

# 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 December 1, 2005

Paul Haagen (Law, Chair of the Council): With your indulgence, I am going to reverse the order of matters, so we can get to the Th.D. immediately; we will deal with the question for the Provost when we have a Provost present.

### *Announcements*

The first announcement is that, with the short time between the November and December meetings, the November meeting minutes could not be produced in time for the mailing, and they will be included with the January agenda mailing.

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

The first substantive item on our agenda is the continued discussion and vote on the proposal for a new Th.D. program in the Divinity School. Dean Greg Jones is here to respond to any new questions. Seeing no questions, I present a resolution:

Be it resolved that the Academic Council accepts the proposal and recommendation to establish a new doctor of theology Th.D. program in the Divinity School and endorses the recommendation.

[The resolution carried by voice vote, without dissent.]

### *Question for the Provost*

We do have a question for the Provost today, which was included with your agendas, and I now call on the Provost to respond. Peter, do you have the question?

Provost Lange: I do, and I'm going to read it. The question relates to mentoring which will be, a topic today, so it is a highly relevant:

Marilyn vos Savant, a popular advice columnist, who apparently goes by the name "Ask Marilyn," recently responded to a young woman asking for advice about a scientific career. "I'm a biology major in college and involved in a program that matches up middle-

school girls with female science and math college majors. But a friend said you shouldn't push people into careers. Do you think girls should be given extra encouragement in these areas?"

The response from Marilyn: "Extra assistance, yes; extra encouragement, no. I think that girls already passionate about science or math could use help overcoming any obstacles that society may unwittingly place in their way. But I wouldn't try to spur girls to follow careers just to achieve a balance between sexes. If they need boosting, maybe they're not really interested."

Question: Does Marilyn's advice correspond to Duke's policy, or do we feel that 'extra encouragement' is necessary – and if so, what are our reasons?

Provost Lange: I must admit to a certain puzzlement at this question. Among other things, it is difficult for me to parse the exact difference between assistance and encouragement, since often discouragement results from the seeming obstacles that assistance can remove. Nonetheless, because I needed to work my way through the question, I went to the only source that I could think of to help me. Some of you may know Dr. Laura. So I called Dr. Laura. Fortunately, she was off-air, because I don't think this question is the kind of thing she usually addresses, and, unfortunately, she gave me the advice you might expect from Dr. Laura: Don't just assist them, don't just encourage them, whip them into the sciences! Ok? So, I thought about that for a while. I said, "No. Actually, whipping them into the sciences is not our policy here at Duke." But it is the case that our policy is to both assist and encourage people who have such passions to live those passions. And therefore, that is the same advice we would give to a male who was interested in the arts or a female that was interested in the social sciences.

Our underlying philosophy of education is to give both assistance and encouragement for people who live out their lives in a way that fills their pas-

sions and provides them joy, and we will do that as well with women who are interested in sciences, Dr. Laura or Dr. Marilyn....

Paul Haagen: Seldom have we gotten off to such a rousing start...

The next two items on the agenda will be presented by Provost Lange and by Nancy Allen, who is Assistant to the Provost for Faculty Diversity and Faculty Development and Chair Emeritus of this body.

### *Faculty Diversity Initiative: Update*

Provost Lange: So, I am going to do a mercifully short portion of this, and Nancy, who has been doing so much excellent work, will be doing a substantially larger portion.

As you know, the BFSI (Black Faculty Strategic Initiative) officially ended in 2003, and at that time I announced the Faculty Diversity Initiative, which took into account the findings and recommendations of both the Faculty Diversity Task Force and the Women's Faculty Development Task Force. (If you're having difficulty remembering all of those, sorry.) My ten-point plan for the Diversity Initiative is included in your packets today, as Appendix B, and I hope you will find the information important and useful.

What I want to do today is to report orally on our progress on those ten points and then let Nancy speak at greater length about our overall Faculty Diversity Initiative, as well as about the Faculty Climate Survey, where we're going to provide preliminary results.

It's a very large survey, there's very much data, and so it will take us a little while to get that all done. We're going to entertain questions and comments from you about our presentations when the information isn't in your report.

In this first overhead, which is also Figure A in the report, you will see that we continue to make real progress in the number of Black Faculty at Duke University. Recall that our goal under the BFSI was to double the number of black faculty over a ten-year period; we exceeded that goal and are ahead of schedule of 2002. We had a flat year the year before, the first year of the transition. I'm not too surprised by that, although I wasn't particularly pleased by it, but we were not able to sustain our attention to all the matters that we wanted. Last year we gained an additional 5 faculty members, including the first black faculty member in the Nicholas School, where they have been making considerable efforts to diversify their faculty in recent years. I expect continued progress across our units in the current year. And I should say that Nancy is in fact devoting a very substantial amount of attention to assure that we do so — and any failure on our part to do so would be entirely her fault!

I want now to turn to the 10 point plan, and report to you on where we are with respect to the various initiatives. I'm just going to put up the various points and then discuss them.

The first point here was the creation of a standing committee composed of faculty and administrators to

advise the Provost on issues of faculty diversity and to review unit efforts. The Faculty Diversity Standing Committee is up and running. It was chaired in its first two years by Professor April Brown of the Electrical and Computer Engineering Department, and she continues to provide faculty leadership. But it is currently chaired by Nancy Allen, at the request of the members of that committee, with the thought that administrative leadership would allow us to have a stronger and more sustained effort, because faculty members do actually have other things to do. The committee is working well under this new arrangement and on a number of projects which Nancy will describe for you.

The second point here is the Office of Institutional Research and has to do with data collection, and of course this report is part of that effort. We have, in fact, intensified our data collection efforts, and expanded them to pay substantially more attention to the issue of women, women in sciences, and other minorities. Appendix H, as you know, provides a complete chart of faculty by gender, race, tenure status, and schools.

The third point was that we would conduct exit interviews. We adopted an interview protocol which came from Johns Hopkins and which is used nationally, and the results are submitted to our office annually in June. We recently reviewed information from exit interviews of those faculty members who left Arts and Sciences departments and Fuqua, and there were no real big surprises. We mentioned some of them last night. Mentoring, or the lack thereof, is an area in which we have work to do. Nancy will be reporting some things about mentoring today. Departmental culture, the location of Duke, that is that we are not on the West Coast, nor in the northeast metropolitan area — in case you hadn't noticed. Certain partner situations and some gender-related issues did come up in the exit interviews. Salary did not seem to be high on the list of reasons for faculty to leave.

The fourth point was that when we reviewed the annual documentation that we get from the deans on the number of women and minorities in the applicant and finalist pools of faculty searches, they are also doing exit interviews, although I must say that I'm not entirely happy with the level of data that we're receiving from the deans. Nor would I say that we have really pushed them as hard as we should in that regard, and I intend to crank that up at the end of this year with respect to those searches.

Diversity is also being reviewed as part of the constant strategic planning process, with the Diversity Standing Committee reviewing each and every submitted school plan for its attention to diversity issues, and then reports back to the deans on the committee's evaluation of the plan.

Five is that each stage should establish a well thought out and clearly articulated mentoring process. This has been somewhat slower to develop but it's in the works. The Faculty Diversity Standing Committee

is making progress on a principles-and-practice document, which we will implement in the near future.

I also note that the theme for President Brodhead's commission on the status of women this year is mentoring.

I should say that mentoring is a complicated issue; we have had several meetings about mentoring, and there are very substantial differences within the faculty about how mentoring is best accomplished. For instance, the issue of whether or not a department should assign to a junior faculty a senior specific faculty member to be his or her mentor. There are widespread differences of opinion about whether that is a good or bad idea. But if you don't do that, then there are complications about how you assure that effective mentoring goes on. So, mentoring is both something that we need to pay a lot of attention to, but also something that we may not be able to resolve easily or uniformly or rapidly across all units. It is a cultural issue, fundamentally, and we need to resolve it at that level.

The sixth point is that the deans will develop a recognition of faculty women and minorities for distinguished chairs and recipients of rewards and honors. So, here I have a couple of things to report. First of all, this was a disappointing area in the first couple of years that I was Provost, as some numbers that I'm going to show you in a moment will indicate. It has improved somewhat in the last couple of years, but we also have undertaken this year a change in the process — you will remember that the council voted and agreed to this change in process last year — so that now school chairs are initially designated from committees within each individual school. That is, for the chairs that are restricted to the schools, the determination of the chair-eligible faculty within that school is first designated by the school and then recommended to me. We will see how that process affects these data.

So let me show you the data. This is 2000, and you can very easily see why there was substantial distress in the years 2000-2002; we made some improvement in subsequent years. Obviously, to the extent that we don't have as many senior women faculty overall, we do have a constraint on our ability to make major leaps forward on this problem.

Point Seven: that we would lead and encourage the deans and department chairs regarding diversity goals. This is my responsibility. I can do nothing more than assure you that I discuss these matters with them on a regular basis, both at the time that they're doing their search plans and during the year as I ask how they're progressing in various searches: are they discovering candidates who would meet the kind of diversity goals that we have outlined? And obviously the review at the end of the year then feeds back in the subsequent year's search plan.

Eighth, that we would collect and publicize examples of successful Duke programs for building pipelines for minorities. We could do more here but we are doing some things. There are excellent examples, for instance in Pratt, in the recruitment of women fac-

ulty, and the Pratt dean has discussed the issues of how that success has happened with the other deans in order to try to transmit models of action that can be successful.

For their work in these areas as well, Jackie Looney and Ken Kreuzer were awarded blue-ribbon Faculty Diversity Initiative update-on-diversity awards last month. The School of Medicine, for successful recruitment of minority students and through other programs, is leading this area as well, and the Graduate School has undertaken a number of programs to try to encourage this. But there's always more work to be done in this regard.

Number nine: through the provision of funds to support grassroots networking activity for women faculty. We determined at the time of the Faculty Women's Initiative that it was not the responsibility of the central administration, nor was it desirable, to create groups, but that if groups emerged we would support them — rather like that assistance versus encouragement kind of thing we were talking about earlier. And we did in fact get a proposal for a Faculty Women's Network, which has been chaired by Teresa Berger of the Divinity School. We have regularly provided funding for that group to carry on its programs.

Finally, I promise to spend on the order of a million dollars a year to promote faculty diversity through assistance with appointments in walk-down kind of ways, so that schools that came up with, or departments that identified, diversity appointments that might be outside their normal expectations for that unit could get assistance and the dean could get assistance in funding those appointments for some period of time.

Actually, we're spending substantially more than a million dollars. As you can understand, this is an open-ended mandate in the sense that when the deans come and they have something that's really desirable in this regard, we have not resisted assisting them with those appointments, and I think this incentive has worked well. It is costing us something on the order of 1.2, 1.3 million dollars at the moment, with various appointments in various stages of either a 3 or a 5 year walk-down.

So, let me now turn the podium over to Nancy Allen, who will highlight ongoing work of the Faculty Diversity Standing Committee and give you a sneak preview as well on the Faculty Climate Survey.

Nancy Allen (Rheumatology & Immunology, and Assistant to the Provost for Faculty Diversity and Faculty Development): Thank you, Peter, and it's nice to be back in front of this room, in a little bit different capacity, but I do want you all to know that I still keep this handy. This is my 1/3-sized "Did You Remember to Consult the Faculty?" plaque that was given to me at the last council meeting in May. Since I'm a 1/3-time administrator, but I'm still a 2/3-time faculty.

Peter has covered the progress that we've made in the 10-point plan fairly well. I thought I would describe just a little bit more about the work of the Fac-

ulty Diversity Standing Committee, and talk a little bit about my role as Special Assistant, as Peter and I have defined it, these first few months, and then give you a bit of an introduction to the results we have so far in the Faculty Climate Survey, which again are just a teaser. We anticipate that the full Climate Survey results, or as full as we will be able to generate by then, would be presented at this Council in either February or March.

I would just like to show the makeup of the Faculty Diversity Standing Committee this year, and the charge, both of which are in your handouts also. April Brown did chair this committee for the first two years of its existence, and then she graciously agreed to continue on the committee, which is a huge help to all of us. We have faculty representation and administrators, with Peter, Ben [Reese] and Judith [Ruderman] involved also. The charge to the committee last year was modified a bit from the inception charge, and it's listed here that we will both evaluate data and look at progress that we've made towards faculty diversity issues in our work force.

People serve on this committee for three years at a time, and we are always interested in knowing who might be willing to take this on in the future. Peter mentioned that Ken Kreuzer got one of the diversity awards, since he and Jackie Looney worked on a summer research opportunities program for minority students that has been quite successful.

The committee this year is reviewing data. We are looking at areas that the president has directed us toward, we're overseeing the implementation and review of the Climate Survey Project, we've provided input on mentoring of junior faculty — I'll mention that further in a moment. We have begun some consideration of a website that would unify policies and information that would be helpful, both in recruiting faculty and for our own faculty, in terms of the leave policies, the tenure-clock-relief policy, information that would be useful across the board in some way that could be accessed more easily than now.

This year, the committee is meeting once a month in order to handle ongoing issues as well as (as Peter mentioned) our review of the various schools' strategic plans, to be certain that efforts towards diversity are included in each of those plans, and also in the overall plan. We're communicating with Prasad Kasibhatla, who chairs the Planning Steering Committee, and with John Simon, who is the planning guru in the Provost's office at the moment.

Peter did mention that my role as special assistant is both to chair that committee, the Faculty Diversity Standing Committee, and also to work on pulling together data for reports, to write drafts of new and/or revised policies — one of which you will hear today — to review the various exit interviews that we've collected so far, to work on monitoring the Climate Survey Results, and to serve as a liaison to the Faculty Women's Network and the President's Commission on the Status of Women, which is a follow-up to the

Women's Initiative. So all of that has kept me busy in my 1/3 time. I'm also coordinating efforts with Professor Ann Brown in the School of Medicine, who is my counterpart there. She serves as the Associate Dean for Women in Medicine and Science and as chair of the Diversity Council in the School of Medicine. Together we're working on a number of projects. Currently, one of those is a sort of flexible-time or modified duties or part-time, depending on how we want to look at this in the future, but a faculty policy that would allow for some flexibilities that perhaps we don't have today. We hope to bring that forward to the Council in the Spring also.

I'm helping to plan the second in a series of management seminars for department chairs and center directors. Last year there was a separate session held for each of those groups. This year, it will be a combined session, since we thought it would be worthwhile for chairs and center directors to be in the same room and to learn what the issues are for each group. Blair Sheppard from Duke Corporate Education actually leads the management seminar and did a very good job last year. I think that will be helpful.

As part of this, Ben Reese and I will include a session on diversity and hiring recruitment retention, showing some examples of where things can go well, and where perhaps they don't go well if there's not leadership attention to the issue.

In September, I did attend the American Council on Education Sloan Foundation meeting outside of Chicago which was titled "An Agenda for Excellence: Creating Flexibility in Faculty Careers for Tenure-Track Faculty." And I brought back information from that meeting and included their recommendations as one of the appendices of the report. It looked like we are already ahead of the game in many ways and catching up in a few others.

I think this is certainly a national issue, when you see the graphs that are put out about the leaky pipeline for women, starting out after the Ph.D. is awarded. We've come along way in increasing women in our undergraduate populations, even at the level of graduate student and professional student populations, but there is a drop-off at each level after that. And trying to figure out what we need to do to bring those women into the academy and to keep them is certainly an issue that we wish to pay attention to. I'll talk some today also, in a few minutes, about the tenure-clock relief, when we get to that item on the agenda.

Peter mentioned exit interviews and what we found out so far from these. I believe Arts and Sciences, through Ron Witt's efforts, interviewed 13 of 16 people who left last year and found some helpful information. I don't think it was particularly new or unexpected. A number of faculty commented that they had been very happy at Duke, and they left because of partner issues or for a different location, or for other family issues. A few people did leave to go to Ivy League schools slightly higher (but not too much higher!) than us on the rankings list.

Mentoring, as Peter mentioned, was brought up, and it was interesting to me that about half the people who responded to the mentoring question said they didn't get any, but half of those said they didn't want any! So that brings us back to Peter's comment about the various thoughts that faculty members have about mentoring. There's no one good way to do it. We're going to have to have kind of a smorgasbord of options, but there should be some accountability within departments, within schools, and at our whole institution, for whether we are making efforts and whether those efforts are paying off.

A few people mentioned that they had wanted more research time, and other duties encroached on this. There were comments such as, "The tenure rules are unclear," "My department is an old boy's club," and "Women are not regarded as full members of their departments." And those do raise significant concerns and get back to the culture and climate within one's professional unit.

I'd like to turn now to the climate survey; hopefully will generate some interesting questions. This idea got started after the women's initiative and through the early works of the Faculty Diversity Standing Committee. April Brown took it on herself to bring this to the fore and to work with her committee to come up with the best survey, that perhaps we could use as a benchmark to compare with our sister and brother institutions. (I don't know if they're all sister institutions, or brother institutions, or some mix of them. I think I know which ones are the brothers...)

This climate survey also built upon the results of the survey that was done of junior faculty here in 2002, which was a Ford Foundation-funded pilot study of junior faculty conducted by Richard Chait and Kathy Trower from Harvard's School of Education. Peter reported on this in 2003 and, at that time, we found that there were significantly higher levels of satisfaction on several points among faculty of color at Duke compared with other institutions: for example, number of courses and students taught, physical setting, resources for support for research and teaching. However, Duke's junior faculty of color indicated that they were less clear than faculty of color at other institutions about the evidence considered at the tenure decisions and expectations for performance in advising in and campus service. And Peter did include findings from that study in the January 2005 Academic Council presentation on the Faculty Diversity Initiative.

In figuring out which study to use, April and her committee evaluated a number of different ones, including those from Stanford, Michigan, Rice, and MIT, and we ended up adapting a modified MIT version. April Brown, Susan Roth, and Judith, along with David Jamieson Drake, and Kendrick Tatum from Institutional Research, spent considerable time last year adapting this survey for our purposes, and, as those of you who completed the survey recall, it did go out in the Spring of this year, and David and his team

started looking at it during the Summer. They have been working with us. David and Pat Hall, particularly, have been working with a subgroup of the Faculty Diversity Standing Committee, including Susan Roth, Judith, myself, April Brown, Wagner Kamakura, Ben Reese, and Monty Reichert. And we've been meeting every 2 weeks since early September to look at the piles of charts that have come out of this.

The survey had around 25 sections, and there are 25 charts generated for each section, and then it can be broken down by gender, by race, by school, by rank — quite a bit of information that we will need to digest. That's what we've been trying to do in this small group.

I'd like to just show you what our response rates have been. Overall, from the entire institution, there were 1367 responses, which is an overall 55% response rate. Just to look at gender and ethnicity, we had responses from 920 men and 447 women, and the actual percentages on the right have to do with what the percentages of our full population are. So, we did end up with fairly close to the university percentages there. A few more women than men decided they would click on the "Yes, I will answer this survey" question. And we did give people three tries to respond.

Race and ethnicity, you can see here. A slightly smaller percentage of black faculty responded, only half of the Hispanic faculty responded, and a few more, or actually a little bit less, of the Asian faculty responded, also, than what you would expect from the overall breakdown of our faculty. If you look at that total of 1367 regular ranked faculty, 559 were from the campus and 808 from the Medical Center. There's a slightly lower percentage from the Medical Center, a slightly higher percentage from the campus faculty. I'm really going to just show you a few of the charts to start us off, and then Peter and I will entertain questions.

So, just to see overall from all of our faculty, are we happy with aspects of our work? On this particular chart, there were no major surprises, I guess. All of these particular questions were in the positive, so we did better than "neutral" for all of the questions and a little bit more than "somewhat satisfied" for several, including benefits package — thank-you Tallman [Trask] — scheduled classes, advising responsibilities, intellectual stimulation of your work, which I'm happy to see is at the top of the list. So, thank you Peter, I guess, and the deans, and the chairs, and everyone.

So, no one was terribly unhappy. Salary was at the lowest end of all of those bars, so there's a bit of work to do there. Maybe the next strategic plan will help us correct that. (Didn't get a rise out of the Provost on that one! I'm sure he'll speak about it later.) Just a couple of questions that had to do with gender. And, we have p-values at the bottom here. Double-stars would be a  $p < .01$ , and a one-star is less than .05. We decided to show both, because, at some point, it may be helpful to look at clusters of questions, so in

our small climate survey working group, we decided to ask David and Pat to include both of those on the various charts, so we could get an idea. We may end up taking some of them off later. But let's just look at this one for a minute. If you look at the ones that are significantly different at  $p < .01$ , that would include women being less satisfied than men in "My colleagues value my contributions," "My colleagues solicit my opinions about their research." They feel more scrutinized by their colleagues, and you have to work harder to be perceived as a legitimate scholar. I'll let you think about that just for a moment.

I do have some information about how the individual schools, and where it breaks down, or even divisions within Arts and Sciences, and let me just inform you about those. In a question-set on relationships with colleagues, female faculty responses were significantly different from those of male faculty in 8 of the 10 questions. Female faculty in the humanities are significantly more likely to indicate that they had to work harder to be perceived as a legitimate scholar. But otherwise, there were no significant differences for them. Female faculty in Arts and Sciences, Natural Sciences, in contrast, are significantly less likely to agree that their colleagues value their contributions and more likely to agree that they are under constant scrutiny; that they are ignored in their department; that they have to work harder to be perceived as a legitimate scholar; and that they are not free to discuss the behavior of their colleagues. That's the difference between faculty in the natural sciences and all other groups.

Female faculty in Fuqua are less likely to agree that their contributions are valued, a 3.2 compared to a 4.0, and their opinions solicited, 2.5 compared to a 3.9 on this Richter scale. They're more likely to agree that they're ignored in their department, a 2.9 compared with a 2.0, that they have to work harder than their colleagues to be perceived as a legitimate scholar, and that bringing up their colleagues' behavior might affect their reputation. And that was a 3.2 compared to a 2.0. Pratt female faculty and female faculty in the School of Medicine clinical sciences are significantly more likely to agree that they have to work harder than their colleagues to be perceived as a legitimate scholar. In Pratt, it was 3.4 compared to 2.2. In clinical, it was 2.9 compared to 2.6, but there were larger numbers in faculty in the School of Medicine. There were no statistically significant differences by gender in this question-set for Arts and Sciences, social sciences, for Law, Nicholas, School of Medicine, basic sciences or for the School of Nursing. The most widespread gender disparity, in this particular area is in regard to the feeling of many female faculty that they have to work harder than their colleagues to be perceived as a legitimate scholar. One chart on work and family issues — surprise, surprise: This is all regular-ranked faculty by gender. There are two-stars — you can barely see them on the left-hand side — for all three of these questions, so they are significant at  $p < .01$ . Women

faculty with family responsibilities are viewed or treated differently than men faculty with family responsibilities in the individual's unit. Women don't feel they have enough time to manage both personal and professional responsibilities, and more women than men said that they would be happier in an institution with a lower level of stress owing to time management effects.

And just one more... Our subgroup came up with the convention to list on the right-hand side White, Black, Latino, Latina, Asian as the four colors, and then if you look at a particular color for a particular question and see to the right a letter, it means that, in the case of the top question, white faculty differed from Asian faculty for their overall satisfaction as a Duke faculty member. Then if you come down to the bottom bar, commitment to diversity is demonstrated in Asians different from White and Black, Black individuals different from White and Asian, and so on. So, it's a little bit busy. It took us a while to figure this out, and I don't know that it's clear enough, and, if you have comments about it, we can change our convention for the final report.

Anyway, this is just a teaser to the overall report, which, as I said, we will be working on. There will be information given back to the deans about their particular school, and that is part of the plan. We hope that from this whole survey, there will be a number of action points that we will want to recommend to the Provost to carry out. So, with that, I will end my portion of the report and see if you have any questions for Peter or me.

### *Questions*

Ann Marie Pendergast (Pharmacology & Cancer Biology): Are the perception differences real or imagined? So, when you say that women must work harder, is there a way to measure if they actually do? Is it hours, or what?

Nancy Allen: There are questions in the survey about numbers of hours, and I don't know that we can totally figure that out. It may be that David can do some magic with the data to see if the perception question and the hours question do match up.

Ann Marie Pendergast: And that is actually difficult, because some work more efficiently than others, three hours for one may not be the same as three hours for another.

Nancy Allen: Yeah, Susan?

Susan Roth (Dean of Social Sciences in Arts and Sciences): I think one thing that's fair to say is that the perception that you have to do more to be considered legitimate is really the important, the thing to take away from this. Whether or not it's real is not relevant, I don't think, to this question...

John Staddon (PBS and Faculty Secretary): Is there going to be an attempt to find if this difference in perception reflects a real difference?

Susan Roth: Well, I mean, that's a whole other issue. You would have to be able to then realize how legitimate people were perceived and how hard they worked, and that would be a whole other thing. I think they're just trying to get a climate survey, so most of the questions are trying to get at people's experience. That may not be satisfying to some, but (interruption) ... it's a self-report questionnaire, which doesn't necessarily reflect people's evident behaviors.

Berndt Mueller (Physics) [asked a largely inaudible question relating to the issue of real vs. perceived gender inequities/differences.]

Sunny Ladd (Public Policy Studies): Question about exit interviews: do many people who leave the tenure track stay on in some kind of part-time role?

Lange: The answer to that is no, that the number is very small... There are very, very few who move from one track to the other.

Sunny Ladd: Are there more than ...family responsibilities who leave Duke of their own volition before they get to tenure

Lange: Every faculty member who leaves Duke is interviewed: every faculty member who leaves Duke for reasons other than retirement is asked whether they would be willing to be interviewed.

Mary Fulkerson (Divinity School): Nancy, you may have said this and I forgot, but what is the closest to a surprise about the results of this, and secondly, what kind of judgments can be made about the percentage of people who didn't fill it out?

Nancy Allen: Those are both good questions. I don't think we really, as a subcommittee, have gotten our list together of what's the biggest surprise. We're still in the process of plowing through all five sections. I don't think what I've shown today was particularly a surprise, but as we break it down further, by school, or whatever: David found that dividing things into clinical versus non-clinical, so the basic sciences would be included with the rest of the university, showed a bit more difference than you might expect. And I didn't get into that today, but that certainly will be part of the final report. Issues such as more collaboration and more involvement in strategic planning, we see that happen on the campus side more than in clinical medicine, and I think that does show up, and that may be a good area on which to act. But I don't think – Susan, would you like to ...?

Susan Roth: Nancy's picked some areas where there's some sections where there are consistent gender differences, but there are many areas in which there are no gender differences. And the race and ethnicity differences ...

Nancy Allen: Right. Those are small numbers and there are some areas where we can't really draw conclusions, but that was a bit of a surprise that we didn't find more in the race and ethnicity groups. I agree with you, Susan.

Lange: I think one of the things that we need to explore is whether the difference in the nature of the research culture of the basic sciences and in the sci-

ence departments that are on hard money has impact on a number of these questions which have to do with workload ... I'm actually rather intrigued by that, because we make some assumptions about that, but I'm not sure they're going to show up.

Nancy Allen: And your second question?

Mary Fulkerson: Can you make anything of the percentages of people who didn't fill out the survey?

Nancy Allen: Guess we can't very easily. There were people last Spring who were suspicious about it, about the confidentiality; even with all that we did to try to reassure them, they still didn't believe it. That may have been one reason. There are people who just don't do web surveys. There are people who probably are skeptical that anything would happen from a survey, and so why should they participate? I think there probably are a number of reasons.

Lange: Let me just comment on the quality of the survey, because we used a modified version of the MIT survey, and this is now being run out at a number of other schools. One of the things that I'm very interested in is to see the areas where our results differ from or parallel those at other universities, because there is some problem establishing an appropriate method for understanding different cultures, divisions of different cultures. You want to know how much is a reflection of the culture that is broadly characteristic of faculty you might find at work from what is institutionally specific to Duke... In fact we're going to reap great advantage over time from the fact that we're doing the same survey that other institutions are doing, because it'll give us some ability to control for some factors that we otherwise cannot even begin to control.

Felicia Kornbluh (History): I have two things. One, if we have any data about the job – are there any differences there?

Nancy Allen: We will have some. I think it will be small. When we looked at the overall numbers, they were so small of the individuals who did complete the survey. Our recollection is between 25 and 50 overall. David does have data. It's just that we had agreed that when cohorts were 5 or less in any particular group, if you're trying to separate out in a school, for example, you may not be able to do comparisons. With the overall group, we may be able to make some comments. There are also write-in comments in some of the surveys and Pat Hall has been reading those probably as bedtime reading for the past four or five months, and we haven't heard anything about those yet.

Felicia Kornbluh: You're talking about proposing flexible time alternatives in the future ....flex time option... Is there no job-sharing currently at Duke?

Nancy Allen: We don't have any policies on the books, per se.

Lange: Dare I say this. I have been violating the rules of the Faculty Handbook for some time, in respect to part-time tenured faculty. That is, we have had tenured faculty who have gone onto reduced time. We have allowed them to do so even though that is not

allowed in the current rules, and one of the reasons for us changing the rules is that this seems like a wise policy, and it seems also wise that those not to be embarrassed to say ... We do have faculty who have gone to reduced time. For instance, a tenured faculty member might say, "Listen, I have some issues at home. I need to or I'm just burned out. I need to go on 80% time." Our rules don't actually allow that. Then there is job-sharing — we don't have any policy on job-sharing. Nor have we had at the time of election any requests for job-sharing, and I don't think we're going to have any policy on this. It's not very common practice in academic, it's mostly ... nationally, that's where it's been most common.

Nancy Allen: Ok, maybe one or two more questions. Michael?

Michael Lavine (ISDS): Yes, Nancy. I'm looking at page 29, at this question about agreements are honored ... It looks to me like somewhere between 1/3 and 100% of the respondents are unwilling to agree strongly that agreements are honored.

Nancy Allen: Well, somewhat less likely than "somewhat agree." I guess you can use that statistic. We don't say what agreements are honored, I mean, so you don't know what's going through someone's mind with that question. Yes?

Question: These are all interesting items of information and my question is: may we share this with the other members of faculty in our schools so we can have a sense if they have questions as well, or is there a plan to disseminate these information at a later date?

Nancy Allen: I don't have a problem with this particular draft. It is a draft, and we will be coming forward with more complete information about the study, with an executive summary and action items and so on, but I don't have a problem with these. These were selected already.

Susan Roth: You're going to get better information if you wait for the whole report, because then you'll have a full context.

Nancy Allen: Right. I mentioned also that the dean of each school will get their school's information or the divisional deans will have information for each of their divisions that will make sense to them, compared with looking at the entire institution. Ok.

Sunny Ladd: number of additional cost .. Age by gender...[inaudible]

Nancy Allen: Yes. That's on David and Pat's agenda for action fairly soon, I believe. They've just crunched a huge amount of information, and we should be very, very grateful for all of their work and grateful to Peter for supporting this project.

Paul Haagen: Thank you, Nancy and Peter. Next, Peter and Nancy will present a proposal to expand the current tenure clock relief policy.

### *Tenure-Clock-Relief Policy.*

Nancy Allen: I think this will be fairly quick. We have a cover letter, and I had marked up in the

clean version of the revisions. The impetus for doing this is to take us to the forefront of tenure clock relief; also to reduce some administrative headaches, perhaps, by expanding the tenure clock relief or grant a leave for a semester, or 6 months, to a year. That will make it easier to count all of this, we think. Jeane Bross and I have been working on a simpler coordinated leave request form that the faculty member would complete, the chair would sign off on, the dean would sign off on. It would end up in the appropriate locations in the Provost's office for his signature, and we'd be able to better keep tabs on all of this.

At Peter's request, I did look at how many faculty had used the parental relief policy from 2003-2005, and in the past, in those two years, 35 faculty did use the policy. I don't know how many of that number have extended their tenure clock. That's been a little bit harder to tease out, and maybe these forms, in a central location, would help us. Some men have used the parental leave policy, so I'm assuming a few men have used the tenure clock relief policy already. Peter says they have.

So basically what we have for you today is a request to approve, when Paul gets through with it, these changes to the tenure clock relief policy. I have one minor change, and that is after this was printed, I realized that one paragraph, which is now at the end of the temporary parental leaves non-regular rank faculty section, should go at the end of the temporary parental leave's regular-rank faculty section, because that's the part that says that the automatic one-year extension of the tenure probationary period will be approved once a faculty member has applied for, and received, a parental leave.

So you have this before you. I'm not going to say much more about it. But, if you have questions, basically what we are asking you to do is to say "Yes, this is a great idea." We'll go from 6 months to a year for tenure clock relief for a parent who takes an approved parental leave. Two individuals could share that one year, if they are both parents of the child. Presumably, one would take the parental leave and take 6 months of tenure clock relief, and the other would take 6 months tenure clock relief if they so choose. So that would include father and mother, or domestic partners. Yes, Tolly?

Mary Boatwright (Classical Studies): I'm very happy to see this, because back in the day, I was the head of the committee on the Faculty Women's Network that pushed for this way back then. So we've come a long way. I just have a couple of questions that I just don't know whether I could not read the corrections. One is that it seems to me on pages 2 and 3, it's not quite clear to me whether the parental leave goes to somebody who's the primary caregiver. On page 3, it looks like — and as you just said — that if it's split, a family let's say that both spousal units are here at Duke, so 6 months with one, 6 months with the other. So I don't quite understand ...

Nancy Allen: Yes. The parental leave goes to the primary caregiver, and the primary caregiver is the one that has the automatic extension of one year. If the other parent and the first parent choose to split it, they can. They can split the tenure clock relief. We don't have a mechanism within this policy to split the parental leave, but I could see that Peter might say he would look the other way for that, too, at some point.

Mary Boatwright: I have another question, too, about the money if replacements for instructional time are needed. How do the 35 people ... was this already in place and, if so, out of the 35 people who have parental leave, how many of them help out the departments that are involved have gotten relief money?

Lange: I have no way of knowing that. The relief money comes from the deans. Basically, what would happen is that the department would come and say, "Because Joe or Jenny is taking leave this year, we can't teach a particular course" or "we can't offer a program that's appropriate," and then the dean of the department would respond appropriately. (indeterminable). We don't have any sense of control over it.

Paul Haagen then proposed following resolution:

Be it resolved, the Academic Council accepts the proposal to revise the current tenure clock relief policy, faculty and both chapter 4, to increase the tenure clock relief from one semester, 6 months, to two semesters, one year, and to approve the revisions as orally amended.

[The motion was approved by voice vote without dissent.]

Haagen: The final agenda item today is a presentation from David Jarmul and Geoffrey Mock on changes in internal communications.

### *Changes in Internal Communications*

David Jarmul (Associate Vice-President for News and Communication): Thank you for inviting us here today. Actually we're going to talk about internal communications, but also about some other broader changes affecting communications at Duke. Before I start, John Burness was unable to join us, but asked me to express his regrets and also his support for what Geoffrey [Mock] and I will be discussing.

First, though, I want to briefly provide some context for these changes that Geoffrey is going to lay out for you. They are the culmination of more than a year of planning and extensive information-gathering with the faculty and others across the Duke community. They incorporate the recommendations of a Duke-wide internal communications committee of faculty and others that I led, which examined internal communications at Duke and a number of important problems. And they reflect our conversations with the senior leadership about how we can better communicate the good work that all of you are doing and help you

get the information you need to do your jobs more effectively.

[Begin slides]

Here's the Duke home page, which we created a little over three years ago. One of its most consistent features is how it highlights faculty activities and accomplishments. That's part of a larger strategy by our office to promote your work. For instance: We issue news releases about your research discoveries and other accomplishments. We highlight your work as teachers and mentors, such as with this story that's going to be in tomorrow's Dialogue about how science classrooms are changing at Duke. We produce profiles and features about faculty members. We promote Duke faculty in the news, as with this week's news tip in which Anne Allison discusses an upcoming movie. In fact, we did two movies this week I think. We also distribute faculty op-ed articles to newspapers nationwide, such as with this recent piece we just did with Bill Chafe.

And, of course, we interact with many of you when you get calls from reporters, or if you are looking for ideas about how publicize your work and how to strategize and we always welcome those conversations. Many of you have attended our media training sessions and we also offer information like this on line such as how to write an op ed article and things like



that.

By working together in these and other ways, we've helped bring a lot more local and national and international attention to your work. This is just a portion of a single day's media hits from earlier this week.

Closely tied to this, as you all know we live in a time when new technologies are transforming how people get their information, especially on college campuses, and we've tried to make the most of these changes. For instance, we launched e-Duke about three years ago. We've put extensive news about the faculty and Duke activities on our online news site.

And one of our most recent efforts has been to use the emerging technology of RSS and XML to distribute news in more than 20 different categories and

push it out directly to people without using e-mail. It's a way to begin to syndicate news into different categories and help people find just what they are looking for.

However important challenges remain, some of which are listed here. On the internal communications front, many people at Duke feel simultaneously overwhelmed with information yet uninformed about what's really going on. We want to promote the arts, and improve understanding of Duke's work in the community. The home page is trying to do too many things for too many people. We feel like it's creaking under its own weight. Yet it doesn't provide the faculty and others at a Duke with a single go-to place where they can find the information they really need and want.

So, we've come up with a new approach. We hope it will use the available resources in a mix that will make more sense that will serve your needs as well as those of staff and students and other constituencies— as well as the outside world. Geoffrey will take you through all of that. Many of you know Geoffrey from his long service as the editor of *Dialogue*. What you may not know is that he received a much-deserved promotion to a new role as manager of internal communication for our office. He's been a leader in developing much of what you're about to see. Geoffrey?



Geoffrey Mock (Manager, Internal Communication, Office of News and Communications): Before I go into the tools, I'm going to say a little bit about *Dialogue*, because we are getting rid of it. I came here

twenty years ago when *Dialogue* was started, and I'm actually very proud of what we've been able to do with it. I always thought the university deserved more than just basic house organ. But, it's also true that, after doing a long review, that for the amount of money our office was putting into it and the amount of time and energy our office was putting into it, the university was getting diminishing returns.

At the same time, a number of factors were changing: our office was, as David told you, doing fewer news releases, working more on getting your work published in places like *The Herald-Sun*, *the News & Observer*, *The Washington Post*, *The New York Times*, and other publications. And so that's leaving us with fewer news releases.

There was actually a problem coming up with copy for *Dialogue* given fewer new releases. We had less copy to put in the paper. But at the same time, everyone would probably be more interested in reading a story about you in the *Washington Post* than in the *Dialogue*. So, we needed to come up with some tools that took advantage of these trends.

I start with what we will launch sometime in January, which is the new homepage. And, as you can see, the news is gone, and we are focusing intensely on this homepage with providing people with the things that they're telling us that they actually use and want to use the homepage for. The seven pieces are navigation on the left and right and the big search box and a very powerful search tool in the middle.

But, we're not getting away from news entirely. What you're seeing at the bottom is photo essays, and one thing I should note is this is a demo, so that it will differ a little bit. You see "Founders' Day at Duke," but probably we would not have a photo essay on Founders' Day. What the photo essay would in fact be about are the major themes that the university is focusing on, the things that you are coming up now with the strategic plan. We're going to be talking about arts, we're going to be talking about internationalization, we're going to be talking about financial aid, we're going to be talking about global health, we're going to be talking about scholarship and service to society.

So, for the first time, the homepage will be very closely and systematically intertwined with the major issues that you're grappling with here at the university. So we've got some good responses from this demo, but one question that people are asking is — as I mentioned — where is the news? Well, here it is. This is also what we intend to launch in January, at the same time that we start getting rid of *The Dialogue*.

This is *Duke Today*, an online, daily, electronic newspaper. We'll go through just very quickly some of the main elements. We are going to have a major story that will change every day. The whole purpose of this is to get you to come back to the paper every day. So we'll have a main story that will change every day. The section underneath it will be also changing every day. The left will be the news-clips, so that you

can find out very easily what the media are writing about you.

Calendar items – over here. We will select featured items. One of the things that we found out in the internal communications survey was that there was a real need to find out what is just happening on the campus. *Dialogue* was doing too much covering events after-the-fact and not doing a really good job of promoting them in advance, so people knew what was going to happen. We heard so often, “If I had known that that was going to be there, I would’ve liked to have gone to it.”

Also, we’re finding that people didn’t have a good tool to make sure that you’re not counter-scheduling events, to avoid scheduling similar events, that would draw upon similar audiences, at the same time. We hope that things like this will be able to help the university with that issue.

Now, in the middle will be also a major piece of *Duke Today*, and this is sort of what we call “News You Can Use.” People who did not read *The Dialogue* kept on telling us, “When we read the paper, we like it. We like the writing, we like the stories.” But it just wasn’t essential to what they were doing. They could go through the whole day, they could go through a whole week, they could go a long time without actually reading it. They didn’t need to read it for their jobs or their lives. We hope we can take care of that with material here in the “Working at Duke: News You Can Use” section. Not all the tools will be in place most likely when we start launching it. But this is the place where you’re going to get feeds of what are the specials at dining areas, what are the employee discount tickets that people like to find out about, what are the alerts that are happening that day — severe weather, computer outages, computer maintenances — get parking information, get benefits information, things that are all very difficult for people to find. That’s where it’s going to be.

Now, near the bottom, we’ll have more news. It will be very customizable. If you want to get all the engineering news at a click, you can get all of that. If you want to get all the humanities or medical news, you can get that. If you want sports news, you should be able to get that. Now, in a nutshell, you’ll see this is an internal communications vehicle.

Going back to *Duke Today*, this is going to be more for the outside. People will still use things like the search tool, but we really expect this — as David mentioned, we were trying to put too much emphasis weighing on it — this will be for an external audience, *Duke Today* for an internal audience.

Now, we understand that some employees don’t have access to computers. At the same time, some people just like to read papers. So we’re not getting rid of publications. *Duke Monthly*, which we’re going to start around December 20<sup>th</sup> ... 22<sup>nd</sup>, will be a monthly publication intensely focused on coming events for the following month and Duke as a community citizen. The first issue will include an interview with Harry Belafonte and focus on the Martin Luther King Day events. We are going to have an issue on Ed Larson, who’s the January speaker in the Provost lecture series on evolution. Stories on the Cook lecture at the School of Nursing, lectures at the Franklin Institute, and a couple of the Duke Performance artists will be there. Just go through some of the pages, here. You see our cover stories, calendar. So we’re not getting rid of publications entirely.

Now, there’s one thing that won’t be in *Duke Monthly* that’s, and we’ll have, as I mentioned, community news, coming events, etc. But “The News You Can Use,” the benefits, the auxiliary services, that kind of information, that will not be in the *Duke Monthly*. That is currently in *Dialogue* and will be in *Duke Today*, but it will not be in *Duke Monthly*. So, we need to find other vehicles for that. And Dr. Trask is now reorganizing his office, his communication officers, and is trying to come up with a systematic approach on how we can deal with that. He’s got a number of tools already in place electronically, but they’re working on that issue right now. So, any questions? .

Paul Haagen: Thank you, David and Geoffrey, and I think maybe if we can wrap everything together, we can put together Nancy’s recognition that what the faculty wanted were higher salaries with David’s desire to ensure that faculty get what they really want, and I’m afraid we’ll end up with virtual salary increases. Happy and safe holidays. The Council will meet you again on January 19<sup>th</sup>. The meeting is adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,  
John Staddon

Faculty Secretary  
January 4, 2006