speaking to Chair Haagen. I'd like to request that.

Lee Baker (Cultural Anthropology): I've got a question with regard to the early reviews that seem to go through quite smoothly. Were there precipitating factors that sort of initiated early reviews — like outside offers, second books? That's one question. The second question is with regard to the third-year review, which seems pretty rigorous now, I don't know if that's changed, but is that an opportunity to either say, "well actually, you might want to withdraw your application", or "maybe you should go up early, because we've all evaluated your work and this is really, you're really doing work as an associate professor"?

Provost: Let me speak first about early reviews. So the early reviews are some combination, which varies from year to year, of preemption. That, this person is so good, they're going to be up on the market in their tenure year and we don't want them on the market in their tenure year, and we're going to do what we can to enable promotion. Outside offers: those have been major factors too. We have had a couple where candidates have pushed for early review. And I actually tend to discourage that unless the unit is very supportive. I have had a couple cases where people said, "I really want to come up now." With respect to the third-year review, they had to be both much more serious and rigorous and with substantially less likelihood of being turned down.

Remember when these are occurring. They are occurring after a candidate has been here approximately 2 and 3 quarter years; it's happening in the second semester of the third year of their first term because they have to be given a year of notice if they're not going to be renewed. So even though they have a four-year contract, you have to do it in the third year — pretty short time period. We used to have the, I think, false presumption that we could take 2.5 or 2 and three-quarter year record and make a projection of the likelihood that a person could get tenure and have a great career. We cannot have that presumption anymore and so we don't tend to turn many people down at that review. However, there are letters which are drafted by the chairs, reviewed by the Dean and reviewed by the Provost in a serious way, which are sent back to the candidate after the review, basically giving them a pretty candid evaluation of how strong their case is, what their trajectory looks like, and what they might have to do to improve their chances of getting tenure.

Now, this past year, and in the last couple years I've also occasionally only renewed a person for two years, rather than 4. When that happens, it's usually a

signal that either you better really get your \*\* in gear or 'look, this is a period of time that you really should be looking for another home.' So it's become much more of a signaling device than a sorting device. Any other questions? Thank you.

Paul Haagen: Thank you, Peter. There being no further business in front of the Council, I declare the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,  
John Staddon

Faculty Secretary, December 30, 2005