

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, February 17, 2005, 3:30 - 5:00 PM

The minutes of the January 20, 2005, Academic Council meeting, with a minor prior correction from one Council member, were approved without dissent.

Nancy Allen (Medicine, Chair of the Council): We have just one announcement and resolution today and I will call on Professor Emeritus Don Fluke to read this for us. On his way down here we'll just wish him a happy birthday today. (Clapping) Don is a former chair of the Council at least once and a long-time faculty secretary.

In Memoriam, Douglas Maitland Knight, President Emeritus of Duke University

Don Fluke (Biology, Emeritus) offered a resolution:

A RESOLUTION

The Academic Council of Duke University takes respectful note of the passing of Douglas Maitland Knight, fifth President of Duke University, on January 23, 2005. The Council looks back with appreciation for his leadership in difficult times, and for the significant steps along a path from regional to national stature that his tenure and his efforts represented for Duke University.

Don Fluke: Recent attention to Doug Knight's presidency of Duke has tended to home in on 1969, when the wheels came off. But with your indulgence for a few minutes in a long agenda, I want to recall happier times.

I remember Doug's first public appearance at Duke, giving an address entitled "The Stones of the House." It represented quite a change in tone for this place, just emerging from the bleak time of racial segregation and taking as well a kind of perverse pride in our institutional austerity, an austerity not just of money but of style, too. Those on the faculty who had passionately worked for integration still had to learn how to go about it, and so did Doug, while he was coping as well with a Board of Trustees (very different from our Trustees now) and a community that were even less far along. Doug got us into more public events, convocations, like the one where I remember Bill Hamilton, first chair of this Academic Council, welcoming Doug in behalf of the Faculty as "Primus inter Pares." It was Doug, I'm sure, who started the practice of providing regalia for all who wished to take part. And I remember the Commencement Convocation in 1966, when Duke was graduating its first African-American students over in what is now Cameron, and Doug had to come to the lectern, stop the orchestra and the distribution of bibles — yes, we used to do that — to adjourn us all to the Chapel because of repeated bomb threats in Cameron. He was so concerned to avoid prompting a stampede. It was Doug who thought Duke should have an Art Museum, and took up the opportunity to purchase the Brummer Collection as a start, in spite of some grumbling among the faculty, and probably more among the Trustees. A heightened style and more substance cost some money and Doug set about that need, too. The Fifth Decade Campaign was Duke's first venture in fundraising going beyond the Duke Endowment.

In sum, Doug Knight's vision for Duke University is very much alive and well today as we're moving from national to now international stature. It is my honor to commend this Council for expressing our appreciation of the President who brought us that vision in such considerable measure, and who moved it forward, even in the face of troubling events and troubled times for campuses everywhere.

[The resolution was moved, seconded and passed without dissent, by voice vote.]

Nancy Allen: Don, thank you for those kind words and memories, which are especially appreciated since you lived through those times. I note that President Knight had gotten his degree in English from Yale, and President Knight also presided over the last major expansion of the Library, to my knowledge. So we have at least a couple of similarities with our present times.

We'll now move on to a School of Medicine Faculty Diversity Plan update which we had hoped to hear at our last meeting. But time did not permit that so, I've asked Professor Ann Brown from the School of Medicine, who is Associate Dean for Women in Medicine and Science, to give us that update.

School of Medicine Faculty Diversity Update

Ann Brown (Medicine): The Faculty Diversity Plans for the Schools of Medicine and Nursing were distributed to this group sometime after November of 2003. That's when they are dated and they are included in your packet; there are also copies of a progress report available. Because of the packed agenda, I'm just going to give you some highlights of what we're doing in the Medical Center. I'd like to provide a brief overview of the work that is underway, particularly with regard to this faculty diversity plan.

I don't know how many of you know much about the School of Medicine, but I wanted to share some numbers with you. Based on September 2004 data there are 1482 regular rank faculty in the School of Medicine. And of these, 9.7% are members of the Basic Science departments. So a fairly a small number, about 140 faculty, 10% or fewer of the total, are women so there are probably 14 Basic Scientists who are women. So numbers in the Basic Sciences are small. The remaining 90% of regular-rank faculty are in the Clinical Science departments. Of all regular rank faculty 29% are women, 2.9% are Black and 2% are Hispanic — these percentages reflect national averages.

What are we doing to try to improve these statistics? Well first our Dean, Sandy Williams, is extraordinarily committed to building a diverse faculty. As many of you know, he hired the first two Black chairs and the first female chair ever at Duke that I know of during his first few years here. In addition I'd like to highlight the department of Medicine: Pascal Goldschmidt, who is the chair of Medicine, has also contributed to the significant change and the profile of our leadership by recruiting two outstanding women to be chiefs of Gastroenterology and Cardiology — two very high-profile divisions in the Department — Drs. Pam Douglas and Anna Mae Diehl join the lone woman division chief Marilyn Telen to triple the number of women serving as division chiefs in the Department of Medicine. Danny Jacobs has appointed Randy Bollinger to spearhead diversity initiatives in the Department of Surgery.

So, in two major departments, there has been significant attention to diversity by the chairs and also by our dean. Second, in response to the Women's Initiative, Dean Williams appointed the first Associate Dean for Women in Medicine and Science, and I currently serve in that role. One of my major goals is to implement this Faculty Diversity Plan that I'm reporting on right now. The way we are implementing this plan has involved putting together a few organizational elements and a few programmatic elements. By way of organizational elements, Marilyn Telen and Dean Williams have revitalized the essentially defunct Faculty Women's Committee. This committee now participates regularly in the interview processes for chair re-

mits and as a result of these experiences we actually drafted a series of recommendations to make search processes more effective in identifying women candidates.

We've also established a Faculty Diversity Council, and this is done in response to the Women's Initiative and the Black Faculty Strategic Initiative joining together at the end of both of those independent initiatives. I served as chair of that committee and as our first job we wrote an ROI grant application to the NIH called "Mentoring for Diversity." This grant helped us to focus on what it would take to build a faculty with broader representation by women and under-represented minorities: we think it will take several good faculty development initiatives and attention to institutional climate. That is also reflected in the grant.

We also think it will take scholarly research into what elements of mentoring are important to recruiting and retaining women and minorities; we hope that this type of inquiry leads us to practices that we might call *mentoring for diversity*. The second job of the Faculty Diversity Council will be to respond to Dean Williams' recent request for a strategic plan for faculty diversity, which is currently underway as part of the School of Medicine Strategic Planning process.

Those are some organization elements, to try to get the people in place to begin talking about faculty diversity. In terms of programmatic elements, we have established a new professional development seminar series which aims to improve the transparency of processes that faculty regularly engage in, like writing grants, navigating the NIH grant review process, searching for funding, and even interpreting our own promotion criteria. The first six seminars have been received very enthusiastically, even hungrily! with 80 to 150 faculty at each one. We're in the process of developing a more comprehensive faculty development plan that will incorporate existing resources and create new ones such as a *faculty leadership academy*, which again we've had before, but with the change in leadership, the focus of the leadership academy needs to change to reflect institutional priorities.

These are a few of the things we've been working on. Nancy also mentioned that there had been some interest in exit interviews. There is a new process for performing exit interviews and that is being carried out by two faculty members, Jeff Dawson and Mimi Jakoi. The interviews are being conducted six months after faculty leave the institution. My understanding is that four exit interviews have been completed. They haven't been analyzed in any way yet.

I would be happy to answer any questions or entertain any comments about the School of Medicine...

Nancy Allen: Thank you Ann for that report, which dovetails with April Brown's report last month, Peter Lange's comments about the Faculty Diversity plan, and progress on the University side.

Election of the Academic Council Chair

We turn now to the election of the new chair of the Academic Council who will serve for the academic years 05-06 through 06-07. The candidates nominated are first Professor Roger Barr of the Engineering faculty, Biomedical Engineering. (Barr had apologized that a previous commitment prevented him from attending.). Our second candidate is Professor Paul Haagen from the School of Law. Brief resumes of each of the candidates were read at the last meeting and distributed with today's agenda. In addition to the candidates presented by the Nominating Committee, nominations from the floor are open at this time, the one caveat being that the prospective candidate has to have agreed in advance to serve...

[There being no floor nominations, a paper vote with yellow, chadless ballots, followed.] Nancy Allen: I thank for their assistance in this process today counters Professors Peter Burian and Margie McElroy.

Later in the meeting, after the count was complete, Nancy Allen announced: Our next chair of the Council is Paul Haagen (clapping). So on behalf of the Council I wish to thank Roger Barr for his willingness to stand for election and certainly for Paul's will-

ingness to stand also and to take on this task. I look forward to working with Paul in the coming months to help with the transition.

The Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA)

Nancy Allen: Speaking of the next agenda item, Linda Franzoni was supposed to present the Report on Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics, but we just learned she is ill today. So I will present the beautiful PowerPoint slides that she prepared. Kathleen Smith is here to help me answer any questions you have and we will continue this item at next month's meeting.

The Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics is a group that was formed in 2002, started in the Midwest by some interested faculty-senate leaders who were concerned about the shape and direction of athletics related to academics on their campuses. So, beginning in 2002, I started getting emails from Bob Eno at Indiana University, who was helping to form this group, and we brought information about the coalition to this Council and voted to become a member. Paul Haagen, when he was on ECAC and vice chair, attended the first Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics meeting in 2003. Kathleen Smith, who is chair of our Athletic Council, is on the Steering Committee of COIA, and Linda Franzoni just attended the second large meeting of this group at Vanderbilt in January.

What is COIA? Most university faculty members here love college sports. But faculty are also stewards of academic integrity. The primary goal of the Coalition was find ways in which faculty can strengthen the basis of intercollegiate athletics by identifying and addressing problems that we all have with conflicts that occur on our campuses. Because of the university role, it is a responsibility that faculty members should address and be willing to do so and to work with their presidents and their faculty groups on the athletic councils on these issues. The time has come for a broader approach, not only by the faculty athletic representatives who attend conference meetings and the NCAA. Kathleen Smith is our faculty representative; our presidents, who meet quite often with leaders in the ACC and the NCAA in our case, and keep up with those ideas. But we think that a grass-roots faculty network will help to make a difference. So far, over 40 schools have voted to join COIA, with an initial goal of pushing for some kind of reform. From the ACC currently Duke, UNC, and Wake have voted to join. All the other schools have been approached. Some of them have been involved in one way or another. I know the University of Maryland has. And you can see the list of schools, some of which you may recognize and some not.

The positives of intercollegiate athletics are many, from personal development of athletes to having a campus focus for collective enthusiasm, even more than enthusiasm, from students with their bonfires, but also from faculty who are fortunate enough to get tickets — and of course, from our alumni. Certainly intercollegiate athletics creates bonds among all the groups on campus. However, athletics certainly can compete with the educational mission in ways that create challenges. COIA has come up with a working Academic Integrity document to address some of the practices that may weaken academic integrity, at least at some colleges and universities.

Through Kathleen's leadership and President Brodhead and former President Keohane's leadership, our Athletic Department and our Athletic Policy — contributed to by various faculty members who have served on committees and asked questions — through all this, we think that we are one of the leaders in this area. And our participation I hope will also help bring in other institutions. The Academic Integrity document that we included in your packets summarizes the issues, and there is a link given for the website where the working Academic Integrity document is posted. There will be updates of that document within the next week, after some amendments have been voted on by the faculty-senate leaders.

The document includes issues pertaining to admissions, scholarships, curricular integrity, time commitment, scheduling, missed class time and policies concerning academic advising.

Key points which Linda summarized for us include raising the bar for admissions at many schools (that is, the bar that is set above which athletes may be admitted). There are some schools that don't have as regularized practices as we do and don't have the buy-in and partnership among the trustees, administration and faculty to make changes. So one of the issues here is raising the bar at many schools, keeping relevant data, and making data available to faculty governance bodies for review.

A second issue is scholarships, we would like the presumption of renewal. We would like to require an academic officer not in the athletics department to revoke scholarships, to recommend conversion of athletic scholarships to need-based aid as a long-term goal, and, perhaps, to reduce the number of athletic scholarships. Other issues are curricular integrity, data collection on the academic performance of athletes, with an eye toward spotting differential treatment in either direction, and scrutiny of courses taught by the Athletics Department staff.

Course credit for the sport itself should be limited — I gather that is done at some institutions. Time commitment: there was a lot of discussion about minimizing interference with classes from of either training or competition; about the importance of arranging schedules so as to minimize interference with course-curriculum scheduling. Eliminating divided competitive seasons for those sports that cross semester lines has gained some attention — reversing a trend toward expanded seasons that include both pre- and post-season tournaments. There was even mention of limiting the scheduling of athletic events on weekdays and avoiding conflict during final exams. There are some policy suggestions for advising.

In the NCAA news on Valentine's day, the president of the NCAA, Miles Brand, was quoted saying "the significance of faculty endorsement of athletic reform cannot be overstated." So he is supportive of the efforts of COIA. The totality of the recommendations represents an effort from a group critical to the success of the reform movement. Brand again is supportive. This is just one piece of the puzzle — many groups are involved. Some of the items in the document are recommended best practices. I think Duke already has complied and gone way beyond those best practices. A few of the items in the document would potentially lead to NCAA bylaw changes — those are separated out a little bit in the document. It's still a bit confusing, but hopefully will be clarified by our next meeting so we can perhaps vote on the spirit of the document and not get too nitpicky. Since Kathleen [Smith] is here, if you have any questions we'll see if she can help me with the answers.

Questions

Earl Dowell (Engineering): Do we ever benchmark our admissions results for athletics vs. Stanford and other name schools in the Ivy League? Have we done something like that?

Kathleen Smith (Biology): Christoph [Guttentag] has tried many times to get information from Stanford and other comparable schools, but they will not release their admission procedures. Christoph has tried to get the information indirectly, with limited success. No one shares that information.

Earl Dowell: As part of this national effort wouldn't it be worthwhile to ask this national group to encourage universities to release that data?

Smith: That would be a nice thing if they are asking us to release data on performance to also release that. We're not even comfortable releasing all the data for undergraduate admissions in general.. Admissions data are very protected by all universities.

Marie Lynn Miranda (NSEES): Is COIA interested in tackling the issue of the impact of media on sports markets, timing decisions on academic...

Allen: Yes, that's next.

Smith: They've taken on three things. The one they dealt with first was recommendations for faculty governance, which was last year. The academic integrity issue has been going on for a while. And then the third issue is financial integrity, which is very much in line with

Miles Brand's wanting to tackle the whole business of commercialization. So that's going to be done next after this. Again, you know there is a tilting-at-windmills aspect to some of this. But we hope to provoke good discussion. There may be items that could come up for action. But in any case, I think it's good to have discussion on the table.

Margie McElroy (Economics): I'm glad to see COIA and support it. But I'm a little uneasy about the relationship between COIA and ACC and similar organizations. We've heard these arguments — we have to get bigger financially, and so on — and I think there's some sense that the management in the ACC has a different set of priorities than the universities do. It seems to me it that the big problem is to get these priorities lined up.

Smith: COIA has no relationship with any established athletics group. In fact there is enormous hostility towards COIA; it's a dirty word at the ACC and not only the ACC offices...

Allen: It's just that there are several ACC schools whose faculty senates have agreed to participate in COIA.

McElroy: OK good. I would just like to see them take on the task of deciding in principle how such conferences should be run..

Smith: I think that's part of the financial thing. I think their focus as faculty, though, is to say they have a role and a responsibility for the conduct of issues on campus — and that they need to take a greater responsibility. The aim is to put pressure on the presidents of individual schools, because the presidents really are the ones who allow the ACC to do what it does.

Construction

Provost Lange: Before we move on to the next agenda item I wanted to draw the Council's attention to another matter. As you can appreciate, the large amount of construction which has gone on on campus over the last few years sometimes disrupts the daily lives of our faculty members. And I hear from them occasionally and some of those comments are more uplifting and some less. And so I thought that I would indulge myself by reading you (with permission) a letter which I recently received from one of your colleagues — because it seems to me so well to capture both the best and the worst of the progress that we are making and both best and *not* the worst of how comments can be delivered to those who need to hear them. Here is the letter:

To the Office of Provost Peter Lange:

In the letter granting me sabbatical leave for last fall I was charmed by the request to provide a report to your Office. Because your office and its artwork were featured in Duke Magazine last year, I can write with some knowledge of my audience. Unfortunately, my own office is something of a sore point at the moment: I planned to remain in Durham in my own office for my sabbatical semester because my lab, my computer and its contents, my research notes and data, and the library are the materials I needed for carrying out my plan for thinking and writing. Yet my office, as it turns out, is also immediately adjacent to and connected with the epicenter of construction for the French Science Center. This is significant because sound and vibration (make that "violent shaking") attenuate as an inverse square with distance — meaning, being close and connected to it is really, really bad. In addition, because 'deferred maintenance' on the windows of the Biological Sciences building has been postponed indefinitely, as I sit at my desk working I am bathed in diesel fumes. (For the record, bad smells are not something I usually complain about: for my research I often work with dead animals, so my olfactory system is not particular delicate.)

I've found the best way to avoid this is to work late at night and on weekends. You're welcome to view me at work from your office. Thanks to the digital webcam at <http://www.digitaldpg.com/>, it has been possible for anyone in the world with access to the worldwide web (and preferably Explorer as a browser) so zoom in on any of my office or lab windows to see me and my computer or other activities in my lab. (Lately, however, with all respect to John Ashcroft, most have us have taken to keeping our shades down.)

There are several other faculty whose offices are similarly positioned, from whom you have probably not heard because (1) one of them is partially deaf; (2) another is an assistant professor

who probably feels too vulnerable to complain; (3) the third has a disposition so calm that angry hornets wouldn't ruffle it; (4) none of them spent as much time in their offices this past semester as I, trying (with mixed results) to write and think.

Best wishes in the New Year. Thank you for supporting progress at Duke, (name withheld)

Provost Lange: Just to conclude that little vignette, I'm happy to report my understanding that this faculty member, due to our new interdisciplinary initiatives and our success in raising external grant money, is about to have an office somewhere else.

Proposal to Permit Research-Rank Faculty in the Institute for Genome Sciences and Policy

Let me now turn to the proposal we have before us in the letter from Hunt Willard, which describes a proposal for the Institute for Genome Sciences and Policy to have the opportunity to recommend appointment of research-rank faculty. This will not be a precedent. We already have units which have this capacity, but it is a Board requirement that we provide you with such capacities through normal processes. I believe that this is an extremely important step for us to take as an institution, as we move forward with our interdisciplinary efforts while also retaining the strength of our departments and also retaining for them the right to make all *tenure-track* appointments (which would be retained under this proposal). I think Dr. Willard has taken great care to assure that as this proposal is implemented, the faculty involved will be given proper consideration and that the quality considerations which we would have with any faculty appointment will be maintained. So I recommend this to you strongly. Hunt, unless you want to add anything further we can just hear any discussion, and he can answer relevant questions...

Nancy Allen: Thank you Peter and Hunt. I think this issue is clear cut. The Executive Committee (EC AC) asked if this would set a precedent and it does not. There are other units that have this authority. I think EC AC also felt comfortable waiving the two-meeting rule if no controversial issues arose during discussion. And so I would just ask someone make a motion to accept this proposal and report and I will ask for that motion.

[The motion was made, seconded and passed without dissent.]

Changes in the Procedures for Appointing Distinguished Professors

Provost Lange: The next item on the agenda concerns some changes in the procedures to the naming of distinguished professors. The proposal is rather self-evident, but I want to preface it with two or three remarks. First of all, why would this become an issue at this point? I think it's useful to consider the changes since the 1980s. In 1985 there were a total of 75 distinguished professorships at Duke of which 40 were university-wide professorships and 25 were within schools or departments or fields within departments, and an additional 10 were eponymous chairs: that is, chairs without funds behind them but which were in schools.. Today we have 235 distinguished professorships. And of those 235, 50 are university-wide chairs and all the others are designated to a specific school. 150 of them are endowed and restricted to a school department or field within a department, and another 35 are unfunded, eponymous chairs. Now that change is itself significant. But it is more significant in the context of the change in the budget structure of the university which occurred in the early part of the 1990s. That is responsibility-center management, which is basically our system. Under that system, as your know, the deans raised the money and they keep all the money that they don't have to pay to the center for central services. And they then spend it.

The enormous growth in the number of restricted chairs in schools and departments is to a great extent a product of the enormous efforts that deans have undertaken over that period to raise more chairs for their schools. So we had a very significant change in the process by which the money for chairs is raised and in the location of those chairs.

Now the current distinguished professors process requires that all chairs, regardless of whether they are in schools or university-wide, be presented to the Distinguished Professors Committee for recommendation to the Provost. Each year there has been a great deal of discussion — sometimes confusion, sometimes debate, sometimes obfuscation — regarding whether these chairs are all equivalent or not. How would a school chair be named? What might be the specific conditions that would pertain to a school that might not be the same as the specific conditions that would pertain to another school? Just to give you an example: we have some schools in which 80 or 90% of the full professors have distinguished professorships; whereas in other schools it might be only 15 or 20%.

Thus, expectations differ in different fields, and it makes a difference from a competitive point of view whether or not you have a chair. Those conditions are fed into the DP process. So we have been working for a number of years to try to identify better ways of capturing the new reality. The proposal you have before you is one on which I have been working on for several months. It has received the endorsement of the Deans Cabinet. It has been thoroughly discussed in front of the current Distinguished Professors Committee and received their basic consent. We didn't take a vote, but did receive basic consent. There was no discussion indicating that the proposal might not be acceptable.

Our current procedure is much more restrictive than the procedures used by our peer institutions. Some simply allow administrative distribution of chairs. Others, with more faculty governance, nevertheless still have the schools alone distribute the chairs without any central intervention except a sort of formal sign-off. The procedures which are indicated here would mean that the schools would create their own faculty governance committees in the area of chair of distinguished professorships in those schools. Those committees would recommend to the Dean and then the Dean to the Provost those persons they believe to be eligible for a chair, and the Provost would then retain the right to decide who would get distinguished professorships even within the schools. In addition, the Distinguished Professors Committee at the university level would continue to use procedures already in place to name all university-wide chairs. So I bring this to you for recommendation and I hope approval. I'm happy to take questions.

Questions

Ron Gallant (Fuqua School): Does this allow a school to make a chair offer?

Lange: If the school had a chair available and the dean were prescient enough to make a request to the school committee for a person who the dean was considering for appointment to be considered by that committee even prior to appointment. And the committee were willing to do so, and suggests that that person then was chair-eligible back to the dean as the dean was making appointments. If the dean brought that proposal to me and I approved it, that would be possible.

Gallant: What do you do about that clause in the document that says you have to wait until a certain stage for the announcement — should you privately communicate...?

Lange: Yes, exactly and we do that now sometimes. So it will somewhat facilitate it because it will be a much more expeditious — I don't mean faster — but it is just easier to get a group to deal with their own colleagues at the school level than it is in a large committee which requires getting everybody in the university who is on the committee together at the same time. So it will make it somewhat easier. Any other questions?

Earl Dowell: Peter, I must have missed that meeting. You know I'm on your Distinguished Professors Committee.

Lange: In fact you did miss that meeting. Yes we named every distinguished professor while you weren't there...

Earl Dowell: Is there going to be some sort of liaison between the University Distinguished Professors Committee and those in the schools? For example, we have people from all

across the university on your committee. Is there going to be some interaction between those two groups, some common membership, someone who is on the University committee?

Lange: There is nothing in the proposal that would recommend that. I will obviously work with the deans to assure they get some experienced people, especially in the early years of the creation of the school committees.

Craufurd Goodwin (Economics): Is it your thought that if perhaps you are unsatisfied with the recommendation of the school committee you might then refer it to the university-wide committee?

Lange: No, I would do what I do now — which is to say I don't approve and then the dean and I would probably have a conversation. That would be my expectation. I think what is more likely to be the case is that there will be some chairs that the school committee will recommend that the dean will think are actually worthy of a university professorships and will then forward to the university committee. And of course there is still all the nomination processes that we have now with respect to faculty nominating for either level.

Nancy Allen: Any other questions? If not, again this is an issue which has been worked on over many months. ECAC has spoken with the Provost on several occasions and we know that there have been those discussions with the deans and with the current Distinguished Professors Committee. So, again in the interest of time, I would like to ask that we waive the two-meeting rule and accept this new policy — noting that exact language changes for the Faculty Handbook will be brought to the Council by next months' meeting.

[The motion was made, seconded and approved by voice vote with no dissent.]

Proposed Ph.D. Program in the Department of Public Policy

Nancy Allen: The last agenda item is discussion of the Department of Public Policy Proposal to create a Ph.D. program. I do note that things come in threes for those of you who believe in that and this is our third Ph.D. proposal this year. And these are the only three in many, many years...I'd now like to call on Bruce Jentleson, Director of the Sanford Institute and Chair of Public Policy, and Fritz Mayer to present this information.

Bruce Jentleson (Public Policy): Thanks very much Nancy. I just want to say a couple of words and then I'm going to turn it over to Fritz. Fritz is our Director of Graduate Studies and has played the leading role, both intellectually and in every way, trying to develop this proposal and work it through all the various processes. I just really want to make three points at the outset, from my perspective as Director of the Institute and chair of the Department. Actually the first one is to strongly support this. I think it's very exciting and am very pleased to have reached this part of the process.

The other 3 points are, first, this really is a very big step for the Sanford Institute and the Public Policy Department. In the 5 years or so that I have been the Director and Chair — and Fritz has been the DGS for about 3-4 of those — we had a strategy originally which was to try to deal with our IPP program. We had a sense that it needed a comprehensive review and further development and we made that our priority. I think we succeeded in that and by a variety of indicators we wanted to do that first. And then the question of IPP renewal came up at our external review in 2001-2002 and we proceeded with that.

I think for us this Ph.D. proposal is a big step and manifests the Institute's further growth and intellectual development in recent years. The sense of the external review committee, our sense, and I think the sense of other committees that have looked in the university that have looked at us is that we really are ready for this in a variety of ways: the strength of the faculty, the breadth of the faculty, the depth of the faculty. In turn I think it will add further to the development of that faculty. Having the Ph.D. adds another dimension for our faculty in terms of their own research agendas and the like. Our field of Public Policy is sort of the reverse ratio of many others. Which is to say if you look at other Public Policy institutions that have Ph.D. programs

there is still the numbers tend to be on the masters side. And we fully intend that, in ways that Fritz will talk about. But nevertheless it becomes an important component at Harvard, Princeton, the University of Chicago and many other peer institutions.

The other point, from our perspective, is synergy with our undergraduate program. You probably heard a bit about the changes we're making in our undergraduate program. One of the emphases is on research and writing. Adding a Ph.D. program with TAs enhances our capacity to do that. So we see a synergy here not a zero-sum.

Another point is the interdisciplinary both within the unit and in the broader Duke context. We actually have (I think) at last count eight different types of Ph.D.'s on our faculty as primary appointments, not even counting secondary. And so inherently we have a lot of interdisciplinarity. We connect in many ways with other parts of the university in many things we do and we've built that into the Ph.D. program in a way that we think strikes a balance between being very interdisciplinary, by definition, without trying to do too much too quickly in terms of where we're starting. But I think it speaks to the larger theme that the university has of interdisciplinarity. And thirdly, as someone who is a card-carrying political scientist in terms of my own discipline, one of the differences I think between Public Policy and other areas of the social sciences is there is more explicit and conscious effort to build bridges between theory and policy. The way we define our questions is not just something people sometimes call translational knowledge, but is really policy-relevant research. So in the design of this program, as well as in the research of our faculty, you really see a strong theoretical basis, but in service of a genuine empirical effort, whether it's quantitative or qualitative, to really apply that to policy questions. I happen to think that's going to be more fundamental to the university over the next couple of decades, in a very broad sense, given our position in society. So I think in another way it's both what we do as a discipline, but I think also interconnects with some broader trends we have in the university and broader priorities we have. In sum for us, for university interdisciplinarity, and for this broader question of the place of the university in society, many things we do — and particularly this Ph.D. program — I think really speak to it and both benefit from it and strengthen it as we go on. So let me turn it over to Fritz and he'll give you more substantive detail.

Fritz Mayer (Public Policy): Well thanks Bruce and thank all of you for the opportunity to present today. It's a very exciting step in what has been a fairly lengthy process — as is always the case with these Ph.D. proposals. But perhaps even more so with this one, which is, as you've seen in the proposal, somewhat complicated. It involves a lot of actors around the university. We spent the last two years in conversations within the department and with colleagues in other departments and with the requisite set of committees at Duke. And it has been a very interesting and I think a very good conversation, one that's resulted in a much better proposal than when we started. So, there are a lot of people to thank. You see in the packet there's quite of list of people who have endorsed this proposal, all of whom have been very helpful along the way: obviously my colleagues in PPS, the committee within the department, the chairs of the departments of Economics, Sociology, and Political Science. There's a letter up-front if anyone would like to see it from Mike Munger to add to the list of endorsements that didn't get into the packet. Also Bill Schlesinger at the Nicholas School, with whom we've been talking, and of course Dean Siegel and the Executive Committee of the Graduate Faculty and Tim Strauman in the APC, and Deans McLendon and Roth, my colleagues on ECAC and the Provost. It sounds like an Academy Awards list of people to thank. But it really does reflect I suppose the strength at Duke, the extensive process of discussion with the faculty that results in better proposals at the end.

I'll just say a few more words about the proposal. I won't say too much in detail about it, but I did want to highlight a few points about it and then we'll open up for questions and discussion. The rationale of the proposal laid this out in a somewhat more detail. The Ph.D. program

forces us to grapple with basic core questions about who you are and what it would mean to have a Ph.D. in that area. And as Bruce just mentioned, some of the defining characteristics of the field are that it is applied, that it is about public problems and particularly about intervention — which means that it is fundamentally interdisciplinary. And that's really a starting point.

Bruce mentioned that in terms of conceptualizing the department, one has to understand political and economic social systems — and other things as well — in order to not only understand the problem but anticipate how an intervention might make a difference. So it's fundamentally interdisciplinary, and also *normative*, in the sense that at the end of the day we're about what *should be* done. Therefore there's an ethical or normative dimension to what it would mean to have a Ph.D. in Public Policy and what Public Policy is.

We spent a lot of time thinking about why a Ph.D.,? Why now, why should Duke have a PPS Ph.D.? There are a lot of considerations that went into the judgment, not only ours but also those of the external review committee and others who thought about this. Bruce identified one issue that I think is very important, which has to do with the intellectual contributions offered by a Ph.D. program, not only for us in the department (which I do think significant in terms of the climate of the place and our ability to interact, as Bruce mentioned, with the undergraduate program), but also for the rest of the university. As the rest of the this proposal will show, there are lots of intersections with the rest of the university.

A second point has to do with our standing in the field of Public Policy. Increasingly, having a Ph.D. program is the coin of the realm. Once it was MPP, but now all of the major programs — Harvard, Princeton, Berkeley, Carnegie Mellon, Chicago, Michigan — with whom we compete have Ph.D. programs. And increasingly, it's our sense that that's one of the things one has to have in the field to be a major player. And it is our intention to be and to continue to be a leader and to have impact on the field of Public Policy.

Duke was one of the first movers in public policy more than 30 years ago, very much a leader in the field. I think we still are. But this is in our judgment part of what we need to do to continue to play that role in the field.

Last, in terms of rationale there are many considerations, but one of them surely is what the market is. We spent a lot of time trying to understand what you do with a Ph.D. in Public Policy and what its market looks like. The answer is that the market looks pretty good. There are basically two kinds of market, one is in academia in public policy schools, which is very much a growth industry, and related kinds of applied schools like schools of public health, international affairs programs and the like. There's a pretty good market for these students, certainly students coming out of top programs with places I just mentioned.

Secondly (though not perhaps in terms of numbers) there is quite a strong market for Ph.D.'s in public policy in think tanks, research institutions, government agencies, international organizations and the like. Increasingly this is a degree recognized and valued by those places. We expect roughly 2/3 of the people who get this degree will actually end up in places like that and 1/3 in academic settings. That's about the average across the schools that I just mentioned.

Now just a little bit about why we decided to organize the Ph.D. the way that we did, some organizing principles. One was that we wanted to have a public policy core. That is, we wanted to have at least some courses that all students took that provided a kind of common vocabulary and common set of ideas. Not every program in public policy does this and the programs that don't lack cohesion. Being in such a program is frankly a pretty lonely experience for Ph.D. students. And we were determined that we would have no part of that.

But second we really felt that we needed students at least have a heavy foot in a traditional discipline. And this is an area we've had quite a bit of discussion about in terms of how hard we should press on that. But it was our judgment that for a couple of reasons it was important for students to be interdisciplinary and to be conversant in several social science disciplines, but still to have a reasonably strong base in a particular discipline. So that they could hold their

own in terms of publishing, in terms of the intellectual discourse of that particular discipline and because the market, at least the academic market, seems to work that way. It's very helpful to be able to say that I have many of the skills of an economist, or a political scientist or a sociologist.

So we're beginning with three core disciplines or three core departments, and students will designate one of these three disciplines as their major one. There are requirements that they take courses in others as well, but they would designate either economics, sociology, or political science as their disciplinary concentration.

Third, students will have a policy area above this. And here the idea was of course students need to have depth in a particular policy area to know the history, context, political teachings and key issues in a particular area, and that those areas should correspond with our strengths. So those areas are social policy, particularly child and family policy, and education policy, globalization and development, health policy and environment where we really explicitly collaborating with the Nicholas School — these are areas where either we as Sanford Institute or more importantly Duke as a whole have real strength.

Those are the organizing principles that lay behind what you've seen. Here's a picture if you like graphics (slide). It's to illustrate the basic structure — everybody takes a policy core and then you choose a row and column, effectively. And as one of my colleagues said in ECAC, we have a basic matrix where you designate a disciplinary focus and a concentration in a policy area of focus... There are a lot of options obviously.

I just wanted to highlight one other point in terms of how we're going about doing this. We knew from the outset that we could not do this on our own. The external review committee was very clear that we shouldn't try to. In some sense our relatively small size is a virtue because we can't do it on our own. And therefore from the outset we intended that this be a fully collaborative effort. And so it is collaborative with several other departments initially: as I said economics, political science, sociology, the Nicholas School and students will be taking courses in those departments. There are roles for the DGSs in those departments.

I should note that we have explicit intentions to expand. We don't know exactly how or exactly when, but we've already been in discussions with a couple of departments — sociology and history — about the possibilities. We will be continuing those discussions. And so the fact that we're starting with economics, sociology and political science does not preclude by any means the possibility of expanding to other departments. After all lots of people do work that relates to public policy in one form or another. But we felt strongly that it was important to start with a core that was closest to us, in some manageable way.

Second, the faculty, as you see in Appendix A, is not just the public policy faculty nor is it drawn simply or only from those departments but in fact comes from at present some of the departments in Arts and Sciences and four professional schools in addition to Arts and Sciences. And again, and the expectation, the design is that that it will expand over time. One of the nice things that has been happening is that I've shown this to people and sometimes they say 'Why aren't I on that list?' And I say fine, we'll sign you up. So if any of you would like to sign up we would be glad to have you. It is intentionally a design that is designed to expand.

The last slide just acknowledges a few issues that along the way that we're cognizant of. One is the issue of expansion that I've mentioned. It's nice that people say why aren't we included. And that's a good problem to have. But we're working on that question and will be doing so over time. A second issue that arose and has arisen consistently has to do with the disciplinary requirements and whether or not we're asking too much of people or whether the program is too restrictive or whether it shouldn't be more policy-focused and therefore more flexible. We're comfortable with where we've come down. There has been a lot of discussion on this issue, but it's an issue we're going to be watching and adjusting to if need be. And last is a question of flexibility. There are a lot of requirements, but I should say: it's more flexible than it looks. There has been some concern about how flexible this would be for a student who wanted

to design his or her own program, or for whom the structure didn't work as well. And again I think the answer is that we're pretty comfortable with where we are, but this is an issue that we'll be watching as we move ahead.

As you may have noted in the resolution passed by APC, there was explicitly a suggestion that there be an evaluation of several things as we go forward and that's entirely consistent with our own sense of what we want to do. We do think this is a dynamic process; that we will learn a lot as we go on, and that we will probably make some adjustments over time. But I would say at this point we had a lot of discussion on these issues and we're pretty comfortable with where we are at the moment.

Last, just in terms of the opportunity, it gives everybody a sense of excitement about this. We really think we can have a very fine Ph.D. program. For one thing Duke is a great place to do this. Duke's interdisciplinary environment makes possible things that really aren't possible at some of our peer institutions. And that's a huge asset as I look out there at the other Ph.D. programs in Public Policy and I think that's a great thing moving toward. Second, the field: it is dynamic, still growing, still maturing, still finding its way. It's moving, it's still developing, but we're still somehow early in that process and I think we have an opportunity to really make a mark in that area. As we looked at the other programs and assessed their strengths and looked at our own strengths, the strength of our faculty and Sanford, but more particularly the strength across the campus, we really think we are going to have a top-5 Ph.D. program in Public Policy in an important and dynamic field in a fairly short period of time. And so that's our goal in moving forward.

I'll stop there and be happy to answer any questions that people may have about the program.

Questions

Marva Price (School of Nursing): In addition to other disciplines that might be involved in the Ph.D. program, how about also Public Policy as it relates to public-health nursing?

Mayer: We certainly haven't thought about excluding Nursing and in the spirit that I mentioned we very much welcome a discussion about what that might look like. There are opportunities with Nursing with Medicine as well, that aren't listed here. There are obviously huge policy issues related to Nursing. The whole area of health is one that is clearly a priority for us, clearly a priority for the university. So the answer is we didn't exclude Nursing, we just haven't engaged that discussion yet. I'd be glad to do that.

Earl Dowell (Engineering): I assume you have faculty now in the Institute who are supervising Ph.D. students in the current programs. Could you tell us how many of those there are roughly and is your expectation going forward that that number will remain about the same and then you will add additional Ph.D. students who are pursuing this new degree? What is your expectation?

Mayer: Well certainly we have faculty who are supervising or at least serving on committees of Ph.D. candidates in other departments. I don't know the precise number. My sense would be no more than half a dozen total Ph.D. supervised ...More often we serve on committees, etc., but there are relatively small number of faculty in Public Policy who are the main supervisors, even if they have a secondary appointment in another department. So for most of our colleagues this represents an expanded opportunity to supervise Ph.D. students. I don't see any significant loss of capacity to help supervise students in other departments.

Earl Dowell: What would be the new number if going forward 5 years from now how many Ph.D. students...

Mayer: Looking at the cohort size it's 6-8 per year so strap on steady-state what that looks like dissertation stage you'd probably have 20-25, if you figuring out attrition. The design of this is that people get out in 5-6 years. We don't want to keep them around too long. But,

again the faculty here is potentially very large and of course supervising is a voluntary activity, at some level, so I don't think there will be a significant burden.

Bruce Jentleson: One other point that is relevant is terms of trade. A couple of the courses that were in that common core that Fritz identified — for example the political economy of Public Policy — we anticipate those being of interest to Ph.D. students from other disciplines as well. So we could see some value-added to existing Ph.D. programs by some of the core courses that we are going to offer and probably some of the electives too.

James Crenshaw (Divinity): I very much support the proposal, but I have a question about the note on p. 16 where you allow the possibility of admitting a student without adequate preparation. I'd like to ask why you would admit a student who does not have adequate preparation? ...

Mayer: There is a very specific case with respect to Economics and the concern is essentially mathematical preparation in the *micro* sequence in Economics. So that's really what this is referring to. Not preparation across the board, but it is possible and I think this happens even now in Economics that people get admitted with good background but need additional training particularly in mathematics.

Crenshaw: Training in both semesters the first year? That student would be behind by a year?

Mayer: We wanted it. This is at the request of the Economics department, which wanted some flexibility. So it's conceivable that would happen, or, as is sometimes the case now, students have to take courses in the summer as preparation before the first year, which I think would be more common than letting people get behind. Maybe that statement should be that in general we're not going to admit people that are not qualified. I think we're looking a relatively small number of people in this track. We have every reason to believe that we would have a pool from which to select really quite qualified people. But this reflects a long discussion with the Economics Department; a concern that if we set the bar too high in terms of their background, particularly in mathematics, that we would be excluding people we might want in this program. So this is something of a compromise.. .But it's our intention to admit highly qualified people. And I think the evidence is that we will have a very highly qualified pool of applicants.

John Staddon (ECAC, PBS): I have a question really for Lew Siegel, in response to something Nancy just said: that we've recently approved, or are about to approve, three new Ph.D. programs. What is the impact of that decision, of those new programs, on support for existing programs?

Lew Siegel (Dean of the Graduate School): The two that were approved prior to this are really quite different than the others. It says here the Medical Center and Nursing essentially were financed within their own world. This program (PPS) clearly will have an impact: what we've decided to do is form a program within the world of Arts and Sciences. We have funds that we have accumulated and set aside with which we can develop new programs and we have enough to fund this program easily for four years without having any impact whatsoever on existing programs. We envision that sooner or later this program will be treated like a normal program within the world of Arts and Sciences. Hopefully by then the whole pot will have grown. But that's the idea. In any case, when the cost of this program is spread across the entire school it really won't have very much impact on any other program.

A question: Will the faculty who are mentoring students have previously mentored Ph.D. students?

Mayer: Is the question, would the people who are mentored have they previously mentored Ph.D. students? Answer: Yes.

Mayer: Generally yes, but we haven't checked; this list doesn't represent a survey in which we've asked how much mentoring faculty have done.

A question: I was just wondering if it might be easier at the very beginning stage to have on a committee someone who has previously mentored Ph.D. students. Is there any merit to that?

Mayer: There may be merit to that. We'll think about that. We obviously have some flexibility in how we select those committees and how we think about advising. That's a good idea. Obviously you would want people with experience mentoring and we would want to match people with faculty members who would be good mentors...

Peter Burian (Classical Studies) I'm just trying to understand this Ph.D. program. How many of the faculty do have Ph.D.s in Public Policy?

Mayer: I believe that there are three with a Ph.D. in Public Policy; four counting Jim Vaupel. There are a couple of people with degrees in Public Health which has some similarities. So there may be a couple of other applied ones. So it's true the majority of the faculty come from traditional disciplines: Economics, Political Science and the like. But I have a Ph.D. in Public Policy. I like to think that we over the years found that an attractive pool for us. Obviously there are many fewer Ph.D.'s in Public Policy on the market than there are Ph.D.'s in other disciplines.

Nancy Allen: Thank you Fritz and Bruce for the nice presentation and the excellent work that has gone into putting this together and to all the committee and faculty members who have reviewed it previously. This is a substantial issue and is certainly one that meets the two-meeting rule so we do expect to bring this back to the Council for a vote at our March meeting. The March meeting is the last meeting for some of you serving on the Council and in April we do have new Council members elected so we didn't wish to have it go beyond that. I hope that in the interim between now and the March meeting that you would email Fritz and or Bruce with any comments or questions, or send any suggestions to the Council office that we can review. I think that EC AC will produce a resolution. We'll send Fritz and/or Bruce out of the room for that before the next meeting and bring that to you in March. So, it's just before 5:00: unless there are other burning issues we are adjourned. Thank you.

Respectfully submitted

John Staddon
Faculty Secretary
March 16,2005