

Duke University

DURHAM
NORTH CAROLINA
27708-0928

ACADEMIC COUNCIL
304 UNION WEST
BOX 90928

phone (919)684-6447
email acouncil@acpub.duke.edu
fax (919) 681-8606

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Academic Council

Thursday, May 8, 2003, 3:34-5:05 PM

Announcements

Nancy Allen (Medicine), Chair of the Council: "Welcome to the last meeting of this academic year...As our faculty secretary John Staddon produced the minutes in record time since our last meeting just two weeks ago, we were able to get them out to you virtually... and virtually, virtually...and virtually — because you got 4 copies...So, I'm happy to accept a motion to approve the minutes as written. Moved, seconded and approved... Also, I want to thank John for all his hard work with the minutes and at ECAC this year. We're hoping that you get reelected as faculty secretary when you return from your sabbatical...

"I do want to note that we were remiss in not changing the [roster of academic council members] to note Barry Myers' change rank in Engineering, from Associate to Full Professor...

"I would like to let you know of an announcement that will be made later today regarding the Oak Room dining facility in the West Union Building. This dining facility has closed and will reopen as the new home of the Mary Lou Williams Center for Black Culture. This move is in response to a 2001 cultural-space report which recommended giving the center a more prominent location and additional space and to advance Larry Moneta's [Vice President for Student Affairs] goal of realigning student space on West Campus into a *student village*. We will hear more about that later.

"We are pleased that through the efforts of the Faculty Commons Committee, chaired by Emily Klein, the Faculty Commons dining facility will remain open in its current location. Dining services will work with the Faculty Commons Committee to attract more faculty to this dining facility which is dedicated to faculty- I'll call on Emily for brief comments:"

Emily Klein (Nicholas School): In discussing the changes proposed by Larry Moneta, underutilization of both the Oak Room and the Faculty Commons was a factor. A new vendor/caterer has been hired for the Commons for next year, but we need the help of the faculty if this wonderful space is to be retained for our use. The Faculty Commons Committee is going to put together some sort of questionnaire to try and understand better what people need and want. Please respond! We will make every effort to increase usage at the Faculty Commons.

Nancy Allen: "Thank you Emily and thank you for your committee's work over the last week and a half. We also would like to encourage faculty to participate in commencement this weekend..."

Earned Degrees

All were approved by voice vote. The earned degrees are as follows:

DIPLOMAS DATED MAY 11, 2003

Summary by Schools and College

Trinity College of Arts and Sciences	
Dean Robert J. Thompson, Jr.	
Bachelor of Arts	842
Bachelor of Science	397
Pratt School of Engineering	
Dean Kristina M. Johnson	
Bachelor of Science in Engineering	164
Master of Engineering Management	15
School of Nursing	
Dean Mary T. Champagne	
Master of Science in Nursing	44
Nicholas School of the Environment and Earth Sciences	
Dean William H. Schlesinger	
Master of Environmental Management	62
Master of Forestry	6
Fuqua School of Business	
Dean Douglas T. Breeden	
Master of Business Administration	486
Divinity School	
Dean L. Gregory Jones	
Master in Church Ministries	3
Master of Theological Studies	17
Master of Divinity	84
Master of Theology	8
School of Law	
Dean Katharine T. Bartlett	
Master of Legal Studies	
Juris Doctor	185
Master of Laws	85
Doctor of Juridical Science	
1	
School of Medicine	
Dean R. Sanders Williams	
Master of Health Sciences	74

Master of Health Sciences in Clinical Research	13
Master of Health Sciences in Clinical Leadership	1
Doctor of Physical Therapy	39
Doctor of Medicine	85

The Graduate School

Dean Lewis M. Siegel	
Master of Public Policy	34
Master of Arts in Teaching	4
Master of Science	22
Master of Arts	88
Doctor of Philosophy	98

TOTAL 2857

The Council then went into Executive Session to discuss candidates for honorary degrees, returning to discuss...

Parental Leave and Tenure Clock Relief Policy

Nancy Allen: "The next item on the agenda is a vote on the Parental Leave and Tenure Clock Relief Policy resolution. This policy underwent initial review and discussion at this Council on April 24 and the discussion is reflected in our minutes. There is one change, highlighted on p. 2, which came about after our discussion on April 24, mostly in terms of Medical Center discussions. And that addition is that the approval of primary caregiver status — in the School of Medicine and School of Nursing only — will be made by the department chair, in the case of the School of Medicine, and by the Dean in the School of Nursing. And then a letter requesting parental leave must be submitted to the appropriate dean. That was already in there, but just with a wording change."

There being no further comments or questions, the following motion was moved, seconded and approved by voice vote without dissent.

RESOLUTION TO ADOPT A PARENTAL LEAVE/TENURE CLOCK RELIEF POLICY

Following review of the proposed Parental Leave/Tenure Clock Relief Policy at the Academic Priorities Committee, the President's Advisory Committee on Resources, the Faculty Compensation Committee, the Deans Cabinet and the Executive Committee of the Academic Council, the proposal was presented and discussed at the April 24, 2003 meeting of the Academic Council. The Academic Council, during its regular meeting of May 8, 2003, votes to support this policy which clarifies and strengthens maternity, parental and family leave, and provides tenure clock relief benefits for faculty. Along with the addition of this policy to the revised Faculty Handbook, the Council recommends that this policy be circulated separately to all departments and schools for dissemination to faculty. This policy becomes effective July 1, 2003. _____

Extension Of Eligibility To Serve On The Academic Council

Nancy Allen: "We had our initial discussion of this topic, actually in 2001, but we had our most recent discussion ... in our last meeting on April 24. [There was] discussion in ECAC after April 24, [about] bylaw wording which will need to be approved in the fall. We extended the ability to run for election to the Council to one additional category [so the list of eligible categories] will then match the voting list. And that category is the level of *Associate* in the Medical Center. This primarily effects the clinical sciences. Many of those individuals will not be eligible to run for election because of the 3-year rule that we have in the document. Individuals who are regular rank non-tenure track faculty will need to be in their 3rd year of a Duke faculty position before they are eligible to serve on the Council. That is the only change that we made in the document..."

There being no further comments or questions, the motion to accept the proposed changes was made, and seconded and approved by voice vote without dissent.

Nancy Allen: "I do have an initial reading of the bylaws which we will consider at the September meeting and again by the whole faculty at the annual faculty meeting in October. These are formalities for the Academic Council bylaws and the University faculty bylaws. I'll pass them out. We don't need to vote on them today, but if you have a chance to look at them sometime before September, you'll at least have in your mind what we're looking at to change... I'll now call on Susan Roth to bring forward the..."

Womens Faculty Development Task Force Report

Susan Roth (Psychology: Social and Health Sciences/Provost's Office) began by thanking the members of the WFD committee: Ann Brown from the School of Medicine, April Brown from the School of Engineering, Carla Ellis from Arts and Sciences (Computer Science), Peter Euben from Arts and Sciences (Political Science), Karla Holloway, Dean of Humanities and Social Sciences, Trina Jones (Law School), Berndt Mueller, Dean of Natural Sciences, John Payne (Fuqua), and Jan Radway from Arts and Sciences (Program in Literature). For both task-force reports [on *Women's Faculty Development* and *Faculty Diversity*] we made a decision that it would be important to leave a lot of time for discussion; so what I'm going to do is briefly review or highlight for you the findings and then go over the recommendations...

"A key finding of the report... is that we have not seen any gains over the last 10 years in the [number of women in the] assistant professor rank. Since I presented those data here the last time, we have been able to get data from comparison schools [which do not appear in the report]... This is not a national trend. While we are not the only school for whom this is true, there *are* schools who have made gains over time in the assistant professor ranks.

"The percentage of women is substantially less [at higher ranks]... the drop comes at the associate to full professor change. This is a national trend and we do not have information on the reason for this..."

"The relative number of women versus men holding named chairs is of concern. The good news, which I just learned today, is that this year 6 of the 22 (27%) of named chairs approved by the Board of Trustees were women, which is a 3-fold percentage increase from 1997. A larger percentage of women than men were denied tenure between 1994 and 2001 and women take longer on average to be promoted from associate to full professor. While women are well represented in Ph.D. programs in the vast majority of disciplines, some departments continue to

have small numbers of women in their [graduate-student] applicant pools. For other departments applicant pools seem adequate for increasing the number of women hires. That said, pool issues are complicated and establishing the actual availability of talented women faculty in all disciplines requires a great deal of effort on the part of our deans.

"[Women] faculty *interview data* brought forward 6 issues of note:"

1. The falloff in the number of women Ph.D.s choosing to pursue academic research careers;
2. narrowly defined searches that significantly restrict the pool of eligible women and decrease the likelihood of recruiting women faculty;
3. the sense of isolation among some faculty women;
4. the desire for mentoring on the part of some women faculty around women's issues;
5. the need for recognition of extraordinary service on the part of tenured faculty women;
6. and the problem created by partner hires for the recruitment and retention of faculty women.

"Those are the main findings. Let me now review the recommendations:"

1. The first concerns longitudinal data collection. We are suggesting that we repeat the analyses reported this year every 3 years and that the results be reported to the Provost. And we are also suggesting that we bring evidence to bear on the poor record with regard to assistant professors and on the decrease on the percent of women from the associate to the full ranks.
2. The second recommendation concerns a *Standing Committee on Faculty Diversity*. We see this as a resource to the schools in developing standardized procedures, in developing awareness on the part of deans, chairs, search committees and evaluation committees of unintentional bias that may operate against the successful recruitment and retention of women and minorities, facilitating an ongoing dialogue about diversity that will "steward the overall vision of the university and health system" and deepen the understanding of diversity issues.
3. The 3rd recommendation has to do with standardized procedures within schools to ensure that women faculty are not inadvertently discouraged from, or disadvantaged in, entering the professoriate. Some schools, some departments do these things very well. The key word here is *standardized procedures*:
 - a. The 1st [requirement] has to do with graduate, professional and postdoctoral student mentoring in order to enhance the attraction of an academic career for women.
 - b. The 2nd has to do with search committees, setting expectations that women candidates will be brought forward in finalist pools, documenting failed efforts to recruit women scholars and also creating the possibility of target-of-opportunity hires.
 - c. The 3^r procedure has to do with faculty mentoring, establishing formal mentoring processes for assistant and associate professors. We think this is important not just at the junior level.
 - d. The 4th has to do with the women's community — facilitating personal and professional connections among women faculty that cross departmental boundaries.

- e. The 5th has to do with recognition — developing mechanisms within departments and schools for identifying candidates for distinguished chairs, for awards and honors from professional societies and for service awards.
 - f. The 6th has to do with our endorsement of parental leave and tenure clock relief—I am very pleased that that has been supported.
 - g. The 7th has to do with partner hires — facilitating the recruitment and retention of candidates with spouses or domestic partners.
 - h. The 8th has to do with exit interviews. We currently do not have data on why people leave Duke and these data are key. i. And the 9th standardized procedure is repeating the deans' reports that were requested this year on the status of women every 3 years.
4. The final recommendation, concerning long-term goals, was stated not in terms of any numbers, but in regard to creating a *critical mass* of women faculty in all departments.

Nancy Allen: "Thank you Susan and thank you and your committee for putting this together and I'm sure spending many hours in preparation to bring this to Council. The next task force report will be presented by Rex Adams..."

The Task Force on Diversity.

Rex Adams (Fuqua/Diversity Committee), chair of the task force, began by acknowledging and thanking the members of his Diversity Task Force, present at the meeting: Charles Piot (Cultural Anthropology), Paula McClain (Political Science), Laura Svetkey (Medicine), Greg Jones (Divinity), Sally Dickson (Institutional Equity) and Judith Ruderman (Provost's Office).

Rex Adams: "In the spring of 2001, Duke University issued a strategic plan for the next decade entitled, *Building on Excellence*. It set several major goals for the university. Critical amongst these goals was a far-reaching institutional commitment promoting *diversity* in all aspects of university life. To give added strength to that commitment the plan stated, and I quote: 'Diversity is not an add-on or afterthought or a matter of mere enrichment, but rather an essential factor of critical importance to our success in all aspects of university life.'

"This task force ...was [created] by the Provost in September of last year to formulate guiding principles and to provide programmatic advice as to how the university might best give meaning and effect to the commitment to greater diversity within the most critical body within the university, our faculty. In accepting this charge, the members of this task force fully accepted the force and conviction of the arguments laid out in the Strategic Plan regarding the importance of achieving greater diversity in the intellectual, residential and institutional life at Duke. Indeed, as a group, we are persuaded that an effective diversity of scholarship, teaching and community will be a defined, indeed a signature element of, excellence amongst preeminent research universities in the 21st century.

"But our specific task was to consider how we are to proceed, and what measures must be taken, if Duke is to fulfill its commitment in this regard with particular reference to the character and composition of the Duke faculty. We took as our starting point the *Black Faculty Strategic Initiative*, initiated in the fall of 1993 and just now being concluded after having achieved its primary goal of doubling the number of black faculty at Duke within 10 years. In ... the context of the BFSI, we adopted from the outset three controlling assumptions. While our charge was

clearly to broaden the focus of the university's concerns with diversity beyond race, to incorporate other under-represented-minority groups whose enhanced presence among us would enrich us all, we were clear that our efforts would in no way be used to diminish the commitment reflected in the Black Faculty Strategic Initiative to increase the number and advance the role of people of color among our faculty. To that end, we asked and received from the provost a commitment that resources at least equivalent to those previously devoted under the BFSI would be available to continue to strengthen and broaden Black faculty representation. We took to heart the words of the plan to the effect that the university's diversity goals were to be an integral part of how we conduct our affairs going forward not an 'add on' or 'afterthought'...

"Let's be clear about this: for all of its accomplishments, structurally the BFSI was a sad deal, a provostial subsidy to accomplish an important goal. What we envision is a commitment by every school and department to integrate the diversity goals of this university into the mainstream of their budgeting and faculty planning, supported of course by the provost and aided, on a case-by-case basis where appropriate, by co-invested funds from his office. But we take seriously the need (if we are to be true to our convictions) that *our diversity will in important ways define our excellence*. [There is a need, therefore] for everyone with a voice in selecting and developing faculty, to assume responsibility for helping Duke as a whole achieve greater faculty diversity. For the task will be difficult and long — which was our third major assumption after having examined the facts of the matter.

"To begin with, Duke's faculty, like that of most of our peer institutions, is not notably diverse. The data are included in the report and they indicate just how dominant white males are in the composition of our faculty and most particularly among the senior ranks. Secondly, the rate of change among the faculty is very slow and incremental. And in addition we have every reason to believe that opportunities for overall growth in number of faculty will be constrained [in the future]. This suggests, as a matter of simple arithmetic, that if we are to make meaningful progress toward diversifying the make-up of our faculty, every opportunity for hiring or advancement within our faculty ranks carries with it an obligation to consider how that opportunity might be used also to advance the diversity goals of the university. Given what we know about the generally limited number of minorities available to us in the feeder pools from which we draw faculty, and the striking variability of minority representation across disciplines... we recognize that progress is likely to be somewhat difficult and slower than we might hope. All the more reason why we need to get started and be both thoughtful and determined as we go forward.

"Against this backdrop ... we were struck by the simple thought that our best means for making early progress towards our diversity goals lies in nurturing, developing and retaining the diverse members of our faculty who are already here and working to advance from the junior ranks to more prominent roles. Our focus on retention and development led us to conduct a series of focus interviews. These suggest that there is a significant opportunity to improve overall performance in this regard by directed and measured efforts to increase the support for all faculty at junior ranks. A number of specific recommendations are made to that end. Some departments and schools have more encouraging records than others in attracting and advancing minority talent among their ranks. Similarly, the opportunity across disciplines and subdisciplines to contribute to increasing diversity varies widely depending on the composition of the feeder pools on which they draw. Together these differences and the various reasons for them suggest **the need**

for multiple strategies and targeted efforts, particularly at each school and department, reflecting units specific opportunities and constraints.

"In this business, one-size-fits-all programs are more likely to give rise to cynicism and opposition than to contribute meaningfully to our enterprise. Instead, at the heart of our recommendations is the challenge to the Provost and to each dean and department chair to seize each opportunity to achieve greater diversity among our faculty and to ensure that best efforts and strenuous outreach have been made to use every opportunity constructively in support of the university's diversity goals.

"The specific recommendations to the Task Force are outlined fully on pages 8-12 of the summary report and I will not comment further on them at this time. The one specific proposal that perhaps requires a brief bit of elaboration concerns the formation of a *Faculty Diversity Committee*. This idea grew out of our conviction that a one-time report, such as the one we are making, is unlikely to be serviceable for very long. The effort to achieve meaningful changes in the character and composition of Duke's faculty is likely to be long term and to be subject to revision and enhancement as we learn from each other how best to accomplish this task. A standing faculty committee that is there to monitor our progress and to promote general conversation amongst us about best practices and what works and to promote an ongoing civil conversation about the often-contentious issues of diversity can be useful to all parties as well as serve for a helpful forum for the academic leadership of the university as they seek to devise targeted strategies to achieve measurable goals. No doubt many will have good suggestions regarding the character, composition and reporting relationship of this committee. But I do want to underline our strongly held view that some such continuing body will be needed to help us going forward..."

Discussion

James Rolleston (Humanities): "I have 2 questions on the Diversity Report. First I recall the process of developing a consensus on the [black] faculty initiative as a gradual one. Although it is a success I gather there is a way to go still. Are we wise to shift to another kind of initiative that will require developing a whole new consensus? Second, I found the shift from idealism at the beginning of the report to bureaucracy at the end somewhat alarming. Must diversity be reified into a process on which judgements are constantly being rendered?"

Rex Adams: "I would say two things in response, and I am joined here by other members of our task force.. One, we share the view that the Black Faculty Strategic Initiative, as a matter of program, might have come to its natural end after 10 years. We do not think that task was done and we do not in any way see the formation of this task force as an opportunity to reduce the level of commitment or concern about a continuing strengthening and broadening of representation people of color of this faculty. We said so. We've had these conversations with the Provost. We sought specific commitments to that end.

"Secondly, the suggested [transition] from the idealistic to the bureaucratic is of course a matter of taste. The world is full of eloquent expressions of views that find no practical outlet. Either we're going to make this a diversified university or we're not. If we are, then you've got to get down to opportunities: what are the priorities in how those opportunities are done and what is the process through which academic leadership is exercised to accomplish something that will not of its own weight happen? My experience in business and in life is that social organizations replicate themselves in the absence of some structural effort to change [them].".

John Staddon (Natural Science/Faculty Secretary): "I don't want to be accused of eloquence so I'll stumble a little. Diversity is obviously taken as an absolute good in your report. Since there have been studies both ways as to the educational benefits of diversity — and I think in fact that the best ones have shown that racial and gender diversity do not in fact conduce to educational excellence in any demonstrable way — my question is this: Do you think — does your committee think — that the kind of racial and gender kaleidoscope which seems to be your objective is a good in itself? Or does it serve some other good?"

Rex Adams: "Well I will comment and then ask other members of the committee. Our conviction is based perhaps on life's experiences. [Diversity] makes for a much better education. I find that, and I have members of the faculty from Fuqua where we have a very large degree of diversity within our student body, [who agree]. And I just finished teaching the ethics program, two sections, and my sense is that makes for a very rich and full educational process in and of itself.

"But our starting point is that this university has made a commitment in its Strategic Plan, passed as I understand unanimously by the Academic Council and by the Board of Trustees, that one of the major institutional goals of this institution.. is this commitment to rich and full diversity in everything that we do. Our task was simply to try to say, given that commitment, how can we best help the university shape a program or shape an attitude that would make that happen?"

John Staddon: "Just to follow-up. Would you be unmoved if the weight of such social science research as one can do with this very difficult topic showed that in fact the educational benefits were dubious? Would you still feel that, based on your personal experience and the personal experiences of your colleagues, you want to go further with this?"

Rex Adams: "I'm not familiar with the literature and therefore not qualified to comment. Are there other members of our task force that can?"

Nancy Allen: "We do have other questions here."

Ann Brown (Medicine): "I think that the question you raised is an interesting one about your getting down to the assumption that diversity is important. And I think we all have to sort of accept that if this is going to succeed and if we are going to make progress with diversity in gender and in ethnic and racial diversity. There are two other cases that are generally made for diversity that I'd like to describe, for the record, I guess. One is that, among the sciences anyway, the largest growing population is women. The other case that is often made is the business case, that if you are not accommodating to a diverse faculty because you will have some people coming in at the entry level who represent a diverse group. And they come, they stay, they use resources and leave, the turnover costs money. And those I think are two important arguments to add to it that don't touch on your question of whether the education is actually better, but it has to do with the remaining competitive and solvent."

Barry Myers (Biomedical Engineering/ECAC): "I'd like to say at the outset that I support both initiatives, both in institutional words, institutional values and institutional investments. That said, in the Diversity Report on page 11 there is a recommendation at the bottom I find troubling both in how it was written and in what it means in the absolute sense. That is, if institutional diversity is a property of the collective faculty and not a property of an individual... [should it carry weight in] an individual's AP&T process? I have great discomfort with that idea.

Moreover, in the prologue of this particular report you narrow the focus of diversity to a particular racial community and yet this question was posed, that we should all be weighed against, [which] says, "How does an individual contribute to a diverse intellectual environment?" ... I find this question at odds with your charge and I find the whole paragraph troubling. What are your thoughts?"

Paula McClain (Political Science/Diversity Committee): "Let me try to explain what we were thinking about as we were going through that. I think part of the APT process in terms of what the deans wrote in their letters to the committee. They cover a number of areas. One of those areas is contribution to cross-disciplinarity. It's not something that the committee is doing. It's not something that the outside reviewers deal with. It's something that the Dean deals with. And so our thought was that if in fact we're going to make diversity a part of Duke's culture, just like the importance of cross-disciplinarity, that we would ask the deans if they wanted to address in some fashion an individual's contribution — whether it was a teaching, service or whatever. It was not a requirement as each category, but it would be an opportunity for the deans in their transmittal to in fact address the area if they chose to.. ..It's not to be kind of this broader thing that everybody is to be judged against, but would give the deans in their transmittal letters another area to comment on if they chose to do so, in the areas of research, teaching and service."

Barry Myers: "And so to respond to that, if I may. If I [apply what you have said to] myself: I am a white male who does multidisciplinary work. I mean I have appointments in many departments and papers across many departments, in both medicine and natural sciences. I am diverse in that respect, in fact my research is intellectually unique in the institution. No one else does anything like it. However, I am a white male and not subject to this initiative. So, I don't understand what that question is doing in the [present context]."

Paula McClain: "It wasn't so much the subject of the initiative as to talking about the broader Duke culture, if in fact what you do is different, it is diverse and when the dean transmits it, it seems to me that kind of falls in that [category]. We were ... trying to make the issue of diversity, broadly defined, part of something we can think about in lots of different ways. And this was in that part and that process."

Barry Myers: "Attached to this document, however, [is the] connotation, [that it relates particularly to] racial and gender diversity — which I'm uncomfortable with because the institution hired me, and I have very little ability to change those qualities in myself."

Charles Piot (Cultural Anthropology/Diversity Committee): "I just want to add to what Paula has said. We had long discussions about this on the committee and the thought was that if every individual in the community doesn't 'own' this issue it's going to take a lot longer to change. And there are many ways of defining what one's contribution to the university community is. One might serve on a hiring committee that considers diversity of candidates. There is a member of our committee who is in the sciences, who is a male who goes into the local Durham schools and he's a person of color and he teaches grade-schoolers about science and so on. If we think broadly enough I think there are probably ways in which everyone could be included in this."

Barry Myers: "And that's a very positive quality, but when I go and put my resume into AP&T I don't know that that's where it belongs."

Charles Piot: "Well if multidisciplinary is something that you are being asked to think about, why not diversity?"

Barry Myers: "In the restricted context you are stating, [there is a] focus on those qualities that are unchangeable. In an absolute sense, if you want to talk about diversity as a good in the broadest sense of diversity I could choose to be diverse, I could choose to work with lots of people, I could choose to lots of things. And if the institution is promoting those things then that's good and maybe articulates a good goal In the [narrower] context of a report of this kind though, it is troubling.

Roxanne Springer (Physics): "My question is when you talk about contributing and 'owning' these goals, do you mean for instance that a white male could, I don't know, mentor a black woman or go into public school outreach, so you can just contribute in some way to the diversity. This kind of racial and gender..."

Charles Piot: "That's up to the deans to define. But absolutely."

Laura Svetkey (Medicine/Diversity Committee): "I just want for the record to say that we're not in this report suggesting that someone get extra points in their tenure decision because they are of color. It is that each one of the faculty is responsible for, and has an opportunity to work toward, this goal through mentoring or developing a program in schools or submitting proposals, so that somebody can supplement a grant application so that junior faculty person can be brought on board. There are a thousand different ways that this can be done in fact."

James Rolleston (Humanities): "I do think the point of the original question back there was that at the APT level it shouldn't be a question of plus and minus points for things like this, for activities like this. I mean some people, many, many people will have dossiers that are totally intellectual, they have produced brilliant work and they haven't even given the slightest thought to the social atmosphere or social activities. And why should there be any minus points placed against them?"

Rex Adams: "Service is one of the three elements that is being considered."

James Rolleston: "Well, one can serve on committees."

Anna Lin (Physics): "I want to address the issue that women and minorities are often asked to serve on more committees, perform more service, [just] because they are minorities, but they are not being acknowledged for that. Or when it comes up for tenure, that's not really considered. This is a way of saying, if that's a university goal, then we will acknowledge that you have contributed to that."

Ann Brown: "So, I guess the question that I am hearing in all of this is a concern that you will be disadvantaged in the APT process if you do not contribute to diversity in any way. So I guess, is that the intent of this that you will be disadvantaged if you don't contribute to diversity?"

Charles Piot: "The intent is the same as the intent for the service requirement: that when you come to Duke as a junior faculty member you know that when you come up for tenure you are going to be asked to contribute to service to the university, to be a good teacher and now we're adding to contribute to the diversity environment. So if you think of it from day one and there are dozens of ways to satisfy this. It shouldn't be difficult at all for all of us to do."

Rex Adams: "It's meant to be an encouragement not a disincentive."

Ann Brown: "That's what I'm hearing in the questions is a concern that if you choose not to do this, not to contribute to the social environment, but instead contribute to a purely intellectual process — which is a goal of academic pursuits — are you disadvantaged.. I don't actually

personally see that you'd ever be disadvantaged in doing this. I think that everybody has their own sort of pathway, but..."

Nancy Allen: These points relate to recommendations about both reports that we will hear from the Provost in a few minutes. Are there other questions for Rex?

Ken Dodge (Public Policy): "I'd like to address a remark to the point raised by Professor Staddon. John, I've known you for 25 years and I would a bit surprised if your remark was intended to conclude that you evaluate the social science research on humans being done on the effects of diversity and education as having sufficiently high rigor and scientific quality for you to conclude that diversity indeed has no effects on outcomes for members of the community. And I would posit, just as a remark, that there is a huge difference between concluding that the research has been sufficiently conducted with scientific rigor that [we can conclude] there are no effects, versus [saying that] there are a lot of studies with some strengths although numerous flaws and subject to multiple interpretations of the findings."

John Staddon: "I have to say Ken that I am shocked, *shocked* to hear you cast aspersions on social-science research. But I accept the point. I do have a question for Susan Roth, if I may. You talk, Susan, about 'narrowly defined searches' and I wonder if you would expand on what you meant by that as being an impediment to the hiring of women?"

Susan Roth: "Well there's the question about whether you should define searches more broadly so as to not rule out the possibility of women applying. Since there are some narrow definitions of some disciplines that will in effect ensure that you won't get any women out of it [whereas] if you were to cast a wider, net..."

John Staddon: "Could you just give an example? When you said 'narrowly defined' I thought you meant — well, in this search we're only going to look for men!"

Susan Roth: "Well, I mean in Psychology where there are plenty of women. You and I could each come up with the subdisciplines that are much more likely to have women applicants than the ones that aren't. So you're going to get many more women applicants in most fields of developmental psychology for example and many fewer women applicants in most things related to neuroscience. So that would be an example ... so that might be to say that if you are looking for a developmental psychologist, maybe you shouldn't specify things too narrowly. That would be one example. But you may want something very specific."

John Staddon: "I have to respond and say that you seem not at all uncomfortable with the idea that the disciplinary mix of the university will be guided not just by intellectual considerations, but partly by considerations of the distribution of males and females in the disciplines."

Susan: "No; I think it would be idiotic for me to suggest one ought to choose the subdiscipline on the basis of distribution of males and females in that subdiscipline. I think there are instances which maybe I'm in the best position to articulate; maybe other people can jump in if they can think of examples of this — there are instances where broadening the pool is not going to hurt anything and may in fact make it more likely that women will apply. That's all."

John Staddon: "I'll accept that; that's fair enough."

Susan Denman (Nursing): "I feel a little bit like a broken record, but again the School of Nursing is left out of the stats reporting. I did note the comment that we do look different because largely we are women and need to recruit men. However, I don't think that we should be excluded. I think the School of Nursing interacts with the larger university, and therefore some of the data would be very important. Clearly some of the progression statistics for School of

Nursing faculty would be important. And if we are going to revisit this every three years or so comparisons across years are quite interesting. And I would implore that you revisit the stats. I'm sure they would be easy to get."

Susan Roth: "Thank you for that. Actually I had some back and forth with Mary Champagne [Dean of Nursing] in the last couple days about just this issue. The justification — on the tables where we had assistant, associate and full professors percentage of women across the different schools — for not including the School of Nursing was that the data were being presented to demonstrate the under-representation of women on the faculty, which is not a problem in the School of Nursing. Let me tell you what we know. We have 4 associate professors in the School of Nursing, the percent of women goes from 100% to 75% between 1991 and 2001 and the end is 4 for both years. For full professors in the School of Nursing there are no full professors in 1991 and there are 2 (both women) in 2001. And for assistant professors both years the percent women is 100% and the total goes from 4 to 8 over that time period. That's one comment. That's not the only one. I think the promotion issue is really key. And Mary and I talked about that and we actually don't have that data and Mary has promised to bring those forward. And I think that will be very useful."

Jeff Dawson (Immunology): "This is item 7 in the Women's Faculty Development recommendation. And again this brings up a painful issue and as written or recommended it looks like it implies leaving the School of Medicine out. And the reason it's painful is that the recent loss of candidates related to department hires.. So I would encourage you to develop this item so there would be some mechanism that applies to the School of Medicine." Susan Roth: "It wasn't our intention to leave the School of Medicine out. Why do you see it that way?"

Jeff Dawson: "Well I think in terms of mechanics, it would probably be the Dean who would facilitate this and not the Provost — if I'm not mistaken."

Kristine Stiles (Art & Art History): I just want to be sure I understand something that Charlie [Piot] said and then I have a comment depending on what he said. Are we to understand that in AP&T this diversity issue would require ['diversity' to be] like 'service' to be a value that would be evaluated in a promotion?"

A voice: "Yes."

Kristine Stiles: "Well then, I have very serious reservations about it. And I'm speaking as someone whose work is all about diversity. This is a kind of precedent I see in a growing culture of surveillance that will next have a requirement for religious affiliations or animal-protection society or something else.. And I find this a very troubling precedent."

Nancy Allen: "That's why we are discussing these task force reports today to get input and ideas."

Barbara Shaw (Chemistry): "I just had a specific question on the Women's report, on p. 14 with respect to salary equity. There are several questions, but the main one here is: it says (2nd paragraph under salary equity): 'As part of salary equity study each year, a list of faculty whose actual salaries plus supplement are more than one standard deviation lower...' My question is: Why are you including the supplement? 'Supplement' to scientists means 'summer supplement' ... And why are you using that, rather than *base salary* because someone, for example a male who has a base salary that's 30% higher than a female, might not be getting any summer

supplements which means that the person might not be doing research and obtaining money for research to support the program. [Yet] it would appear as if there were no salary inequity."

After some discussion of this issue, Provost Lange interjected: "[The term supplement] absolutely does not include summer salary."

Some discussion ensued among Roxanne Springer, Josh Socolar (Physics/ECAC) and Susan Roth on the implications of the paragraph on p. 14 of the WFDTF report that reports a negative correlation between the number (proportion?) of women in a department and the mean salary level. The conclusion seemed to be that the causes of this correlation are complex and have no clear implications for salary equity. Nancy Allen then called on the Provost for his comments on the two reports.

Provost's Response to the Diversity and Women Faculty Reports

After thanking the committee members for their efforts, Provost Lange continued: "I am going to follow the same practice.. .that I followed with respect to the retirement report. I'm going today to just give you some general reactions to these two task-force reports. Among other things you will have seen that they have a complex set of recommendations, made even more complex by the discussion (which I greatly value), and which is one of the reasons I was sitting back there just waiting to see what came out. Second of all, as you also have seen, the reports actually recommend a number of overlapping initiatives. Figuring out how to do those in the most effective way, in order to assure that the goals and commitments laid out in the reports are met, is part of the job that we have to do. So what you can expect is that in the Fall I will return to the Council with a more specific set of reactions and policy implementation measures that we're going to undertake in response to these reports. That said, I do want to say a few things about the recommendations in each of the reports. I want to underline that these are initial reactions..."

"I'll start with the Women's Faculty Development Task Force. I'm simply going to go through the various recommendations and give you some initial sense of my reactions. First of all [I'll consider recommendations common to both reports]...Both reports recommend that there be systematic data collection every 3 years and a report made to the Provost — I believe it should also be made to the Council — which is one of the things very much in the spirit of both reports and in some of the things that Rex outlined. In fact I think it's quite striking that we found some things when the data were collected this time that we had not anticipated — and that even those who work fairly closely with the faculty in the individual units had [not] really seen. So I think that ongoing data collection, public reporting and development of good measures, is an extremely important matter.

"Second of all, on the Standing Committee on Faculty Diversity, I think this is an excellent idea. I think the implementation of the idea to assure that we get effective implementation of the policies requires some careful thought. In particular, we need to think about what would be the relationship between such a faculty committee and the ongoing efforts that necessarily originate with the administration through the search process, mentoring process, oversight of faculty, etc. So figuring out exactly how to articulate the relationship between a faculty committee, on the one hand, and administrative implementation — and to prescribe appropriate roles for each — seems to be an extremely important matter that we need to consider. In addition, the committee has also recommended [that] this faculty diversity standing committee have a relationship to the deans cabinet. Somebody mentioned herding cats before, I would not refer to the deans as cats, but what I would certainly say is that the deans cabinet does not exist as a corpo-

rate body and so the notion of it acting in a corporate sense is a little foreign to how we operate. So what we need again is to figure out the appropriate relationship between a faculty committee, the deans cabinet, the administration of the individual schools and the Provost.

"With respect to implementation on the issue of searches: one of the things that I greatly appreciate in the reports is the fact that they both set out relatively lofty principles and goals and also recognize that the achievement of those goals within individual units requires a fairly carefully articulated strategy with substantial oversight and care about what the most effective incentives and encouragements (as well as discouragements, I guess, for behaviors you don't want) would be for each unit.

"I think what we need to do as I work through these recommendations will be to try to figure out how best to articulate that process. Whether, for instance, the Provost should meet annually with the Dean, or the deans with the chair of each department, to evaluate a strategy and progress within each department. And think about how progress is being made. It's clear that not all departments deserve to be rewarded for behavior that they should be doing anyway — and that not all departments which are not fully promoting diversity in a manner which is conducive to their own excellence should be rewarded with additional positions — which has been more or less the way the BFSI worked. And so again we need to work through carefully how to use our administrative oversight and the faculty's oversight of these policies to assure that we make the most progress...

"I'll comment on one matter that is not in the report (well it's sort of in the end of the Women's report) which is the question of *overall diversity goals*. The report set an overall diversity goal and measure of progress and I think we need to look carefully at whether that is a wise course or not. I'm not completely convinced that we don't want to have some broad goal, but I'm not sure that we can effectively define how what the metrics of [such a goal] would be.. James [Rolleston], you may think this is bureaucratic, but in the absence of metrics I think that broad goals and values are somewhat difficult to implement.

"Both reports mention at some considerable length the issue of mentoring of faculty, junior and senior. I want to underline two things here. First of all mentoring is an issue across the faculty regardless of gender or race. It varies substantially also by department. So the issue is first of all how do we improve mentoring generally and then how do we address particular issues with regard to certain constituencies? And figuring out how to do that is one of the most important things that we'll have to work through. But that is [preeminently] an issue for deans — [to communicate to chairs]... Because you need to look department by department and I can assure you that differences across departments are very substantial regardless of the issue of race or gender.

"On the issue of women's community and support, I both think this is an extremely important goal and one which ultimately the administration can only facilitate, but which I believe will only be successful to the extent that the groups involved take some of these matters into their own hands. The women's network cannot be created from the Provost's office. A women's network can be facilitated from the Provost's office or from the Dean's office, but it cannot be created from the Provost's office or it will not succeed. So I think there is a message in the report as well to the community of women, or to the community of minority scholars, that the administration is perfectly willing to facilitate self-organization, but that ultimately the success of

building community rests with the community itself. I think recognition is an important issue and we're going to address that in a number of ways.

"Now the domestic partner issue: When I became Provost there was in fact a person in the Provost's office who had the responsibility for seeking to work on... facilitating the hiring of domestic partners. We found it was extremely difficult to do from a centralized office. No one has the range of expertise and no one has the authority, except in case of the Dean or Provost himself, to try to make things happen. So we actually abandoned the position. We then looked at the possibility of hiring an external firm. There are firms out there who claim to be really good at this. Well they may be really good in some sectors, but the academic sector is not one of them. It was evident in pretty short order that these firms do not understand and are not really able to do this. As a result I need to look carefully at what we need to do further.

"We are making some progress. Just to give you an example, this year we were able to facilitate a hiring of a spouse. In this case the male faculty member was at Duke and would have left because he and his spouse had received joint positions at another university. And working with the University of North Carolina we were actually able to secure a tenure-track position for the person at the University of North Carolina for the spouse, so that the male could stay at Duke and the spouse was at a job North Carolina. And we did that by in fact making Duke funds available to North Carolina to bring the person in until the person could be hired. And we know that North Carolina is willing to make similar arrangements in the other direction with us. So what I want to stress is this is a craft business...

"On the issue of parental leave, I want to thank the Council for its enthusiastic... support for the new parental leave and tenure-clock-relief policy. I can tell you that when we began the process, we did not anticipate such unanimous and widespread support and it really is a testimony to the way our community is changing, as well as the superb work that was done by the people working with me, to get such a policy in place.

"Exit interviews? You bet — no question.

"Now going to the Faculty Diversity Task Force: I want to reaffirm first our commitment to recruitment and retention of black faculty in the context of the broader goal of faculty diversity. As Rex made clear, I was asked directly by the committee to assure them that there would be resources at or above the current level and available to BFSI as we expanded the initiative. I come again to the response I gave there, which is that in fact we expect the resources to be somewhat larger. Black faculty are a critical component and a metric of our commitment and will remain so. The conclusion of the BFSI creates a base on which to build. At the same time the awareness of a need to expand the diversity of our task force and to draw on various faculty from various groups seems to me essential.

"John [Staddon] raised an issue in his usual useful way — and I'll say that with tongue and cheek, actually, regarding why we actually have supported diversity. And I think there is a great deal of material in this Faculty Diversity Task Force report even beyond the issue that Rex raises, which is that this is drawing on a strategic plan which was unanimously supported by both the faculty and the board. But I think there are also a couple of principles we might also want to articulate:"

- First, failure to draw fully from all pools of available faculty is a threat to excellence. We should be drawing the best faculty from whatever pools we can get. And you want to be assured that in fact your searches are drawing on all those pools. Of course outcomes by

themselves —just looking at the statistical outcome — cannot be being taken to demonstrate a failure to draw on those pools. But if read in the context of pool data, and [together with] an examination of peer institutions and the outcomes at peer institutions, it can be a sign of a possible problem. That's one of the reasons to have this more articulated and carefully developed strategy.

- Second, diversity of the faculty is also an educational goal in terms of exposure of our students to challenging views and alternative cultures and ways of thinking. I will cede to Ken Dodge and his comments on John's understanding of the precision of the Social Sciences, being a social scientist myself. I'm certainly aware of some of the issues. And of course what we mean by *education* matters as well.
- Third, I would argue that as part of the educational process, role models are important. We must recognize that we are not just educating our undergraduates in substantive subject matters, we are also educating them to become successful and educated citizens. And that if the role models they are confronted with are too narrow, this function is weakened.
- Finally, I would argue that we have seen in the last 20 years substantial evidence that diversity of those who were doing the research leads to diversification of a research agenda — extending the research agenda beyond what existed before. In fact it is in the sciences — in medicine for instance — where this is most clearly evident. So, again there I think that's an important argument for the kind of diversity goal that is articulated in the report.

"I'm not going to spend a great deal more time on the goals other than the ones special to this report. The report makes a good deal of pipeline issues and I will admit to some uncertainty about how to respond to that portion of the report. While I believe that pipeline issues are absolutely critical, I also believe that we need to decide where we can make our most significant institutional impact. I did have a discussion with the committee about this. They pushed back some on that view of mine and I appreciate that and I'm going to work through that some more. But I do think the pipeline issues are critically important. It's just how can we as Duke make the difference with regard to the pipeline issues..." Nancy Allen (calling attention to the time): "The bells are ringing." Provost Lange: "...I think I've spoken about the Faculty Diversity Committee and goal-setting and both positive and negative incentives. Retention and mentoring — I think retention is critical and so is the exit-interview issue. And finally I want to again affirm that there will be financial resources to implement these strategies. As I said, I will come back to the Council in the Fall with a more complete implementation plan, but these are the directions that I'm trying to move..."

Discussion

Josh Socolar (Physics/ECAC): "Could you just comment on the APT issue?" Provost Lange: "I'm going to speak very personally for the moment. My own inclination is that I'm not exactly sure how this particular provision in the task force report can be appropriately implemented in APT. That doesn't mean that I have made up my mind; it says that my current inclination is that I'm not sure I can see how. There is some merit, I believe, in segregating the APT process from a broader set of university goals and confining it to essentially those three

goals which are longstanding, which are: *academic achievement* —scholarly achievement, *teaching* and *service*. I have heard arguments today about how [fostering diversity] might be interwoven with service, but I think there is some merit in separating that out. And in fact, even at the APT process now, the committee is explicitly excluded from making judgments based on institutional goals. To the extent that this is an institutional goal, which exists independently of the work of an individual, it would fall to the Provost — and not to the APT committee and to the APT process — to make that determination. But that's my initial inclination...

"Nancy has also asked me to give you a rundown on the Arts and Sciences dean search. I'm pleased to announce the Search Committee and to say a couple of things about the charge. The Search Committee for the Dean of Arts and Sciences has been set and it will include the following: Brian Cantwell Smith (Philosophy), Houston Baker (English), John Aldrich (Political Science), Sunny Ladd (Public Policy), David Beratan (Chemistry), Xinnian Dong (Biology), Barry Myers (Biomedical Engineering), Joe Nevins (Molecular Genetics and Microbiology), Charles Payne (History) — and Tom DiPrete (Sociology), who will chair the committee. And in addition, Jim Siedow who, although he sometimes disguises himself as a biologist, you may remember is a former chair of the department of English." (laughter —'And former chair of this Council', interjected Nancy Allen) "And former chair of this Council... [Jim] will serve ex-officio from my office, since he is Vice Provost for Research.

"The charge to the committee is to secure for Arts and Sciences and Duke the best possible candidate to meet the requirements outlined in a job description which I have revised relatively recently. It's not radically revised from the previous job description, but does have some changes. In order to succeed in his primary task the Dean must be an intellectual leader among the faculty and energetic and conscientious administrator broadly familiar with issues in higher education, a strong advocate for arts and sciences in its teaching and research mission and a preeminent university citizen. I charged the search committee to proceed with an aggressive national search and actively solicit nominations of potential candidates, both internal and external, from a wide range of sources. Candidates from within Duke are expected to provide a vision statement specifically fashioned for Duke and external candidates are to provide a similar statement addressing broader issues than Arts and Sciences education and their possible implications for Duke. Candidates with previous experience at Duke will be given serious consideration and their qualifications will be judged against equally serious consideration from candidates from outside the university. The committee is beginning work now — next week I believe is the first meeting. And I've asked them to provide the president and myself with a list of 3 recommended, unranked, candidates by the first of December 2003.

The hour being late, Nancy Allen thanked the task forces again and adjourned the meeting at 5:05PM.

Respectfully submitted,

John Staddon
Faculty Secretary