Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Academic Council
Thursday, February 20, 2003, 3:47-4:50 PM

Nancy Allen (Medicine), Chair of the Council: "As I said last month we will try to use the Farmer's Almanac for next year's meetings. We did have snow this week, but at least not on today's date." Before the minutes could be approved, a question arose:

Ronen Plesser (Physics): "There was a suggestion at the last meeting that we [i.e., the faculty] would get more [information about the gender-equity salary survey] than just the two slides reproduced in the minutes..." Will we be able to see all the relevant box plots, for example?

Nancy Allen: "We don't have copies of those in the Academic Council office. We discussed this with the Provost and this is what was approved for mailing out with the minutes...So I think if you wish them individually you could contact the Provost's office."

The minutes were approved as written by voice vote, without dissent. The Council then went in to Executive Session, and returned to...

Election of the Faculty Secretary

Nancy Allen: "The primary responsibility of the Faculty Secretary is to provide the minutes for these meetings. He or she is also a member of the Executive Committee. Professor John Staddon has decided to take a long and well deserved sabbatical. He has been creative this year in his minutes and we appreciate that along with the incorporation of photographs with the minutes. As former Faculty Secretary, Don Fluke has agreed to run for this important office. He served as Faculty Secretary from 1990 until 1998... ECAC\(^1\) offers the name of Don Fluke as Faculty Secretary for the academic year 2003-04." A motion was made, seconded and unanimously approved.

Election of the Faculty Forum editor

Nancy Allen: "ECAC has asked the current editor, Professor Larry Evans if he would be willing to accept nomination for an additional two-year term for this office and he responded affirmatively... I ask the Council to ratify the reelection of Professor Evans as Faculty Forum editor." A motion to re-elect Larry Evans was moved, seconded and unanimously approved.

Restructuring of two university committees

The next item was further discussion of the reorganization of two key committees: 1. The Academic Priorities Committee into an Academic Programs Committee (APC) and

\(^1\) Executive Committee of the Academic Council
2. the President's Advisory Committee on Resources into a University Priorities Committee (UPC). On behalf of ECAC, the following resolution was moved by Richard Burton (Fuqua) and seconded by Paul Haagen (Law):

**ACADEMIC COUNCIL RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH THE UNIVERSITY PRIORITIES COMMITTEE AND THE ACADEMIC PROGRAMS COMMITTEE**

WHEREAS the faculty of Duke University, through the Academic Council, reaffirms the importance of strong faculty governance as outlined in the 1972 Christie Report; and

WHEREAS the faculty wishes to strengthen and enhance faculty governance through the restructuring of two key advisory committees in order to have one committee which combines discussion of University and academic priorities in context with budget and financial information, and a second committee whose sole focus will be development and review of academic departments and programs in the University; and

WHEREAS the Academic Council has reviewed and discussed the proposal submitted by an ad hoc committee chaired by Professor John Simon (Chemistry); and

WHEREAS this proposal has been reviewed by key faculty leaders, the proper existing committees and senior administration; and

WHEREAS the intention is to replace two existing committees, the Presidents Advisory Committee on Resources, and the Academic Priorities Committee, with two newly charged committees, the University Priorities Committee (UPC) and the Academic Programs Committee (APC), respectively;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Council endorses the creation of the University Priorities Committee and the Academic Programs Committee. In accordance with existing faculty governance rules, members will be appointed to these two committees in time for them to begin functioning at the start of the 2003-2004 academic year. 

There being no further discussion, the question was called and the motion approved unanimously by voice vote.

**The Women's Initiative**

Nancy Allen called on President Keohane to introduce discussion of this topic: President Keohane: " Probably most of you have read something about the Women's Initiative in the papers, but I wanted to give you a bit of background before Susan [Roth, Professor of Psychology: Social and Health Sciences, and currently an intern in the Provost's office] shares some of our conclusions. There are several members of the Steering Committee in the room and I'm sure they will be glad to join us in answering questions later on. Some people have asked, Why now? Why the Women's Initiative right now? And maybe the simplest response is that last winter I began thinking about unfinished business — things I wanted to do while I'm still at Duke². And one of the things that came up really high on my list was a set of questions about the

² President Keohane announced her resignation as President on March 3, 2003; her term ends in 2004.
status of women. I realized that even though I spent a good deal of my prior life thinking a lot about women's issues — as President of Wellesley, or whatever — since being at Duke I hadn't really paid very specific attention ... to what life is like for women at Duke: women in all constituencies, undergraduates, graduate and professional women, faculty, employees, administrators, alums.

"And so I started a series of conversations, which is a very feminist way of going about gathering information. I started talking to people and I had a series of breakfasts and lunches with faculty members mostly, mostly women, but also with some men, with some students and staff members. And I basically asked, so what's it like to be a woman at Duke? Are there issues that we should be talking about that we are not talking about?"

"To make a long story short I found that there were indeed some concerns and some interesting observations. But most pervasive was the response: I'm so glad you asked that question! This is something we really don't talk about at Duke. But there are some things that I think we ought to be at least paying attention to..."

"Over and over again I heard that, and began to hear some of the same senses of success and some of the same concerns. So at that point I stopped the series of breakfasts and lunches and launched an initiative. I organized a Steering Committee which I chair. The Steering Committee on the Women's Initiative, which includes 16 people who represent each of the main constituencies that I've just described.

"Those people were chosen by the following criteria. They each have responsibility in one of the areas that the women's initiative looks at. So, for example, instead of asking an undergraduate student to serve, we have the Vice President for Student Affairs and we have Donna Lisker from the Women's Center. And instead of asking a graduate and professional student to serve, Jackie Looney, who is the Associate Dean, is serving and so forth. We have deans, we have vice-presidents, we have people who can make a difference, we have faculty members and we have concerned members of the community, alumni or alumnae, who serve to bring their perspectives to bear on what we are doing.

"Our goal is to make some changes, not just produce a report. That is one of the reasons I wanted the people on the committee to have some authority — so that when we set about implementing our policies they would be in a position to make things happen.

"We've had a whole series of very interesting discussions. We set ourselves a goal of drawing up a set of manageable questions [out of the] huge universe we might have been looking into. We meet every three or four weeks and we have undertaken a lot of research. Susan Roth will be reporting about some of it.

"Our goal is to have a report ready in June when the Steering Committee itself will disband. But we do not want to make this "the year of the woman"— and then next year we'll go on to something else. We want to provide a strong foundation. Having some of the things that we have talked about and learned about become more woven into the fabric of Duke, so that going forward, some of the concerns about women's situation will be dealt with on a more regular and ongoing and normal basis. So we have looked both short term and long term. We have some things we're going to do specifically this Spring. We have some things we will put into place for next Fall, but [when some of these issues come up in the future] we don't want people..."
to have to reinvent the wheel and start a whole new process or a whole new initiative. [These are] some of the things we believe should be on Duke's agenda for some time to come.

"Finally we are very alert to the fact that not all women are alike, even within a certain constituency. And we're not trying to de-individualize people. We are aware that individual human beings, men or women, each have their own characteristics. And certain kinds of things make a difference in terms of racial and ethnic background for example. Life is not exactly the same for an African American undergraduate woman as it might tend to be for a Caucasian woman. And we find a number of these factors make a difference.

"It has been an exhilarating enterprise so far. I was very encouraged by the number of people who wanted to be part of it, and people who wanted to contribute to it and students who volunteered to be part of the focus groups. Because I think all of us are eager to know more about these topics. And I have appreciated the help I have received from a lot of people along the line, especially from Susan Roth... with the strong support of the Provost, she has given special attention to this topic .. She is chairing the Executive Committee within the Steering Committee (... a smaller group that keeps all of us on track in terms of agendas and activities).

"We thought it would be useful for you to hear a mid-course, interim report on some of our work, particularly as it concerns the faculty. So Susan..."

Susan Roth (Psychology: Social and Health Sciences): "There are an enormous number of efforts going on most of which, at this point, have to do with gathering information. The effort of prioritizing a set of manageable questions has not been easy... We hope to set both long-and short-term goals in terms of recommendations for policy changes... In terms of constituencies, there are undergraduate students, graduate and professional students, faculty, house staff, post docs and fellows, bi-weekly and monthly staff, trustees and alumni — all of whom are represented on the Steering Committee... There is an Executive [sub-] Committee of the Steering Committee that meets more frequently to try to keep things organized and the actual full Steering Committee has been meeting on a regular basis since the summer.

"In terms of giving you some kind of overview, there are quantitative and qualitative studies of faculty in all of the schools; there are both quantitative and qualitative studies of the Ph.D. and professional students, and of postdocs and fellows. There are now three sets of deans' reports dealing with the status of women in their schools, that have been requested by the Provost and the President. Each of those reports addresses not only faculty, but also student and staff issues.

"The first two sets of reports came in and then we went back and asked additional questions when we had some better sense of what it is we want to know... And then we also went back to the deans for the third time to get information about applicant pool data specifically in regard to faculty hires...

"There is a Women's Faculty Development Task Force, charged by both the President and the Provost, which ... is actually coming close to handing in a report... We have collected some of our own information and also reviewed an enormous amount of other information...

"... focus groups with alumni are planned for Atlanta, Chicago, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Research Triangle and people from the Steering Committee have already been to New York and Washington to do focus groups with alumni there. These are people from very different Duke cohorts..."
"...conversations with staff have been done over a long period of time and have converged with other information. We have on trying to identify what are the most important issues for Duke employees. There was a systematic qualitative study involving round-table discussions with employees, and there has also been ongoing review of programs for employees, including child care and maternity benefits, flexible work options, professional development and mobility.

"The issue of staff respect has taken a considerable amount of our discussion time on the Women's Steering Committee. It's something we are very concerned about and [we are] trying to understand better what we can do about it.

"There is consideration of a parental leave and tenure-clock relief policy for faculty, coming out of the Provost's office, which you will be hearing more about. And also evaluation of services, coming out of student affairs.

"Let me tell you a little bit about the undergraduate focus groups. These groups are largely being done by a task force of students under the direction of Donna Lisker who are gathering data from both male and female students using focus groups and campus wide forums. Now this has been an unbelievable effort. These students have been videotaped for the most part and are really giving us a picture of what undergraduate life is like here. Jan Radway from Literature, Anne Allison from Anthropology and I have also been meeting with a group of undergraduate students who were chosen [approximately] at random...They are a diverse group ...and we have been meeting with them over a period of time .. looking for the same information as the student task force.

"Both of these efforts grow out of a concern about the level of conformity among our undergraduate women students — [conformity] to highly feminized norms of dress, body type, eating and sexual behavior, [which] leaves some vulnerable to psychological and health problems — but are of concern to us more broadly. [This] Spring... the Task Force of Students is going to be gathering academic, rather than social, information from the undergraduates.

"Let me tell you a little bit about the effects of gender in Duke Ph.D. programs. This was a study that Dean Siegel carried out. He gathered information on the composition, completion rate, the time to attainment of Ph.D. degrees, and job placement (these are for all Ph.D. students now). [He] found that women are well represented in the vast majority of disciplines — 44% overall, engineering 26%, and physical sciences 30%; highs of 50% in the biological sciences, humanities and social sciences.

"[But] the proportion of women enrolled in Ph.D. programs is actually decreasing in math, computer science and mechanical engineering — and this is cause for some alarm.

"[Dean Siegel found] no overall gender differences in completion rates in the physical sciences or engineering...

"I think the bottom line here is that we're doing quite well at the Ph.D. level. I'm sure you've all heard reference to a "leaky pipeline." I think the leak is after the Ph.D., before entry into academia. That's where we have real problems, and we will try to make some recommendations as a task force about the mentoring of postdoctoral and graduate students to help in ways that we can.

"Let me give you an overview of the data from the Provost's office that I was working on starting last summer... [The] most glaring problem, in my opinion, is the percentage of assistant professors who are women: little or no gains over 10 year period starting in fall 1991, and that
includes all schools but Nursing. There has been an improvement, thankfully, over time across the schools in the percent of women at both the associate and full professor levels. However, with the exception of Arts and Sciences and the School of Law the percent of women at the full professor level is still under ten percent...

"There is no evidence, in my view, of salary inequity on the basis on gender. I have looked closely at the data and am in agreement with the methodology and think that there's no need for worry there...

"What is somewhat worrisome is the... relative number of women versus men professors holding named chairs: 18 women versus 166 men...

"With a regard to tenure, there is no evidence of gender bias in academic-unit negative votes, for tenure cases between 1994-2002. There is no evidence of gender bias and race of successful promotion to full professor between 1994 and 2002. There is a 7% difference, for all schools, in percent of cases denied tenure from 1994-2002... I don't know if that's statistically significant or not. We're dealing with small numbers in a lot of cases and you're going to get big flips in percentages for very small changes in numbers. That's something to keep an eye on. There is a gender difference in Arts and Sciences...in time from associate to full professor."

Susan Roth then went through a series of slides looking at variables such as percentages by rank by year and school, years in rank, and comparisons with COFHE school averages. For the most part, no significant gender differences were found. The major cause for alarm was a graph showing that the percentage of female assistant professors in Arts and Sciences started at 30% in 1988, rose slowly to a high of 36% in 1996 and then declined back to 30% in 2001. Other COFHE schools do "better" than we in annual increases in the number of female assistant professors. Roth also saw a problem in the very small representation of women in the ranks of distinguished chairs, although this seems to be improving a bit over time.

Discussion

Robert Wolpert (ISDS): "You compared Duke to other universities in terms of percentage of women. I noticed when you came to looking at a school-by-school basis, there were vast differences among disciplines. Duke has a relatively large engineering school, many other universities don't have one at all. Universities without engineering schools might be expected to have a higher faction of women."

Susan Roth: "The COFHE data were just for arts and sciences... COFHE... lumps all the professional schools together, and we thought the comparison was problematic for that reason. So I did actually not present any comparisons for the professional schools..."

Margie McElroy (Economics/ECAC) "[What about]...people [women] who never stand for promotion?"

Susan Roth: "We actually looked at all the assistant professors since 1982 who left before coming up for tenure. We... tried to get information... about why those people left. And it was not in fact possible to distinguish between people who left for another job or people who left because they decided they wanted to be out of the professoriate... So one of the recommendations from the Women's Faculty Development Task Force will be that exit interviews be done, so that we can routinely collect this kind of information. As of now, there is in fact no evidence, in my opinion, that people are dropping out once they're on the faculty as assistant professors. The bigger problem is entering..."
Blanche Capel (Cell Biology): "One of the things... we might want to keep track of is exit interviews for graduate students and post-doctoral fellows as they leave our programs. There seems to be a huge loss, we have 50% of women entering our graduate programs. But we only have a small percentage of those people lining up as assistant professors. Maybe by comparing what women say as they exit from graduate school...?"

Susan Roth: "Actually, some of that is being done by Jackie Looney in the graduate school and hopefully we'll have some information that bears on just that before we're done."

Terrence Oas (Biochemistry): "Do you have quantitative data about the assistant professor applicant pool?"

Susan Roth: Yes, but it is difficult to define an applicant pool precisely. Neither the number of PhDs in a discipline nor the number of applicants for a given position is really adequate. And disciplines vary in the proportion of women attracted to them, so pooled data can be misleading.

Terrence Oas: But if you just looked at the total applicant pool for Arts and Sciences for the last three years and compared the percentage of women in the pool with the percentage of women hired, wouldn't any discrepancy raise questions?

Susan Roth: "I can tell you we've been knee-deep in this in one Women's Faculty Development Task Force. [The problem is that] lots of times offers are made to women and they're turned down. So, you can't just look at the number of applicants versus the number hired... you need to go talk to the chair of every department and find out in detail what happened in searches. It's really a risky business drawing conclusions from those numbers.

"Some things look better than they actually are, [a department may] have better numbers in terms of women ..., but if you look more closely or longitudinally, you may see that more recently, the record is not as good as it was in the 80's. In other cases, things look really bad in terms of the number of the women in the department, but if you look at the number of offers that have been made to women recently, [there may have been many].

"One of the things that has come up over and over again in a number of different contexts is that spousal hires is another big recruitment issue. We are struggling about a recommendation with regard to that."

Richard Willis (Fuqua): "I'm struck by the statement about the conformity among undergraduate organizations, I wonder if you have a sense, from the focus groups, of how many our students differ from some of our sister schools in ways we might want to be concerned about or ways that we might want to celebrate?"

Susan Roth: "I don't think this is a problem that's peculiar to Duke, [but] I don't think that that means it's ok... we are really struggling to figure out what to do about it." We are more interested in figuring out what to do about the problem here at Duke, than comparing ourselves to other schools.

President Keohane echoed the comment about celebration: "One of the things we are trying to do is to figure out what aspects of a rather multi-sensitive undergraduate experience turn out to be rewarding for students and conducive to their flourishing as human beings. And, we know there are such things, such things do happen to women at Duke...we worried they don't happen frequently enough and that don't happen across the board. There are good things to cele-
brate, we're trying to figure out what those are and figure out how we can make those experiences more common..."

John Simon (Chemistry) raised a question about spousal hires: Why does this seem to be less of a problem at the college level?

Susan Roth: "... Peter do you have an answer to that?"

Provost Peter Lange: "Well, one of issues is that colleges are more willing to find accommodations..."

John Staddon (Faculty Secretary): "Would it not be the case that if you take colleges as a group, their threshold for acceptance of a potential faculty member would be lower than ours? In other words, the applicant pool for colleges as a groups is larger than for research universities as a group. That would, ipso facto, make it easier for colleges to accommodate two people, would it not?"

Richard Burton (Fuqua): "In your earlier discussion of work in progress, a lot of this was qualitative as I understood it. And, as I listened you are talking primarily, and in some cases exclusively, with women." Does this introduce a bias if the data are taken to reflect the whole community?

Susan Roth: "Good question. Some of the decision just to talk to women had to do with time constraints. In the undergraduate focus groups, they're actually talking to men in groups and women in groups. Probably [there are] many more groups of women, but they are talking to men's groups too. I do think it's important to do that on the faculty level and on the graduate-student and alumni levels. I believe in most other cases the conversation is with women. I think it's a matter of time constraints and I think we need to understand the math, too, but...we're thinking of it as an additional piece of information. Certainly, if people were interested in doing it, it would be helpful to fill out our picture. At the undergraduate level, we've had a lot of discussion of this on the Women's Steering Committee. If you start trying to think about changing the culture among the undergraduates, and you don't include the men in programming, then the question is whether you can really effect a significant change in the culture. I think people have different opinions about that and about where you start and all of that. I think in the long run, you have to go with information from everybody, that's true. I don't know if you want to speak to that at all Nan?"

President Keohane: "I think we're starting by cutting into a very complicated problem, and we're focusing chiefly on self-reported experiences. We understand very well that that's only part of the picture, and we have to have a fuller picture..."

Robert Wolpert raised a question about the overall objective of the Women's Initiative. There seems to be some thought of raising the percentages of women in various disciplines. What exactly should guide this effort? "[Should male and female] percentages... be equal or should they] be equal to the fractions of men and women in the professoriate,... or comparable to the fractions of men and women in the Academy of Sciences or some other august body?"

Susan Roth: "That's a good question. We have discussed it also — on the Women's Faculty Development Task Force and in other contexts. What are the appropriate goals? I don't know what the answer to that is, but I think that it's fair to say there aren't enough women distinguished professors at Duke. I think I can safely go that far. In terms of what my goal is, whether there ought to be an equal number of men and women I don't know. People talk about
critical mass — if you talk about department goals you know — how do you set goals for departments?

"Forget about distinguished chairs for a minute. In terms of the number of women on the faculty, people talk about critical mass [and] we all have some sense of what that means — although if you asked any one of us to operationalize it I'm not sure we'd come up with the same answer. So that's a concept that I think is pretty good. A concept of a critical mass."

In the case of distinguished professors, the issue is whether there has been any kind of inadvertent bias operating at Duke. For example, are "women [disadvantaged] because of differences in their ability to self-promote or whatever, [because of] differences in negotiating skills, or differences in willingness to look for outside jobs, etc.? If there is something in the procedures by which distinguished chairs are named that is inadvertently biased against women, then we should look into that and try to do something about it. And I think right now I personally am not willing to talk about numbers and I'm not sure anybody else on the Women's Faculty Development Task Force is either."

Laurie Shannon (English) raised a question about the lack of growth in the percentage of female assistant professors hired at Duke since 1988. "What is special to Duke that is generating that number?"

Susan Roth asked if anyone in the audience had any ideas.

Dean Berndt Mueller commented on the statistical difficulties in evaluating these percentages: "I would not read the difference between 30 and 34 % as meaning that Duke is in a different category than comparable schools."

Susan Roth suggested that looking at the data overall led her to think that comparison is meaningful.

Earl Dowell (Engineering) asked if more tenured women are the result of external hires than internal promotions. Susan Roth did not think so.

Ronen Plesser, Susan Roth and Dean Lange engaged in a discussion of the possibility that many women are offered jobs at Duke but decline to take them. They concluded that we need to know causes in order to derive prescriptions for policy.

Robert Wolpert: "Are entry pools for women shrinking? Is this [the flat percentage of women assistant professors at Duke] a national trend?"

Susan Roth: "It's not a national trend. I can't recall right now what I've seen that bears on that, but I know that this is not a national trend. Mostly you are seeing increases at all ranks. And we do see increases at the associate and full ranks here."

Robert Wolpert: "Assistant [professor hiring] is unique in that we're competing for women at the age that most women choose to have children."

Susan Roth: "Well, Peter's right that you should see a national trend if it's a question of the pool shrinking although I'd have to look at individual school data. I'm not really sure if that's a plausible hypothesis or not. But that's why you see problems in the sciences at the post doc and later levels."

Ronen Plesser: "I just wanted to say that I know the data from Physics... in physics the percentages [of women] at the assistant professor level [are] increasing...."

Susan Roth concluded that more data on the pool of women available in various disciplines are needed. But she felt that the result, once adequate data are available, is not likely to be
that Duke’s problem is a pool problem. "I think that for the most part it’s not going to be the case that we had as few women as we do because they are not out there. For the most part it’s not going to be a pool problem."

Al Buehler (Phys. Ed.) "What can we do, or should be doing, [about the undesirable situation for] undergraduate women? Start with the first-year women. What can we do to change this thing down the line? What do you hope to do?"

Susan Roth: "Well I think there are some programs we know that seem to be good for them in terms of their intellectual involvement, like the FOCUS programs. And we are starting to think about adding some additional programming, both auricular and co-curricular programming, that will intensify their involvement in things other than those things which we are concerned about..."

Ronen Plesser: "I know you are still collecting data to start public discussions. Can you give us some idea of what, in the broadest sense, are the kinds of conclusions you think might come out with? What might actually happen as a result of this? What kinds of things might you consider?"

Susan Roth: On the faculty level, we might suggest changes to how search committees operate, and changes to faculty mentoring. We might point to ways that women are inadvertently disadvantaged here at Duke. At the undergraduate level, we may recommend changes in programming. I’m not yet ready to talk about changes we might recommend at the staff level.

President Keohane: "I will try to answer that and also make slightly more general comments because I’m sure our time is drawing to a close. We are already talking about some very specific things in terms of policies around child care, parental leave where the Provost has taken a lead. So there are very specific benefits issues which we’re working through the relevant committees, but which we expect to have on the table this spring. And those have primarily to do with employment situations for both faculty and staff.

"We’re also thinking very hard about the undergraduate part of the situation. We want to work with some of the women who have become aware of these issues — perhaps for the first time... 50% of the women undergraduates at Duke belong to sororities. [They are] an enormously powerful force, so if there is a way in which we can take the leadership of the sororities and begin to tackle some of these issues instead of (as many people say) being blind to them or even in some ways promoting some of them... We are looking at a type of program [for certain undergraduates]. .designed specifically to help them from the very beginning to have the kinds of experiences that students in the FOCUS programs do. Women athletes, women students in Geology go on field trips, students [are involved in] Project Build — we hear about situations in which things are going well. But we can create more such opportunities and more mentoring.

"One of the things that we worry about is that this is very much an institution where, apart from the classroom and apart from some of the professors who reach outside the classroom, most of the campus is peer pressure most of the time. And it goes back to the issue about the way our culture puts pressures on people. It’s not unique to Duke, but we still feel some responsibility for making sure that the women who come here as undergraduates have as full and self-developing an experience as they can.

"As far as the larger point that I wanted to make.. I think if we will be very careful about the way we analyze and present this data. We are encouraged by some of the things that we find. But one of the things I want to always think about as we leave this that there is clear problem here if women are represented in very significant numbers at every level up through the Ph.D. — and then, all of a sudden, the cliff falls off. Even though we recognize that other institutions may in some disciplines be doing better than Duke, and we may at Duke be better in some depart-
ments than others, it is clear that there is a big decline between the numbers of women who choose to pursue the Ph.D. [and] those who choose to become Assistant Professors. We don't know why that's true, and we need to find out. There are many hypotheses. Some of them have to do with lifestyle, some have to do with choices that may be made for other professional reasons, some of them have to do with spousal issues. But before we start presenting policy recommendations, we want to [understand] a very large and multi-factorial problem to try to figure out if we can identify pieces of it that we can address..."

There being no new business, the meeting adjourned at 4:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

John Staddon
Faculty Secretary