

Rex D. Adams
Professor of the Practice of
Business Administration

The Fuqua School of Business
Duke University
Box 90120
Durham, NC 27708-0120

Tel (919) 660-7727
Fax (919) 681-6245
adams@mail.duke.edu



INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO: MEMBERS OF THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL
FROM: REX ADAMS *RDA*
SUBJECT: REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON FACULTY DIVERSITY
DATE: APRIL 21, 2003
CC: PETER LANGE

It is my pleasure to present to you the final report of the Task Force on Faculty Diversity, which I have chaired. In order to save a great deal of paper, and to focus attention on the heart of the matter, I include only one appendix—the original charge and the composition of the committee. I am making a copy of the complete appendices for inspection in the Council offices and at the Council meeting on May 8, should members wish to see more detail.

The task force was charged last fall with “discussing, debating, and defining the salient diversity issues that should inform the construction and goals of a new diversity initiative” for the years ahead. After several months of reviewing the data and debating the issues (including the definition of “diversity”), we now propose a faculty diversity plan for the Provost’s review.

At the Council meeting I will walk the Council through the proposed Faculty Diversity Plan and then entertain your questions and comments. Members of the Task Force will be present to elaborate on or respond to any points.

I look forward to meeting with you on May 8th.

A Proposed Faculty Diversity Plan for Duke University

Report of the Provost's Task Force on Faculty Diversity

March 2003

Submitted by Committee Members:

Faculty

Rex Adams, Professor, Fuqua School of Business, chair
N. Gregson Davis, Professor of Classical Studies, Arts and Sciences
Mariano Garcia-Blanco, Professor of Molecular Genetics and Microbiology, and
Medicine, School of Medicine
Paula McClain, Professor of Political Science, Arts and Sciences
Marie Lynn Miranda, Associate Professor of the Practice, Nicholas School of the
Environment and Earth Sciences
Charles Piot, Associate Professor of Cultural Anthropology, Arts and Sciences
Weitao Yang, Professor of Chemistry, Arts and Sciences
Laura Svetkey, Professor of Medicine and Nephrology, School of Medicine

Administration

L. Gregory Jones, Dean, School of Divinity
Jacqueline Looney, Associate Vice Provost for Academic Diversity and Associate Dean
of the Graduate School
Sally Dickson, Vice President for Institutional Equity, *ex officio*

Staff

Judith Ruderman, Vice Provost for Academic and Administrative Services

Liaison to Women Faculty Development Committee:

Susan Roth, Special Assistant to the Provost, Professor of Psychology, Arts and Sciences

Appendix A

Provost's Task Force on Faculty Diversity

Background:

The Black Faculty Strategic Initiative (BFSI) was formed in 1993 to focus Duke's attention on the under-representation of Black faculty on our campus. Its goal was to double the overall number of Black faculty in the regular ranks within a decade's time. As of spring 2002, all indications are that in terms of raw numbers we will have succeeded in attaining, and perhaps surpassing, this goal by 2003.

We do not have the luxury of patting ourselves on the back and putting the BFSI aside. Issues of campus climate remain of concern and need concentrated attention. Moreover, the discrepancy between our tenure-track Black faculty and those in regular rank but not on the tenure track is still much too great, even though we have made strides in narrowing the gap.

While we maintain a focus on the two issues noted above, we must begin to devise a new diversity plan appropriate for Duke University in the early 21st century. "Race" itself is a recognizably more complicated term than it has been in the past: in definition and classification; in identity and politics. In addition, significant changes have occurred in the racial and ethnic demographics in the United States and in our own region. These changes themselves suggest both challenges and opportunities for recruitment, retention, and curricular initiatives, so that we are well positioned to take advantage of the opportunities that a broadly diverse community offers. Ultimately we wish to achieve three interlocking goals: to draw the best faculty to Duke, along with the best students; to create an environment that engages, and hence retains, these talented teachers and researchers; and to ensure that our education prepares our students for life in a diverse society.

To formulate a new diversity plan for the next decade, the Provost has formed a task force composed of seven faculty and three administrators. Its charge is as follows.

Charge to the Task Force:

- To discuss, debate, and define the salient diversity issues that should inform the construction and goals of a new diversity initiative for the decade 2003-2013.
- To review the results of the Black Faculty Strategic Initiatives in terms of what Duke University has achieved by means of it and what Duke has learned from it.
- To call for, and review, demographic data pertinent to its deliberations.
- To consult with colleagues within and outside of Duke University, as necessary.
- To recommend to the Provost and the other senior officers of Duke University, by February 2003, an appropriate plan that includes an overarching goal; targets and rationales; strategies and timetables; and resource requirements.

A Faculty Diversity Plan for Duke University

Report of the Provost's Task Force on Faculty Diversity

March 2003

Submitted by Committee Members:

Faculty

Rex Adams, Professor, Fuqua School of Business, chair
N. Gregson Davis, Professor of Classical Studies, Arts and Sciences
Mariano Garcia-Blanco, Professor of Molecular Genetics and Microbiology, and
Medicine, School of Medicine
Paula McClain, Professor of Political Science, Arts and Sciences
Marie Lynn Miranda, Associate Professor of the Practice, Nicholas School of the
Environment and Earth Sciences
Charles Piot, Associate Professor of Cultural Anthropology, Arts and Sciences
Weitao Yang, Professor of Chemistry, Arts and Sciences
Laura Svetkey, Professor of Medicine and Nephrology, School of Medicine

Administration

L. Gregory Jones, Dean, School of Divinity
Jacqueline Looney, Associate Vice Provost for Academic Diversity and Associate Dean
of the Graduate School
Sally Dickson, Vice President for Institutional Equity, *ex officio*

Staff

Judith Ruderman, Vice Provost for Academic and Administrative Services

Liaison to Women Faculty Development Committee:

Susan Roth, Special Assistant to the Provost, Professor of Psychology, Arts and Sciences

A Faculty Diversity Plan for Duke University:
Report of the Provost's Task Force on Faculty Diversity
March 2003

Executive Summary

In early September 2002, Provost Lange constituted a Faculty Diversity Task Force and charged it with discussing, debating, and defining the salient diversity issues that should inform the construction and goals of a new diversity initiative for the coming years. The task force met in full committee on average twice a month from September through the first weeks of March, and subcommittees worked additionally on special aspects of the report.

Focus points for the task force deliberations were review of the available local and national data and gathering of additional information, both quantitative and qualitative; refining the definitions of diversity for purposes of creating a focused, workable faculty diversity plan; and framing the salient points of agreement about principles and recommendations. The result of these discussions is the proposed Faculty Diversity Plan (FDP).

Fundamental Principle.

The fundamental principle affirmed by the members of the task force, and underpinning its proposed plan, is that **diversity is an institutional good**. This statement derives from our conviction that

- true learning depends on diversity;
- diversity defines the world we inhabit;
- diversity is necessary for faculty excellence; and
- diversity benefits everyone at the university.

Challenges.

The challenges faced by Duke in fulfilling the fundamental principle are that

- it will take time and perseverance to enhance the diversity of our faculty;
- new patterns of thinking about diversity must be developed, and the university culture changed, if we are to create a climate conducive to the recruitment and retention of a diverse faculty;
- a faculty diversity initiative must be both focused and individualized to be successful;
- the “pipeline” for future faculty members lacks diversity, and building that “pipeline” is a necessary goal for Duke;
- recruitment of a diverse faculty requires special, proactive, targeted efforts; and
- financial incentives commensurate with the strength of our commitment must be made available in support of a diversity initiative.

Recommendations.

The Task Force on Faculty Diversity recommends to the Provost that Duke University

- build on the successes of the Black Faculty Strategic Initiative and thus recommit to a strong emphasis on the recruitment and retention of Black faculty; at the same time, reach out to additional underrepresented racial and ethnic minorities (especially but not exclusively U.S. minorities): Latino/Hispanics, Native Americans, and Asian-Americans outside the sciences and engineering;
- create a standing committee on faculty diversity to assist with the implementation of both the minority faculty initiative (the Faculty Diversity Plan) *and* the women's faculty initiative;
- take an individualized approach to diversifying the faculty, one that does not set overall institutional targets but rather engages the individual units—schools, departments, and centers—in examining their data, goals, and strategies and in enhancing their efforts;
- orient the deans and faculty to the goals and mechanics of the Faculty Diversity Plan (FDP), and continually re-affirm these goals;
- take a national lead in building “pipelines” for diverse candidate pools for the faculty at Duke and other universities;
- enhance recruitment efforts with proactive, creative strategies targeted to reaching out to diverse faculty candidates;
- seek to retain our faculty by addressing climate issues within units, including mentoring, and by including contributions to a diverse intellectual community as a factor in evaluating the research, teaching, or service of candidates for appointment, promotion, or tenure;
- collect and analyze data on an ongoing basis, including (but not limited to) the use of annual surveys of the faculty and exit interviews, and utilize this information in evaluations of chairs and departments as well as in budget meetings with the deans;
- provide central financial support for programs according to the individual unit's needs and resources;
- set expectations of deans, department chairs, and center directors for making diversity integral to their mission and operations, including allocating unit-level resources to this initiative, and evaluate these administrators and all faculty on their contributions to achieving the University's diversity goals.

A Faculty Diversity Plan for Duke University:
Report of the Provost's Task Force on Faculty Diversity
March 2003

Prologue

In February of 2001, Duke University amended its mission statement so that, for the first time, it now includes the goal of promoting “a deep appreciation for the range of human difference and potential.” That same month, the University issued its strategic plan for the next decade, entitled *Building on Excellence*, which sets goals for the University. One of these goals, promoting “diversity in all aspects of university life,” reinforces and expands on the mission statement. In an important affirmation of diversity as a foundational principle, the strategic plan states, “Diversity is not an add-on or an afterthought, or a matter of mere enrichment, but rather an essential factor of critical importance to our success in all aspects of university life—indeed, of life itself (*Building on Excellence*, p. 54).

In adopting diversity as a goal within our mission statement and strategic plan, Duke fully recognizes and engages an issue critical to all of American higher education and to the future of the nation itself. Indeed, it is clear that most, if not all, American campuses are struggling with imbalances of race, ethnicity, and gender. For a variety of reasons, many groups within our society face barriers to an educational trajectory that leads to a university career. Moreover, many among those who do make it to our doors encounter recruitment and retention challenges, including unfriendly climates, which are far too prevalent nationwide. Rather than accepting the *status quo* as an inevitable result of a much larger societal inequity, Duke has chosen to be a leader in developing and implementing strategies that will increase diversity among its faculty. Making this commitment is not only the right thing to do, it must also be a signature of a great learning institution in the 21st century.

The Black Faculty Strategic Initiative (BFSI), initiated in the fall of 1993, is a major outgrowth and sign of this institution's commitment to the development of Black faculty for building excellence at Duke. In creating the Task Force on Faculty Diversity in the fall of 2002, the Provost was inspired and guided by the BFSI—and by the strategic plan, *Building on Excellence*, that he spearheaded, and that was approved by the faculty, administration, and Board of Trustees of the University. The mandate of the new Task Force was to prepare a report that would outline a Faculty Diversity Plan (FDP). (See Appendix A for charge to, and composition of, the Task Force.) The Task Force recognizes that the full range of human diversity includes such traditional markers as race/ethnicity, gender, religion, nationality, sexual orientation, and disability. It also recognizes such additional points of diversity as secular values and intellectual commitments. The University benefits from diversity in all these aspects. Nonetheless, a diversity initiative must be focused to be successful. The Task Force proposes an initiative that continues our focus on Blacks and targets three additional underrepresented racial/ethnic minorities: Hispanics/Latinos, Native Americans, and, in certain programs of study, Asian Americans. The following report articulates the fundamental principle

underlying the proposed diversity initiative, examines the challenges to fulfilling that principle, and recommends specific strategies for attaining our faculty diversity goals in the coming years.

Fundamental Principle: Diversity is an Institutional Good

True learning depends on diversity.

True learning depends on many things, including mastery of material, honing of skills of critical inquiry, and development of habits of openness and truthfulness. True learning also depends on exposure to difference, for knowledge is gained through engagement with the unfamiliar. Exploring multiple world-views is a critical component of academic activities, and a multiplicity of backgrounds and perspectives stimulates the diverse exploration required for comprehensive learning, teaching, and research. Education is not about being tourists, sampling exotic cultures, but, rather, about becoming engaged members of a richly diverse intellectual and cultural environment. Our students grow through interacting with those of different backgrounds and views and, if we do our jobs well, upon graduation they are broader and deeper in their perspectives and better prepared to embrace a diverse world than when they first arrived on campus. In the words of *Building on Excellence*, “Those who learn only with and from those whose life experiences are quite similar to their own learn much less than those who share that learning with teachers and peers who approach the world from very different situations and perspectives. It is the unfamiliar that stretches us, not the already known” (BOE, p. 54).

Diversity defines the world we inhabit.

The worlds we inhabit are increasingly diverse. To prepare our students to live, work, and lead in these worlds, Duke has a responsibility to provide an education that is relevant to what our students will encounter in their local and global communities. This learning environment presumes a diverse faculty. *Building on Excellence* puts it this way:

Diversity in educational experience also prepares students to work with and lead diverse groups of people. These skills will be essential to the success of our graduates in the years ahead, when economies are without borders, minorities become the majority in many parts of this country, and international political and cultural challenges are of profound significance. We would never choose to overlook the building of competencies in critical inquiry, reading, and writing, or, for that matter, in the use of technology; for we recognize the importance of these competencies for navigating the world as productive workers and good citizens. Just as we acknowledge our responsibilities for helping our students to build those competencies, so, too, we must help prepare our students for the diverse worlds they will encounter after graduation. (BOE, p. 54)

Diversity is necessary for faculty excellence.

An excellent faculty, considered as a whole, depends on significant diversity among its members and their intellectual interests. Through such diversity, scholarship is advanced as creativity is encouraged, canons are expanded, received assumptions are challenged, and new intellectual territories are discovered while old ones are explored in new ways. Diversity is thereby an essential component of excellence.

A diverse faculty benefits everyone.

The presence and visibility of a diverse faculty—particular people as well as their bodies of knowledge—benefit the *entire* student body and, indeed, the overall culture of the institution. As *Building on Excellence* underscores, a valuation of diversity should become part of the patterns of thought and work at Duke University: “We must learn to see diversity as a source of strength. . . . Diversity leads to fresh thinking, innovation in problem solving, aesthetic creativity, and renewed wonder about the manifold aspects of our world. An attitude of inclusiveness, living comfortably with diversity, opens up the mind and the spirit, provides fertile ground for a better education, and makes a large, complex institution much more livable, enriching, and harmonious.” (*BOE*, p. 55)

Challenges to Duke in Fulfilling the Fundamental Principle

The diversity of our faculty is not yet commensurate with the diversity goals of the institution.

The Duke University faculty, like that of our peer institutions, is very largely White and male. This lack of diversity has existed for a long time and will not be redressed overnight, since, by its nature, faculty composition changes very slowly. Progress requires a proactive, concerted effort. To fulfill the commitment to diversity that we have made as an institution, every opportunity for diversifying is precious and must not be squandered.

New patterns of thinking about diversity must be developed, and the university culture changed.

Attitudes that have worked as engines against diversity in the past—whether open prejudice, more subtle preconceptions about people, or consideration of diversity as an “add on”—are as counterproductive to building Duke’s faculty of today and tomorrow as they are to encouraging diverse groups to go into academic life in the first place. These attitudes have no place in an institution of higher learning.

Commonly, diversity work in universities falls disproportionately to members of minority groups and a small number of faculty and administrators committed to this

work. Because diversity benefits us all, we must broaden the sense of responsibility to include every member of the university community. Diversity work is everyone's work.

The well-run institution of the 21st century must do more than take diverse backgrounds and perspectives into account; it must seek actively to capitalize on those differences and to maximize the contributions of all members of the community. The leadership of the institution must honor diversity and set expectations for appropriate management practices. These practices should emphasize mentoring of faculty and attention to climate. In this way, all can reach their full potential and the institution as a whole benefits. In the words of *Building on Excellence*, honoring diversity is, first, “a matter of simple human decency. [Second, in] practical terms, an environment that is unfriendly to members of the community prevents the effective conducting of the community's business, be it teaching, learning, or working in the myriad jobs within our complex institution.” (BOE, p. 55)

Recent focus groups with Black faculty across the institution—summarized in Appendix B—underscore how variable the climate is at Duke and how much energy must often be devoted to dealing with climate issues. What is true of the situation for Black faculty is indubitably true for others: racism, sexism, and homophobia are unfortunately alive and well on our campus, as on other campuses, resulting in feelings of isolation and marginalization. Retention of faculty requires ensuring a hospitable climate on both the unit and institutional levels; in such a climate, all faculty feel welcome and valued, and have a voice in the ongoing institutional debates and discussions. Moreover, *all* junior faculty require mentoring so that they feel a part of the department and school, get good advice about juggling competing demands, and are monitored in their progress toward fulfilling the requirements of tenure.

Those in leadership positions within a department or school have the power to change the climate for the better in their units and must be held accountable, and rewarded, for doing so. As the summary of the faculty focus groups states, “across all [categories], those who inhabited a *less* hostile working environment invariably traced their more positive experiences to a visionary chair or dean or administrator – one who was committed not only to hiring more faculty of color but also to taking very real steps in creating a more racially-sensitive environment” (Appendix B, p. 2). Regular assessments of the climate are necessary for taking stock of current situations and measuring progress.

A diversity initiative must be focused to be successful.

We have achieved a good measure of success with the focused diversity strategy called the Black Faculty Strategic Initiative (BFSI). We now reaffirm the goals of the BFSI and its emphasis on recruiting and retaining Black faculty. Although the BFSI *per se* will be concluded as of the next academic year, its spirit and its aim remain vital.

Increasing the number of Black faculty, in particular African-American faculty, should be a priority for Duke University, which was without a Black faculty member

until 1967. Since 1988, in part as a response to its segregated past, the University has made noteworthy efforts toward building its Black faculty. The decade-long Black Faculty Strategic Initiative beginning in the academic year 1993/1994 has borne good fruit: a doubling of regular rank Black faculty in the past nine years, from 44 in fall 1993 to 88 in fall 2002. However, as demonstrated in Appendix C, Table 1, we are certainly not at the point we would wish to be. Although the numbers have grown, they are still woefully low: 3.7% of Duke's faculty is Black. Furthermore, the numbers of Black faculty are unevenly distributed across schools and departments, with excessive numbers in non-tenure track positions. Although the ratio of non-tenure track to tenure track Black faculty has decreased over the years to 0.87 (i.e., 41 of 88 Black faculty are on the non-tenure track), the ratio is still significantly higher than that for White faculty (0.53; i.e., 691 of 1988 White faculty are on the non-tenure track). Although many Black faculty have found a welcoming presence at Duke, others have struggled with the *status quo*. (See Appendix B.) These differences indicate that there are forces still at play that counter the recruitment and retention of Black faculty.

Clearly, efforts must be strengthened, not only so that we do not lose ground with the BFSI's accomplishments, but also so that we can continue the momentum. In the words of Provost Lange to Academic Council Chair Nancy Allen, in October 2002, "As of this fall we have reached a doubling of Black faculty across Duke, one year ahead of 'schedule.' As we all know, however, such a schedule is arbitrary and such results—while laudable—are somewhat precarious. Even as the BFSI comes to a formal close in a year's time, I believe we must recommit ourselves to continuing efforts to attract and retain Black faculty."

While retaining the focus on Black faculty, we recommend broadening the scope of a new diversity initiative to include other racial/ethnic populations that are also underrepresented on our faculty.

A specific priority should be the recruitment and retention of Hispanic/Latino American faculty. This very heterogeneous group is the fastest growing minority population in the United States—soon to be *the* largest minority group in the nation—and in recent years an increasing presence in our region and state. The numbers suggest that this group is very poorly represented in our faculty ranks. (~1.8%; see Appendix C, Table 1.)

Native Americans, although well represented in North Carolina, are severely underrepresented among our faculty. Although we do not currently track this group, as far as we know there are *no* Native American faculty at Duke University. The student body includes Native Americans, however, and we offer courses addressing Native American history and culture. The addition of even a very small number of Native American faculty members would make a positive difference at Duke and should be a priority.

Finally, Asian-American faculty at Duke are clustered in Arts and Sciences, Pratt, and Medicine, but are underrepresented in other areas and have a disproportionately high

have a disproportionately high ratio of non-tenure track appointments (Appendix C, Table 1). Dealing with these imbalances should also be priority.

Defining diversity is a complex task, since, at its broadest, a definition of diversity includes *all* difference. The institution should keep the broad definition always in mind, as outlined in Duke's mission statement and strategic plan. At the same time, human and financial resources are not unlimited. Because of Duke's history and location, we believe that the ethnic and racial minorities discussed above should occupy the prime focus for a new diversity initiative. Such an initiative complements the work of the initiatives and structures already in place for internationalizing the campus and attending to women's issues.

A new diversity initiative must be more nuanced than in the past.

A new faculty diversity initiative requires a more nuanced approach than that of the Black Faculty Strategic Initiative, which set an overall University target of doubling the Black faculty in the regular ranks between 1993 and 2003. Numbers ("critical mass") are essential but not sufficient, and thus the new initiative needs to attend more directly to issues of availability, recruitment, and retention.

Across the campus there are great differences in the numbers of, and climate for, underrepresented minorities. These differences result from such factors as the proactivity or reactivity of search committees; the interest or lack of interest of chairs; the incentives or disincentives for diversifying; the robustness or paucity of mentoring; the clustering or dispersion of minorities; the surveying or ignoring of faculty satisfaction; and the richness or thinness of the "pipeline" (the pool from which to draw faculty recruits).

Together, these differences and the various reasons for them suggest the need for multiple strategies and targeted efforts, particular to each school and department, reflecting the unit-specific opportunities and constraints.

The lack of diversity of the pipeline is a major problem that must be addressed.

Duke could and should take a national lead in encouraging young scholars to enter academia. Our data indicate that the lack of diversity in the pipeline is a major challenge to recruiting minority faculty. Appendix C, Table 2 summarizes pool data from COFHE universities. Clearly, COFHE universities do not represent all the sources of qualified applicants, nor are all COFHE graduates qualified for Duke faculty positions. However, these universities, sharing many features with Duke University, provide a reasonable estimate of the applicant pool. Overall, the COFHE data reveal that the potential applicant pool is as imbalanced as the current faculty at Duke, if not more so: the potential pool between the years 1999 and 2001 was ~4.3% Black, ~3.8% Latino/Hispanic-American, and ~0.4% Native American.

In some disciplines, the numbers of underrepresented minorities applying for faculty positions reveal very large disparities. (See Appendix C, Table 3.) In Art and Art

History, for example, out of 44 applicants for Duke assistant professorships in 1999-2001, there were no Blacks, Hispanic/ Latino Americans, Native Americans, or Asian/Pacific Islanders. In Chemistry, while there were 58 applicants from these four groups out of a total of 353, 46 of them were Asian, a group *not* underrepresented in the sciences. Looking more closely at pipeline issues within departments and schools, in recent reports submitted to the Provost by the Deans (See Appendix C, Item 4.), we see clearly that different units at Duke face different challenges with regard to applicant pools. It is also clear that plans for enhancing applicant pools must be based on thorough investigation of available minority faculty within disciplines and sub-disciplines. All pool data unambiguously indicate that in order to solve the issue of faculty diversity we must solve the issue of pipeline diversity.

Although we do not have data to support this, we believe that the trajectory away from academia among these groups begins much earlier than Ph.D. programs. Mentoring and apprenticeship—in formal programs or informal relationships, that would help youth to imagine what is possible and provide the training necessary for success in a given field—are lacking in our region and nationwide. The University must lead nationally by acting locally among the many under-privileged youths in our regional schools. This effort must include initiatives that start with kindergarten, continue through 12th grade, and are intensified during college years.

There are currently several models of pipeline initiatives at Duke University. One notable example in the sciences is the program called Summer Research Opportunity Support Program in the Biomedical Sciences—initiated and run by Drs. Ken Kreuzer and Doug Marchuk with the overwhelming support of the biomedical sciences faculty—that brings undergraduates interested in biomedical research to Duke for summer internships. In the social sciences and humanities, the Bunche Institute and the Mellon Minority Undergraduate Program provide two additional models. We need to build on these models and extend the reach to even younger students.

If we do not solve the pipeline problem today we will guarantee a diversity problem in higher education thirty years from now. Moreover, unless we tap the talent of these underrepresented groups we may compromise the nation's future. For a discussion of one aspect of this issue, see *The Quiet Crisis: Falling Short in Producing American Scientific and Technical Talent*, by Dr. Shirley Ann Jackson et al. (This report, published on the website <http://www.bestworkforce.org/index.htm>, is attached as Appendix D.)

Recruitment of a diverse faculty requires a proactive approach and special efforts.

Even if a pipeline is robust in a given area, creative recruitment of faculty is necessary to compete in the university marketplace for the best candidates. Recruitment of targeted populations requires a proactive approach with the support structures necessary for facilitating that approach. A plenary paper by Professors Caroline S. V. Turner and Daryl G. Smith, entitled *Hiring Faculty of Color: Research on the Search Committee Process and Implications for Practice*—from an April 2002 University of

Minnesota conference called “Keeping Our Faculties—Recruitment and Retention of Minority Faculties”—is an excellent resource for addressing this issue. (See Appendix E.) Notably, 71% of underrepresented minority faculty hires in their study occurred as the result of special efforts. Without such efforts, success is unlikely.

Financial incentives commensurate with the strength of our commitment must be made available in support of our effort.

A primary question is how to grow our Black faculty while embracing a commitment to other minority groups as well. As the scope of our initiative increases, the resources to support it must increase accordingly. The task force recommends that the Provost make sufficient resources available to achieve the goals of the University’s faculty diversity plan: that is, resources commensurate with a continuing commitment to the recruitment and retention of Black faculty plus additional funds to encompass the increased breadth of this new plan. In addition, the Provost should set out clear expectations to the deans and center directors for the expenditure of their own resources to fulfill the University’s diversity goals. No ending date for the Faculty Diversity Plan is specified because a diversity initiative should now be recognized as integral to faculty hiring and retention, and to the ongoing development of the culture of the institution in accordance with our mission statement and strategic plan.

Financial incentives toward fulfillment of the diversity plan’s goals can and should take a variety of forms, depending on whether departments and schools develop and sustain clear commitments and strategies to diversify their faculty. Because the challenges and opportunities vary across the disciplines, strategies can include, for example, immediate faculty hiring, postdoctoral programs, and initiatives directed at an even earlier stage of educational development.

Recommendations

Defining Diversity Goals

- Duke should build on the successes of the BFSI and thus recommit to a strong emphasis on the recruitment and retention of Black faculty.
- Duke should reach out to additional underrepresented racial and ethnic minorities (especially but not exclusively U.S. minorities):
 - Latino/Hispanics, a major area of emphasis
 - Native Americans
 - Asian-Americans outside the sciences and engineering
- Duke should coordinate a racial/ethnic initiative with the work of the office of the Vice Provost for International Affairs.
- Duke should coordinate a racial/ethnic diversity initiative with the work of the women’s initiative. Both initiatives should be attuned to issues concerning the intersection of gender with race/ethnicity.
- Consolidation of the work of both the diversity and women’s initiatives should be considered in the implementation phase.

Creating a Structure for Implementation:

- To implement the diversity goals described above and the recommendations that follow, the Provost should create a standing Faculty Diversity Committee that should
 - Be formed and charged by the Deans Cabinet, with the concurrence of the Provost and the Executive Committee of the Academic Council;
 - Be chaired by a senior faculty member, appointed by the Provost;
 - Contain representation from the faculty members of the Provost's Task Force on Faculty Diversity;
 - Include the Vice President for Institutional Equity and utilize the full resources of the Office of Institutional Equity;
 - Be conversant about national currents;
 - Deepen the university's understanding of the issues;
 - Determine strategic leverage points;
 - Assist search committees in advancing the faculty diversity goals of the institution;
 - Advise departments on best practices;
 - Review deans' reports on the status of, and climate for, minority faculty;
 - Advise the Deans Cabinet and Provost on implementation of the Faculty Diversity Plan.
- This committee should have resources available for consultation, assessment, training, and other needs.
- This committee should be appropriately staffed.
- In order to make the committee successful, avoid overburdening faculty committed to diversity issues, send a clear message about the importance of this work, and foster the accumulation of expertise in this area, faculty representatives to this committee should be compensated in some way.

Taking a More Nuanced Approach to Goal-Setting:

- An overall institutional numerical goal should not be sought.
- Instead, a determination of unit-level goals—both quantitative and qualitative—should be the result of discussions among the faculty of each department, the chairs of departments and deans of schools, and the Provost. Data should inform these discussions, with assistance from the Office of Institutional Equity and the Office of Institutional Research.
- The goals should be finalized and approved as part of the approval of the schools' search plans.

Orienting Faculty to the Faculty Diversity Plan:

- The Provost should discuss with all deans the importance of the Faculty Diversity Plan (FDP).
- The Provost should meet with incoming chairs to discuss the importance of the FDP.

- Orientation programs for new faculty should reinforce the spirit and concrete goals of the FDP.
- Deans' orientations of new chairs should also reinforce these goals and set expectations for their fulfillment.
- A workshop should be developed to help deans and chairs understand the *mechanics* of the FDP.
- The Faculty Diversity Committee should serve as a resource to departments to help acquaint all faculty with the effort and to help achieve buy-in to the Plan.

Attending to pipeline issues:

- Since building pipelines is of critical importance in several areas, this strategy provides an opportunity for national leadership that Duke should set as an institutional goal. (See Appendix C, Tables 2 and 3, and Item 4, for pool data.)
- To improve the pipeline, existing programs should be expanded and new ones developed.
 - Duke has already made a commitment, through activities of the Office of Community Affairs and the Center for Child and Family Policy, for example, to the K-12 education of youth and the betterment of the Durham community. This commitment should include a focus on increasing the pipeline of diverse faculty by helping local schools to encourage and equip underrepresented minority youth to pursue higher education. Specifically, the Duke community should strengthen ties with the Durham Public School system, which has both great needs and enormous potential. Such activity should be considered consistent with expectations that deans, department chairs, and center directors seek opportunities to implement the Faculty Development Plan.
 - Departments with limited pipelines of underrepresented minorities should make efforts toward increasing those pipelines in order to address the long-term issue. These efforts must be rewarded by the institution. Programs such as dissertation and post-doctoral fellowships should be designed to attract more individuals into the *final* stages of the pipeline. Longer term programs must involve direct contact of students, fellows, and faculty with K-12 students; in this arena, minimal efforts can have enormous impact. Specific policies should be implemented to make this part of the culture of the institution, e.g., a requirement for each graduate student to visit a local school for one morning a year.
 - Examples of successful Duke programs for building pipelines at all levels of education should be widely publicized, and directors of those programs should be available for consultation
- To ultimately increase the pool of targeted faculty, the following data should be available for review:
 - PhD production. Deans, department chairs, and center directors should review the data on the numbers of doctorates that are being produced and by what institutions;

- Undergraduate minority programs. Data should be sought on the results of programs designed to encourage minorities to pursue advanced degrees.
- K-12. Data should be sought to determine the educational stages where maximum impact can be delivered. Duke should coordinate its efforts with national groups that are intensely studying this issue (e.g., in the sciences the National Academy of Sciences).

Attending to recruitment issues:

- Deans of schools and department chairs should mandate that search committees think creatively and be proactive in seeking diverse candidates. Being proactive includes:
 - scrutinizing lists of fellows from Mellon, Ford, and other prestigious foundations with specialized programs for underrepresented minorities;
 - engaging all members of the department in identifying potential candidates in the targeted racial/ethnic groups;
 - utilizing broad and creative strategies for advertising positions;
 - enlisting the assistance of the Office of Institutional Equity to help the staffs of search committees more effectively conduct their searches.
- Search committee chairs should make use of the resources and expertise of the standing Faculty Diversity Committee by consulting with the Committee before, during, and after the search.
- If insufficient pools are identified as a reason for lack of minority hiring, then steps for building the pool should be identified by the department or school.

Attending to retention issues:

- The Office of Institutional Equity and other appropriate offices should develop resources, including written materials, that are directed specifically toward academic units to help department chairs address climate issues.
- Department chairs, center directors, and deans should proactively address climate issues within their units, utilizing formal assessments (see below) and other qualitative information.
- Department chairs, center directors, and deans should ensure that every faculty member receive adequate mentoring.
- For the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) process, contributions to a diverse intellectual community should become part of the evaluation of a candidate. This does not mean that the ascriptive characteristics (e.g., age, sex, racial/ethnic background) of faculty will become a factor in tenure and promotion decisions, as these decisions are made on the basis of excellence in research, teaching, and service. What it does mean is that, like the contributions to cross-disciplinary work, contributions to a diverse intellectual environment will be a standard question asked of the dean during the evaluation process for faculty being considered for tenure and promotion. Specifically, the dean will be asked to address the following question: How does the candidate's research, teaching, *or* service contribute to a diverse intellectual environment at Duke?

Collecting and analyzing data on an ongoing basis:

- Assessments of faculty satisfaction should occur with regularity.
 - These should include but not be limited to annual surveys and exit interviews of *all* faculty.
 - Human Resources, the Office of Institutional Equity, and/or the Office of Institutional Research should construct a model of such surveys and exit interviews.
- A major review of all aspects of the Faculty Diversity Plan should be conducted 3-5 years after adoption.

Providing structures for follow up:

- Results of data collection should become part of the deans' evaluation of chairs and departments.
Results should be discussed by deans with chairs at annual budget meetings.

Providing financial resources:

- In some cases, financial resources should support targeted faculty appointments; in other cases, programs geared toward post doctoral fellows; and, when consistent with the Faculty Development Plan, programs for younger students, including K-12. The nature, as well as the extent and duration, of central support is a complex matter best determined in the context of the individual unit's overall situation.
- Where pressing needs, and key leverage points, are identified, financial resources should be made available.

Setting Expectations of the Schools, Departments, and Centers for Achieving Diversity Goals.

- Deans, department chairs and center directors should consider diversity as integral to their mission rather than as an add-on.
- Deans, department chairs and center directors should devote appropriate resources to achieving diversity.
- Deans, department chairs and center directors should be evaluated on their performance in achieving these diversity goals.
- Deans, department chairs and center directors should evaluate their faculty on their contributions toward achieving these goals.

The Task Force on Faculty Diversity proposes this Faculty Diversity Plan in support of the goals of *Building on Excellence*. As we conclude this report we repeat the salient quotation from the University's strategic plan with which we began: "Diversity is not an add-on or an afterthought, or a matter of mere enrichment, but rather an essential factor of critical importance to our success in all aspects of university life—indeed, of life itself (*Building on Excellence*, p. 54). The Task Force trusts that Duke University will embrace this opportunity to provide local and national leadership in building a diverse faculty.