Duke University
DURHAM
NORTH CAROLINA
27708-0928

ACADEMIC COUNCIL
304 UNION WEST
BOX 90928

phone (919) 684-6447
e-mail acouncil@Duke.edu
fax (919) 681-8606

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Academic Council

Thursday October 18th, 2012

Susan Lozier (Chair of Academic Council/Nicholas School of the Environment): Welcome everyone – if I can have your attention, we will start our meeting. Welcome to the October Academic Council meeting. I trust everyone is enjoying this beautiful fall weather. I have a few announcements to start our meeting. The first is a congratulatory note.

Duke Nobel Laureate

Dr. Robert Lefkowitz, Professor of Medicine, Pathology and Biochemistry, and a Howard Hughes Medical Institute investigator, was awarded the 2012 Nobel Prize in Chemistry, a prize he shares with Brian Kobilka , a postdoctoral fellow in Lefkowitz's lab in the 1980s and now on the faculty at Stanford's School of Medicine. These scholars were recognized for their studies of G-protein–coupled receptors. While we are certainly proud of any Nobel laureate that walks this campus, I think we can be particularly pleased that Dr. Lefkowitz has spent his entire 39-year research career at Duke. Congratulations to Dr. Lefkowitz on this honor (applause).

Student-Athlete Recognition

The 1A Faculty Athletic Representatives (FAR) Academic Excellence Awards have been released for 2012. To receive this award, students must have graduated in the past academic year with at least a 3.8 cumulative grade-point average and must have participated in at least two years of intercollegiate athletics. Six Duke students received this award. They are:

Victoria Arendt, Rowing, with a major in Biology
Megan Deakins, Field Hockey and Track, Neuroscience
Sophia Dunworth, Volleyball, Biology
James Kostelnik, Track and Cross Country, Political Science
Jessica Lyden, Swimming, Psychology
Leslie Morrison, Track and Cross Country, Mathematics

Congratulations to these students for their remarkable achievements (applause).

Death of Pelham Wilder, Jr.

My next announcement is on the loss of a member of our Duke community. Pelham Wilder, former university marshal and professor emeritus of chemistry died on October 6th at the age of 92. Wilder taught for more than 50 years at this university and served as the university marshal from 1977 to 2000. As written in *Duke Today*, Wilder was held in high esteem on this campus for many decades. In a 1999 interview, the late Mary Duke Biddle Trent Semans, great-granddaughter of Washington Duke, remarked that Wilder "personifies Duke University." The Duke community has lost a valued member. On behalf of the Duke faculty, I extend condolences to the Wilder family for their loss.

Honorary Degree Nominations

My next announcement is an invitation for nominations. As you know, it is a university tradition to award honorary degrees at commencement each year. There is a Trustee-Faculty Committee on Honorary Degrees that will soon begin the process of selecting the 2014 slate of honorees. When this selection process is finished next May, this Council will be asked for its approval of the slate. Your input to this process, however, does not need to wait until next May when you're asked to vote "yea" or "nay" to the slate. The Committee on Honorary Degrees is currently soliciting nominations from faculty members for honorary degrees.

An excerpt from the nomination form best describes the type of nominations that are sought:

"Honorary degrees are awarded to recognize excellence in any valued aspect of human endeavor, including the realm of scholarship, public service, the arts, religion, science and medicine, commerce and communications. Especially welcome are nominations of those with some connection to Duke."

For your information the 2012-2013 Honorary Degree Committee faculty members are: Jocelyn Olcott, History, also an Academic Council member. Not sure if Jocelyn is here today…there she is; Karla Holloway, English, a recent Academic Council member; Barton Haynes, Medicine; Norman Christensen, Nicholas School and David Katz, Biomedical Engineering. So I know last May there were some questions when I introduced the slate of nominees and a number of Council faculty members wanted to know where these names came from. I wanted to let you know that this fall, the process is beginning for 2014 nominations and you have an opportunity now to have input. Sandra Walton, from the Academic Council office, will send an email to the Council membership in the next couple of days to provide contact information should you have a nomination. The University Secretary's Office has asked that nominations be submitted by November 1st.

Finally, I have reached my last announcement before we begin our agenda, and this announcement actually takes the form of a few remarks about this date in history.

Academic Council 50th Anniversary Plans

In 1962 on the 1st of October, James Meredith became the first black student at the University of Mississippi. Later that evening Johnny Carson hosted his first Tonight Show. On the 5th of that same month, the Beatles released their first record "Love Me Do." On the 8th, North Korea reported a 100% election turnout, with a 100% vote for the Workers' Party. That's amazing (laughter).

On the 12th, the US performed a nuclear test at the Nevada Test Site. And on the 16th of October in 1962, the Cuban missile crisis began as President John Kennedy was informed about the presence of Soviet missile base construction in Cuba. And on the 18th of that same month, at 16:59 GMT the US launched the Ranger 5 spacecraft to the moon. And just a little over three hours later, there was a second launch, that day. At 4pm local time Richard Predmore, Professor of Romance Languages and Chair of the Election Committee, called the Duke faculty together in 308 Flowers for the inaugural meeting of the Academic Council.

The Cuban missile crisis ended later that month when Khrushchev ordered the withdrawal of Soviet missiles, the Ranger 5 ran out of power within 725 km of the Moon, ceasing operation just three days after its launch, a Nuclear Test Ban treaty was signed in October of 1963, effectively ending further U.S. and Soviet nuclear tests, the Beatles disbanded in 1969, and Johnny Carson's 30-year run on the Tonight Show ended in 1992. But 50 years later, Duke's Academic Council, as well as the North Korean Worker's Party, lives on (laughter and applause). Apparently, longevity comes to those who know how to use their power (laughter).

On a more serious note, I do not know a single soul, including all parties arguing before the Supreme Court last week, who believes that 50 years after James Meredith walked onto the campus of the University of Mississippi, that we are finished with discussions on how best to admit students to our campus so that we provide opportunity to those with few opportunities, so that we ensure fairness and so that we create a campus community and culture that all students find welcoming and enriching. In this regard, fifty years has been but a moment.

Back in 308 Flowers at the second launch on October 18, 1962, the first elected members of the Council, 51 faculty members from across this campus, 49 men and 2 women, met to discuss how they were to organize the newly constructed Academic Council. The first order of business was to adopt election procedures for the Executive Committee and to decide on the nature and number of standing committees. As a side note, I want you to know that some of those committees have been standing for over 50 years! (laughter) Over the course of monthly meetings throughout the 1962-63 academic year, this first Council, working with Duke President J. Deryl Hart, and Provost Robert Taylor Cole, laid the foundation for the faculty governance that serves us to this day.

In 2002, the 40th anniversary of the Council was celebrated with a retrospective focused on that faculty governance. As noted by Professor Nancy Allen, then Academic Council chair, "the Council has served as the faculty voice on critical, intellectual and governance issues on Duke's campus since its formulation." As a tribute to that record, former council chairs were invited to the 40th anniversary and Professor Allen shared a timeline of the major accomplishments of the Council.

To celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Council, ECAC has decided to focus on how Duke in 2012 differs from Duke in 1962 and what those differences portend for Duke in the years and decades ahead. The University, after all, provides the context for faculty governance, and in a broader sense, the context for our professional livelihoods.

And so last summer I went searching for the Duke of 1962. I entertained myself (seriously) by reading the minutes from that first year of the Council and I am quite sure that had the pages not been hand-typed, yellowed and dated, I may have been hard press to guess whether certain passages were from 1962, 1982 or 2002. Here were faculty discussing the construction of new student housing, an addition to the library, bylaw changes, faculty salary raises -- seems like we don't discuss that much (laughter), and fundraising. Some things never change.

For those of us who have walked these slate sidewalks and/or attended these Council meetings for many years, it seems at times as though this place does indeed stand still or at least we act as though we can will it to stand still. Historically, faculty, by and large, have been reluctant to embrace change.

Indeed, as noted by Louis Menand in his 2010 book, *The Marketplace of Ideas*, the professional conservatism of professors is an ancient source of ridicule. Menand notes that the Cambridge classicist, F. M. Cornford, in a satirical guide for young academics, advised that the basic rule of faculty governance is "Nothing should ever be done for the first time!" (laughter). This rule is a bit at odds with what my 20 years in the academy has taught me about faculty governance, which is that nothing should ever be done for the last time! The combination of these two yields a disheartening sum because you see, if we don't start or stop anything, it means we keep doing nothing over and over again (laughter). Yet, even though academicians are considered institutionally conservative, the institution, and its faculty have indeed changed. As with our own lives, changes from one year to the next can be imperceptible, but 50 years provides an ample horizon for viewing large scale changes.

And so, to celebrate this milestone, ECAC has planned a series of conversations on aspects of the University that have significantly altered over the past 50 years and, as a result, significantly altered our role as faculty members. These Council Conversations are an opportunity to consider not just the past 50 years, but how these changes will shape the University in the decades ahead.

There will be three of these Council Conversations, each appended to a Council meeting in the spring semester, each involving members of the Duke community. One conversation will focus on changes in the structure of the university, another on changes in teaching and learning and another on changes in the professoriate itself. Today, I'll give you a brief preview of those conversation topics and some of the changes over the past 50 years that motivate these conversations.

So, to begin: the Structure of the University. In 1962, Duke had 40 departments; today there are 66. Of those 40 in 1962, just more than half, 23 were in Arts and Sciences. Today 30 of the 66 departments, just less than half, are in Arts & Sciences. Then there were 8 schools, today there are 10. These changes seem incremental until we get to the next count. In 2012, in addition to the 7 University Signature Institutes, there are 78 centers, 45 programs, and 14 other institutes scattered among the Schools. In 1962 there were none. Why this change? Louis Menand, again in *Marketplace of Ideas*, remarked that there is "always a tension between the state of knowledge and the system in which learning and teaching is actually taking place." Has the explosion of centers and institutes and programs been in response to that tension? If so, what tension is there today? These structural changes, visible even to those of us here far shorter than the 50-year span, as well as anticipated structural changes that are concomitant with global campuses and programs, motivate these questions for the Council Conversation next spring: How has the transition from a department-based institution to one where the research and teaching missions of the University are a shared responsibility among departments, institutes and centers impacted the University? The faculty? The students? Where does this institutional diversification lead in the years ahead? How does the addition of a global campus change the structure of the University and how does it challenge our understanding of a campus community? In brief, how have and how will structural changes impact the role of a Duke faculty member?

The second Council Conversation will focus on Teaching and Learning at the University. During the 1962-63 academic year, 811 undergraduate degrees and 563 graduate and professional degrees were conferred, for a total of 1,374. During 2011-2012, 1,641 undergraduate degrees and 3,322 graduate and professional degrees were conferred, for a total of 4,963. In fifty years, we have doubled the number of undergraduate degrees, yet seen a six-fold increase in the number of graduate and professional degrees. In 1962, undergraduate degrees were 60% of our output, today they account for 33%.

In 1962, there were 23 undergraduate majors, with an approximately equal number of minors. In 2012 undergraduates have a choice of 49 majors, 56 minors and 23 certificates. And some of my advisees seem to want to take all of them, I think (laughter).

Beyond the numbers, teaching and learning over the past fifty years have evolved in response to technological advances. A few years ago, as chair of the Academic Council Committee on Undergraduate Education, I gained some insight from a fellow committee member, David Malone, who is now a fellow Council member. David remarked that as information has become increasingly accessible, the classroom needs to shift from a place of knowledge acquisition to a place of knowledge construction. Since that conversation, I have shifted my classroom teaching style to one where I place a heavier emphasis on working with students to formulate the questions, rather than a sole focus on finding the answers. But a larger question is now looming. Do we need the classroom? With the recent advance in the sophistication of online platforms available to bring teaching to any nook and cranny around the globe, what happens to the teaching and learning in a classroom? What happens to the teaching and learning on a campus? Last month in an Academic Programs Committee meeting, one member speculated that the "industrialization" model of college education, where students are constrained to the same space during the same four years, may soon be an outdated model. In the not too distant future, students may come and go on their own schedules, at their own pace, sometimes gathering in virtual space, sometimes gathering in real space. Students would be, in effect, unbounded by spatial and temporal constraints. An interesting idea. Yet even boundlessness has its limits. You see, space and time constraints are precisely what create community. And so moving ahead, as we consider how to enhance a Duke education via online courses and offerings, those considerations must include an understanding of what creates community and what value we place on that community as part of an educational experience.

Also beyond the numbers, our classrooms have changed just by the virtue of who has filled the seats. In 1962, physical education classes were separate for men and women: even the course offerings were distinct. For example, 1962 courses offered for men included Phys Ed 164, "Athletic Coaching in Secondary Schools" and Phys Ed 172, "Recreational Leadership," neither of which was offered to women. The young women instead were required to take classes such as Phys Ed 103, "Games and Rhythms for Children," taught by Miss Lewis. Really--I could not make this stuff up (laughter). On a more serious note, the Duke classrooms in 1962 were most decidedly different from ours in 2012 because not a single black undergraduate filled a single seat. The following year, 1963, the first black undergraduates, just five, took their seats in our classrooms. Next spring this Council will help mark the 50th anniversary of that milestone.

Looking back, I think it is safe to say that fifty years ago the teaching mission of the University was fulfilled by tenure-track professors in classrooms standing in front of chalkboards teaching undergraduates within a discipline. I think it is also fair to say that those faculty in front of the classrooms and those students in the classes were more than likely culturally and racially homogeneous.

And so questions for our conversation on teaching and learning, for next spring include: How have teaching and learning at Duke changed, and how are they changing, in response to technological advancements; to the changing composition of our student body; to the growth in interdisciplinary research, programs and structures; to the rising number of professional and graduate students; and to globalization? What are the current expectations from students as to how and what they should be taught? How do we see those expectations changing in the years and decades ahead as the online revolution takes hold? What are the faculty's expectations for how teaching and learning should evolve in the coming years?

The third Council Conversation will focus on the Professoriate. In 1962, there were 650 Duke faculty members, today we number 3,238, a five-fold increase. In 1962, School of Medicine faculty were 22% of the faculty; today they account for 64%. In 1962, Arts & Sciences faculty were 55% of the faculty; today 19%. Practically antipodal changes. 14% of the faculty in 1962 were women, with women mostly concentrated in Physical Education, Nursing and Medicine. In 2012, 36% of Duke faculty are women. In 1962, there is no record of any non-white faculty member. The first black faculty member, Samuel DuBois Cook, was not hired until 1966. Non-white faculty members today account for 21% of the faculty.

Beyond the numbers, the professoriate has seen changes in the expectations placed on faculty members. As Duke has risen in national and international prominence, the expectation for faculty members to produce research of national and international prominence has risen. And that expectation, for many faculty, but not all, across this University has brought increasing expectations of grantsmanship. Research productivity is quantified in 2012 to a degree unheard of in 1962.

Beyond the numbers, the professoriate has seen an increasing specialization of our workforce. In 1962, faculty titles included Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor, Lecturer and in the School of Medicine, Associate. In 2012, faculty titles include those of the regular rank tenured and tenure track faculty, Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor as well as those of the regular rank non-tenure faculty, Assistant, Associate and Full Professors of the Practice, Research Professors, Clinical Professors, Track I, II, III, IV and Track V Professors, lecturers and medical instructors.

Non-regular rank faculty titles include adjunct professor, lecturing fellow, consulting professor, consulting associate, clinical associate, research scientist, research scholar, research associate, artist in residence, instructor, scholar in residence, and visiting professor. This proliferation of titles indicates a trend toward a division of labor. This specialization is everywhere: In 1962, Major League Baseball had pitchers and relievers. In 2012, Major League Baseball has starters, middle relievers, long relievers, set-up pitchers, closers….you get the picture.

What has driven the specialization in faculty roles? Research universities emerged at the turn of the 20th century as a coalescence of first rate research and first rate teaching; a coalescence that was generally manifest individually, not just collectively. And now? What faculty pitch the whole game? Do we want or need faculty that can pitch the whole game? What combination best meets the needs of the University? Of the faculty?

And so, questions for our Council Conversation on the Professoriate this spring include: What are the expected roles of a faculty member now compared to 50 years ago? How is the University's teaching and research mission met with its current faculty "portfolio?" How might we expect the role of a faculty member to change in the years ahead in response to external changes such as federal funding restrictions and online course delivery? How might we expect the faculty portfolio to change as the University expands its global and digital reach?

ECAC and other Duke community members are working this month and the next to finalize the line-up for these Council Conversations. Please stay tuned for more information. These conversations are planned for the spring semester, but the next 50th anniversary event is at our November 29th meeting, when Richard Wagoner, the chair of Duke's Board of Trustees, will address this Council on the role of the Board in University governance. Since he became Chairman of the Board in the summer of 2011, Mr. Wagoner has made a very strong effort to communicate directly with the faculty through regular visits to ECAC. This planned address to the Council as a whole is another effort in that direction. We are delighted to welcome Mr. Wagoner, on the occasion of our 50th anniversary, to this Council. Please make every effort to attend.

Finally, before I return to our agenda for the day, I would like to thank Kendrick Tatum, Assistant Director for Institutional Research in the Provost's Office, for her invaluable assistance with compiling the 1962 and 2012 comparisons that I shared with you today. I also want to thank Sandra Walton and Ray Liang in the Academic Council office for their help as well.

Jane Richardson (Biochemistry): I just had a question, whether there was a way to input suggested questions within one of these three discussions?

Lozier: Yes, absolutely. I would love for everyone to do that. To do so, write to acouncil@duke.edu or write to me. What we are planning on doing is having Duke community members lead the discussion, but we're also then going to open it up to the Council as a whole. But having those questions ahead of time would be very helpful, so please send those. Thanks for that question.

Approval of Meeting Minutes

Now, on to the first item on our agenda, the approval of the September 20th meeting minutes. Are there any corrections or edits? May I have a motion to approve? A second?

(*approved by voice vote with no dissent).*

Bylaw Changes

At our meeting last month, ECAC introduced suggested changes to our bylaws regarding the annual election of Council members and the handling of the election of members to ECAC. The bylaws with the suggested changes were posted again with today's agenda.

A brief review of the four proposed changes follows: 1. Currently, new Council members start their term at the April meeting. Since the business of the Council is bounded by the academic year, ECAC finds it more appropriate and justifiable to have the membership term coincide with the academic year. Thus, voting privileges for members elected each spring begin in the fall, with the sole exception to this rule being the election of ECAC members at the April meeting.
2. Currently, there is no provision for the case in which a School or Division fails to have sufficient faculty members to fill a nomination ballot. Since the Council moved three years ago to listing only those members willing to stand for election, there have been instances with each election when the number of faculty members willing to stand for election is less than the number needed for a nomination ballot. The edited bylaws include a provision by which a nomination ballot can be bypassed, so that the election will just be one step: instead of a nomination ballot and an election ballot, it will just be an election ballot. 3. Currently, ECAC members

are elected via slates, whereby two nominees compete against each other for each open slot. Instead of having this one-on-one competition, ECAC believes that each Council member should receive a ballot with twice the number of nominees as there are open seats listed on the ballot and then ask each Council member to select their top choices. 4. Instead of listing names in forward or reverse alphabetical order, ECAC wants to list names randomly on the ballots.

As I mentioned at the September meeting these changes have been discussed within ECAC and they have been vetted with the Faculty Elections Committee. Are there any questions? Hearing none, may I have a motion to approve the changes to our bylaws? A second? (*approved by voice vote with no dissent).*

Our next agenda item is a presentation on Academic Analytics, which will be given by Provost Lange and Dr. David Jamieson-Drake, Director of the Office of Institutional Research--I hope you were able to take a look at the Academic Analytics website link that was posted on our agenda.

Academic Analytics

Peter Lange (Provost and Thomas A. Langford University Professor): Let me introduce David Jamieson-Drake. I will say here--and I think this will not be contradicted anywhere in the country--David is the preeminent institutional research officer at any university in the United States. So all the mistakes that are made here are my fault (laughter).

David Jamieson-Drake (Director of Duke's Institutional Research Office): In the same vein, I'd like to thank Pat Hull who actually did most of the work--she's over there in the red--all of the mistakes are still mine (laughter).

Lange: What I'm going to do today is present to you a new faculty research productivity measurement tool, which we now have institutionally available and which is much more accurate, flexible, broad and hence useful than anything we've had in the past. In doing so, I'm also going to show you some data about Duke which I have to tell you when I initially saw it I found quite striking, in which you, I hope, will also find striking, even as you all can--as we did--find little critical holes to poke in it. With that introduction I want to also offer four caveats as you look at this data that we are fully aware of. First of all, it is only a measure of research productivity which is certainly not, regardless of field, the only measure of any faculty members' contribution to the University or to the larger society. We continue greatly to value both teaching and service and hence are cautious of the use of this tool even as we derive the fullest appropriate value from it. Second of all, we do not measure quality of publications in this measure. It measures number and other characteristics of a person's research productivity, but it does not measure the quality. What that says to everyone who looks at this data is that you have to continue to use something which is not often enough invoked, which is judgment. Third, while the tool is by far the best one available for measuring and understanding research productivity in field appropriate ways across almost all disciplines, it is not fully developed in all fields and hence even within the research area is still not capturing all of the data we would like. We do expect that it will do an even better job in the next couple of years, and I'll mention a couple places where that's true as I go through it. Finally the great merit in the tool lies more in the ability to use it to compare units, like departments or divisions or the University as a whole, to similar units than to compare individuals, either within Duke or across universities.

Let me take you through this. The organization which collects this data is an organization called Academic Analytics. It is a private for-profit company, and has been in existence for about five years. It initiated with the dean at the graduate school at Stonybrook. I would say that in the first two years, when they tried to enlist us to join them, we did so somewhat reluctantly and then we told them that the data they were providing us was entirely inadequate to what we would like and to their credit they took our criticisms (I'm sure they got them from other people as well). They went back and they revised the data in very substantial ways and we now feel much, much better about it.

What is the core measure that they use? The core measure that they use is something called the Faculty Scholarly Productivity Index, which you will see me refer to repeatedly as the "FSPI" and you will see that on the charts. What it does is calculate a number of productivity metrics per faculty member. I want to stress that because it takes size of unit entirely out of the equation except as that might somehow affect how productive any particular faculty member in that unit could be. The measures here are controlled by the fact that we start out at the individual faculty member level. Second of all, except for a few kinds of honors and awards, it emphasizes relatively recent--you'll see how recent--data not old data. Not things that somebody did twenty years ago. This is definitely an index which you might characterize as "what have you done lately" index of research productivity. And third, the databases that we've been using now--they release a database once a year or sometimes a little bit more--it is through calendar year 2010 so the last year and a half or two years are not in here.

What is the FSPI methodology? It looks at thirteen metrics in five areas and I'm going to go through these very quickly. It looks at books--you can see the books where the books are covered--and it looks at the percent of faculty in a department who have a book and the percent of books published per faculty member. It looks at journal articles and as you can see here, the time frame is a little bit shorter so this is more "what have you done for me lately" index and it looks at, within the faculty of any unit, the percent of those faculty who have journal publications and the percent of journal publications per faculty member. Citations: 2006-2010. Again percent with a citation, number of citations per faculty member, number of citations per publication and here I would stress it is not weighted. This goes back to the quality issue. The journals in which those articles are cited are not weighted by some of these tiers that you have within various disciplines or areas. So there is no weighting on these, that's where the judgment comes in.

Fourth, it looks at grants. Fifteen agencies and again you can see the measures. Finally, it also does something that we've never had good access to which is the honors and the awards received by faculty members. The length of time in how far back it goes in counting those awards depends on the award. So a Nobel prize, I believe counts forever (laughter). The prize from the North Carolina Association of your sub-discipline probably counts for a week (laughter). If any of you have those, I'm sorry. It shows you the sources, I'm not going to review these now. These sources are very extensive and I want to stress that in the area of journals, especially the sources, are the same ones that are often used for other indices you might look at but the point is, here they accumulate them in a so called--does anybody know what disambiguation is? Disambiguation is one of the new words that I learned recently. Disambiguation…how many people in here actually know what disambiguation is? Okay, a relatively small subset mostly from the administration. Disambiguation is the process by which you identify who somebody who has a similar name really is and therefore what they published as opposed to somebody else. So you're basically taking the ambiguity out of the name, disambiguation right? And there is a big process and that's largely a hand process. That is not a machine doing that process so disambiguation is a very key part of how they get this data. As I said these data are collected on an individual basis. How are the results aggregated? So they aggregate into units which follow this classification of instructional programs which comes from the Feds. Faculty activity, and this is one of the merits of this, is measured in more than one field, that's a merit but you get 100% credit in every field that you are in. So some of you are worth two or three times your cents. There is another process here called deduplication. That is if, you are in two units and then you roll those two units up together you don't want to double count it at that level so then they de-duplicate so you only count once in the more aggregated unit. They look at 382 institutions, 172 disciplines. 5,350 programs are in the database. So this is a big database and one of the nice things here is because we are now receiving unit-level data, this wasn't true before this year. We can actually put together rosters for instance for our interdisciplinary units. So we can pull out individual faculty members, saying these are the people in this unit, let's look at them even though they are across different departments by pulling out the individual records and then doing the same kind of analysis I'm going to show you in a minute. In the most recent release of the Academic Analytics database, there were 1200 Duke faculty because clinical departments are not in there so this is close to the number that you said. So 1200 faculty but 1800 records because people appear in multiple units. It actually would be interesting to know that relationship at other schools. I just thought of this but that is sort of a subtle measure of interdisciplinarity, right? How many people are in multiple units and therefore show up in multiple counting? We probably could get that from them.

One of the nice things also, is as I said earlier, that they use these metrics in a sophisticated way so they don't apply them the same way across every unit. They recognize that different kinds of publications, citations, etc. count differently in different disciplines and so there is a weighting. Here we have shown you the weights that come with the data. Now, there are two things to be said about this. First of all, a unit could decide, these weights might be right for units in our area in general but ours is a special department. So we really weigh books more. Let's say you're in a science department but for that science department--even though books don't count very much--for your department historically there's been an important wing of that department which has published a lot of books and not been such a journals field. You can adjust the weights. You cannot adjust the weights for the other institution but you can adjust the weights for your own institution and see how that might change your position relative to others. That's a nice piece of tweaking that you can do. Of course, it also opens the way to all kinds of mischief. As it says here, the Z-scores essentially normalize the data in a way that allows you, across all these different kinds of data, to treat them as part of the single index.

Now what I want to do is show you some real data. What we've got here is screenshots. We were thinking about doing this live and trying to go on the web but there were two consequences. First of all, we thought there was at least a 50 % probability that it would break down and second of all, it was going to take much longer. We're showing you screenshots but certain things I'm going to show you can be done live so you can sit at your computer and make these adjustments and look at different ways of cutting the data as you go through it.

This first slide shows you Duke as compared to all other institutions in terms of all the faculty who were looked at for the FSPI and this is a pretty striking piece of data, I hope. Duke had the fourth highest research productivity for its faculty of any of the institutions (applause). Remember, judgment, judgment, judgment (laughter).

Lozier: What I want to ask is this, and I don't want to be a cynic after such good news but this is based on the standard ranks. So if University of Chicago showed this might they be changing their weighting and be in third?

Lange: No.

Lozier: But you just said institutions have the ability to do that but this is a standard…

Lange: Just for themselves. They can do it for themselves. You can do anything you want.

Jamieson-Drake: The weights are by program not by institution so they can change the weights for their programs but there's no way that you can drill it up for their entire institution.

Lange: By the way, in last year's data we were in the same position with a slightly lower score and I think one of the striking things here is also that the gap between us and five is larger than the gap between us and three which is marginally comforting (laughter). But I think the thing you really, since I don't like rankings that much anyway and we have tried to avoid these rankings in too much excess.

Speaker: Can I get a clarification on your question? The FSPI is by individual faculty?

Lange: Correct.

Speaker: Thank you.

Lozier: We're going to leave plenty of time for questions after this.

Lange: Yes, because the other two presentations that I have to make can be vastly compressed. So, this is pretty impressive. It's pretty good and we liked it (laughter). I can't say we didn't like it. It's Harvard, Stanford, MIT and in fifth is Princeton and sixth is Berkley. Remember per faculty member. This is what's nice about it. This next thing shows you a comparison of a broad area of departments. What we did here, if you look on the left here, we picked all the departments in the business school so business is one of the subcategories. Over here you see the ranking of research productivity of the selected business departments in all of the same schools that we looked at before. Here you can see Duke is ranked 6 or 7. And you can see the scores there. By the way on the right-hand side you have the option of checking which of these comparative groups you want. These are different comparative groups like this is the complete, comprehension doctoral, doctoral HSS. There's a bunch of different categories you can select and you will see in a minute you can also select by a department as you get down. In this case we chose business but you'd be able to pick--this is for instance biomedical--you'd be able to select this instead of business. Or you'd be able to select engineering instead of business if you want to do that subcomparison. Now, you can go down to the program level. What's happened here is that within biomedical sciences a particular department here, biomedical and biomedical science number 11, we anonymize the departments for the purpose of this, so that we didn't get into a lot of invidious discussions or prideful discussions, whichever one. So we've anonymized them, but we've picked this department and now you can see how this department ranks against the same department at all the other schools. Over here again, you can pick what subset of schools you wanted to look at. David, you jump in anywhere here, where you think I'm missing something important. Obviously in the departments, this is the place if you change the weights your department might show up differently but everybody else's weights are going to be the standard weight. Now, for each department and faculty member there are a set of indices, remember those weights I talked about before, they are captured up here. So for instance, you have up there percent of books, books per faculty member, percent with the journal publication, journal publication per faculty member, percent with a citation, citations for faculty members, citations for publications, percent with a grant.

Jamieson-Drake: And there's a scroll bar on the right, the top one, all thirteen are listed on the left, you just can't get to it because of the way the screen shot was taken.

Lange: Right. Okay now, so what you see there are the Duke numbers. Here you see those same percentages for a group of selected comparators and the selected comparators are over here. So I could've gone through and checked off any of those three hundred plus institutions as ones I'd like to compare ourselves to. Let's say we wanted to compare ourselves to the Big 10 schools, or to the Ivy League, or to the Ivy League plus three other schools, we have something called the Ivy-plus. You can pick the institutions and then compare your own scores against the scores of those compared. Not surprisingly, for instance in this case, we've picked engineering here, engineering does pretty well overall. So given that engineering does pretty well over all, not surprisingly, actually on every one of these indices we do better.

These are the metrics for the programs. We just did one for the humanities here, so you can see. Remember the weights here would be different. So we've picked a humanities part, which you can't see here because it's down here and we're not scrolling. So the humanities are down here, and we picked a humanities department and we put that up against a set of comparators, which you can see checked there in this case, it's Brown, Harvard, Indiana, California, Chicago, Michigan etc, you can go down the list. So someone picked these out and then you see a comparison again here: percent with a book, books per faculty member and so forth and it would scroll down.

Okay, so there's another way to visualize the data. So what you see here is all the big areas at Duke there are one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight: biological sciences, humanities, social and behavioral sciences and so forth, and what the average FSPI is for the faculty members in those units. You can see the number of programs in the unit ranked here. So biological sciences has about 16, health and professional sciences has about 2, and the size of the circle represents the number of faculty members in those units. That's on the left hand side. On the right hand side you see a display of all of the departments in those units. Now what's interesting about this is that zero measures the average of all the units in the 300 plus thing. So this is one standard deviation. What you see here is that every area at Duke is at least one standard deviation better than the average, which is what explains our score. Now the striking thing about that is of course the fact that all of them are in there. Right? So we don't only have very high quality but we have very high quality across a very large number of our units. And over here on the department side, here is the one standard deviation and you can see the vast majority of our departments are also more than one standard deviation higher. Obviously there are a couple units here unnamed right, who have the lowest FSPI per faculty member and so forth. They happen to be in the biomedical sciences and you can see what the colors represent, so you can get the general picture.

This slide does the same thing here. You see the programs on the left and here you see the departments within a program. What we've selected here is social and behavioral sciences, so this is the array of FSPI for the departments in social and behavioral sciences, nicely everyone is more than one standard deviation higher. I should tell you that although we are not showing it, you can go down to the department level and go to faculty member and look at the array by faculty members as well. Last thing I want to show you for the data is the intersection of productivity and age. So how does this work? The colors represent different age categories: less than 42, 43-52, 53-62, greater than 63. These are the FSPI quintiles and this shows you the percentage in each of those quintiles in each of the ages. So not surprisingly the blue which is the youngest is the smallest in the top quintile because you haven't had nearly as much time to develop your FSPI. But this gives you a nice thing and if you think about the departments you can look at departments for instance, say which are more productive at their more senior level. I can imagine lots of interesting research that could come from just looking at this intersection because I would imagine that there are structural differences across fields in what this age distribution looks like. Regardless of whether you are at Duke or at another school.

Okay, so now a few more comments and then we'll have the discussion. So who sees this data, and with what access? First of all this is a secure website, so you have to have permission to get into the website, otherwise you can't get in. And people with that secure access, can see institutional and program level data, for both Duke and comparatively. We can also allow certain people to look at individual faculty level data but that will be determined by a joint decision of the provosts, the deans, and ECAC about who we are going to allow to look at individual data. It will vary by school, I can assure you that. You cannot see faculty level data from other schools. What is the coverage? Well you can see here--I'm not going to go through all of these--I would stress what is at the bottom. Basically because of the way they've been collecting the data up until now, fields in which books and articles in other books generates citations, has been the weakest. They are now adding peer-reviewed humanities journals and book chapters. Book citations will be added within two years. So that will improve the data for those fields that are very book and book citation and book chapter intensive, but remember everybody now is being compared by the same underline measure, within any field. In regards to the reliability of the data, we've just listed the things that we've been doing. We've been doing a lot of work on reliability to make sure that it's right, among other things. Before they send us data on any department, they send us the roster that they are using to compile the data. If we can clean that roster, say, for example "oh no, Joe has gone off to the dark side--became an administrator. So take Joe out of the…"now you wouldn't want to do that for three or four years because Joe's research record is still counted, but after a while you might want to do that and so forth. There are a lot of ways we've been checking. David's group is doing a lot of work to verify that we can be confident about the data. And I think, we think it's pretty reliable. So how might this data be used? Certainly we think it would be good in external departmental reviews. You bring the external departmental reviewers in but you can provide them with the data about your department and how it's compared to other departments which they might select or which you might select ahead of time. It could be support for strategic planning for faculty slots, when things open or when you have strategic funding you want to use. It can be support for annual internal department budget reviews by deans along with the data on teaching and service, so that you can get a broader array of information as you're thinking about how the department's doing, especially as we build up cumulative data over time, so that we get real longevity in the data, and can also see how things are evolving by year. Further uses? You might say well "are we going to use these data for individual faculty salary, tenure promotion judgments?" And the basic answer is no. Number one, the data doesn't cover the scope of--even the full research activity, much less the full range of things that we value. Doesn't say anything about teaching, it doesn't say anything about service. It's primarily designed as a constant basis for inter-institutional departmental comparisons and for that I think it is extremely powerful. Therefore we're only to use the data, not in salary determinations but occasionally for things that might be useful. I'm going to give you one example. Currently, we're working with ECAC and the Faculty Compensation Committee (FCC). We do a salary equity study every two years. That salary equity study generates some general statistics for the faculty, but it also generates--they come to me--a series of names of faculty members whose actual salary is more than one standard deviation below the predicted salary, based on the model we have for predicting salaries by individual departments. What I then do is I sit down with the deans and say "okay, what's going on with this person? Why is their salary so low?" Could be because they are not a very productive faculty member, could be because they've been in some way or another missed or not fully recognized. Now I have an additional tool, when I go that conversation with the dean. I can say "look, I know about the teaching evaluations and I have a feel of what their service is. But let's go actually look at what their research record looks like, as compared to other people in their discipline, or in that discipline and other areas." And that will be a useful additional element that will inform the judgment about how to respond to the salary equity study. It won't determine it, but it's an additional tool. So let me conclude. As I've stressed overall, judgment is critical with the use of any data source and that's just as true here as it is with any other one. Second of all, I fully believe that better data is better than just good data. I also believe that better data is better than just impressions and rumor and we do a lot of stuff on impressions and rumor. Finally, I think institutional comparisons are useful for gaining a sense of our research strength in fields and across fields, especially when we're number four (laughter). So that's my presentation and I'm happy to take questions. We have about twelve minutes for questions and then I'll have enough time to do the other two things.

Questions

Jane Richardson (Biochemistry): I'm sort of interested in whether we're going to have input in correcting this database? And there are two pieces of this. One is whether we can get access to see whether we think our stuff is recorded right and then the other one is there are things like--I wish I could remember the name of it--but somebody is doing a disambiguation site, where you can go in and make your record yourself, validate that you are really you and say which of the publications which sound like they are coming from you are really you and which ones aren't. I would hope that once this is set up they'll be using it, but of course, it depends on people actually doing that. I mean something that Duke buys into.

Lange: I don't think that we're going to send out everybody's record to them individually and say "did they get the disambiguation right?" We're going to rely on them doing it, we're going to do spot checks ourselves and we are always talking with them about what sources they are using.

Richardson: Well, this is bothersome -- it's sort of like not being able to get into your credit record.

Lange: Well, remember we're not using this to evaluate you.

Richardson: But our department you are using it for.

Lange: The department we are using it for, right. But the weight of any single faculty member in that department--the amount of error that's likely in that disambiguation process, if it's done well, and the weight of any single faculty member probably argues against doing it. At least that's where we are right now.

Richardson: I agree that having a historical record will be very valuable. Are they planning on doing any of that retroactively? Because they could certainly go back a few stages and give us some of that.

Lange: No, they are not going backwards. It's a big enough job to be where they are. So for that longitudinal thing, we'll just have to wait year by year. We have two years of data now that we feel pretty confident about, they'll be a third and four and fifth. For the moment it's closer to a snapshot, than to a movie.

Jamieson-Drake: I just want to add that, have you talked about Scholars at Duke here? There's a parallel program called Scholars at Duke, where everybody will be able to look at their data and the data kind of correspond. The data at Scholars at Duke will not be time limited. It won't be limited just to the data that Academic Analytics uses for inter-institutional departmental comparisons, it will be everything. So you can check that and then what we've done, I mean Peter sort of blew by it a little quickly, you didn't have a chance to see it. We've done very critical checking at the individual faculty level, with a number of faculty members to see how well that Academic Analytics gets your stuff. And so we've found two misses out of a possible 102, verified by the faculty members. In addition every time we've gotten a report from them we've compared it to the prior year and asked for a detailed report, again at the individual level of departments that change more than five places and we've confirmed all that as well. We've done a lot of really good detailed checking, we're satisfied that they are doing a solid job, not a perfect job, but the error rate is small enough that the departmental findings will hold up.

Lange: One of the interesting things that we've found is that when departments move in any significant way from year to year it is because multiple faculty members leave, or come in and bring a record with them.

Lozier: I'm just going to remind everybody to identify yourself and your unit and please speak up so that everybody can hear you when you have a question.

Alex Rosenberg (Philosophy): Just to be clear do you contemplate providing this data on the departmental basis to department chairs at the time they are tasked with assigning departmental salary increase pools?

Lange: That will not be my decision to make. That will be your dean's decision to make.

Rosenberg: But it is a possible use of this data?

Lange: It is a possible use of the data. It has upsides and downsides, as you can fully recognize. The thing I'm worried about is that what you might call the "fallacy of misplaced concreteness." So this will be a very concrete, solid piece of data, so there will be a tendency, unless people are careful, to flow to the hard and solid piece of data and the other things will flow away. So I have some concerns myself, but I want to discuss that with the deans. Obviously if the deans can interact with the chairs around that salary determination, if their process allows that over time, then you can insert that judgment into the process rather than just relying on it happening with the head or the chair.

Rosenberg: Also the locus of the greatest information available for exercising judgment and interpretation of this data is, at the lowest level, the chair.

Lange: I agree. But you have to be careful.

Anna-Lisa Crowley (Clinical Sciences - Cardiology): Well my first question is, is there a plan to apply this to Clinical Sciences?

Lange: We don't have data for the clinical departments. They're not in the database. The basic sciences are but the clinical sciences are not.

Lozier: But she said "is there a plan?" Do you know if there is a plan?

Lange: No.

Jamieson-Drake: Well, yes (laughter). Obviously many institutions have hospitals and they have asked for clinical programs to be represented. I heard that anesthesiology is coming in. They'll start out with a small group of clinical departments, see how that works, work with institutions to make sure they can do as good a job with the clinical programs as they do with the non-clinical. So yes, they are trying that but there is no guarantee that it will become part of their product.

Crowley: Thank you for that. I also wanted to echo a previous person's comment that I think actually affects women probably more than men, which is this missing rate. I'm published under two different names and it always comes up when people try to do a medline or a research gate hit, I have a different name. I always have to reconcile it in my CV and say "there are very important publications under my maiden name that would be applicable for things like tenure, and would want to be counted." There's no way if you're a third observer and you have no idea because the names are so disconnected, how do you go after that?

Jamieson-Drake: Actually it might be good to have a small group of women get together with some of the people from Academic Analytics and talk about how to do that, and yes they can. It's mighty impressive but it is a hell of a lot of work and really that's the fundamental work that we pay the dollars to them. We can scrape websites, we can go to the federal government and get grants data down, but it's the disambiguation that is the huge contribution of what they are doing. And they are highly sophisticated at it. So yes, it won't be perfect, but it's probably way better than you imagine it can be.

Crowley: It just means that it would be so easy, if you got to edit it, especially for those who have two names, it just seems like it would save a lot of money.

Jamieson-Drake: That's the hardest nut to crack, you're right, but they have done a good job.

Lozier: So before we go to the next question, I think the suggestions would mean when you look at the disambiguation and you select those five faculty members, you might pick people with names like "Jane Richardson" or "John Smith" and pick women who have used two different names, rather than just five random names.

Jamieson-Drake: That's a smart guess, that's good.

Richardson: Somebody named Kim, that's the worse one I've ever found (laughter).

Ed Balleisen (History): I'm curious whether there are any plans a foot to try to capture interdisciplinary work? Either by say looking at publications outside one's disciplinary channel, or citations outside disciplinary channel, or co-authorship outside the discipline?

Lange: I would love to see that happen. I think it's more likely to happen through Scholars at Duke, that David mentioned earlier than through this data, but it might happen through this as well. Right now I don't think we can do it, right?

Jamieson-Drake: They have just started. We've seen prototypes using social networking methodology from computational biology to establish relationships between disciplines and to identity nodes of high interconnectivity between disciplines at the departmental level and at the individual faculty level. So yes, you've probably seen it applied to social networking in other contexts and these guys are doing it with all the disciplines. I'm not sure how practically useful what they're experimenting with here will turn out to be, to be honest with you. You see some really great visualizations but how we use it is another question, but actually if you're interested in that, they are trying to get something useful going…

Lange: We can get you in the conversation. Jim, did you want to add something to this?

Jim Roberts (Executive Vice Provost for Finance and Administration): If I understood Ed's question correctly, I believe it's the case, for example as a member of the History department, any publication of yours no matter what field it was in would be counted in this data, there's no boundaries around it.

Balleisen: Right, but if you're trying to assess the depth of work which is cross disciplinary boundaries, you need a measure specifically for that.

Lange: And that's what this networking would show. But I don't know if you've ever seen any of those network maps. As David said, they look really cool, but trying to figure out what it's actually telling you when they're dense is pretty difficult. So I think there's also work to do.

John French (History): I went online and looked at their description of what they do. It was interesting because they define this as a "unique tool that helps empower university leaders by producing accurate and timely academic business intelligence, independent of disciplinary values." Last week in the Chronicle, Martin the founder of the firm, made a big splash with his charge that there is a billion to two billion dollars in extra salaries sloshing around US higher education, being needlessly lavished on unproductive faculty. So there is a larger issue (laughter) about what this is about that I'd love you to address.

Lange: Well first of all that's what they say about themselves, it's not the way we're using the data, that's the first thing I would say. Second of all, they are a private business, they can say whatever they want about their private business and they can have whatever opinion they want about faculty salary sloshing around, that doesn't happen to be anybody's view at Duke and nothing I've said or nothing we intend is in any way intended to go after that particular issue. I don't agree with them, I don't even agree with his basic analysis. They have private investors I'm sure and so they sling around these business terms, but we're using the data for what we can get out of it. What they think they're doing with the data is really their business, as long as they recognize that for their purpose and our purpose the critical thing is the quality of the data. Then we can use it whatever way we like.

Jerry Reiter (Statistical Science): You may have mentioned this; I may have missed it, if so I apologize. Which faculty will go into that denominator? Does it include, for example, faculty who are adjuncts, not necessarily at Duke but everywhere else, faculty who have primarily teaching responsibilities who may not be expected to publish as much (secondary faculty), is that something that departments have started to think about?

Lange: No, because basically they send us the roster and I believe it's in conjunction with the departments, right? In conjunction with the departments, we clean the roster to make the roster consistent with what the department sees as the faculty who are actually research productive within that department. So if you have a pure teaching faculty member they are not going to show up here, they'll be taken out of the roster.

Jamieson-Drake: The general rule is tenured, tenured-tracked faculty and research faculty. In the first year we took out all "POPs," professor of the practice, and checked with the departments and there was one department that wanted a couple kept in because they felt that although they were nominally professor of practice and nominally instructional, they were actually engaged in the department predominantly in research, so they wanted to put them in. That's completely at our discretion, and one of the things that we do is show for every single discipline all the faculty who are included in that and a lot of people show up in multiple disciplines, so that's part of the nature of interdisciplinary, but as we show it to people as we've done already, we absolutely take into account their consideration of who their faculty are, but the general rule is research faculty.

Lozier: We need to move onto our next items here, but we will continue to talk about this. The Provost came to an ECAC meeting a week ago and we had a conversation about this and we will continue to talk about this. I can tell you at the ECAC meeting one of the concerns that came up quite clearly and strongly was about the degree which this could be used on an individual basis. And so we are continuing to have this conversation.

Next we have a campaign update that the Provost will give us. Unfortunately the President sends his apologies, he's at the Time Summit in New York City today and cannot make this meeting and so the Provost is stepping in and giving us a campaign update and then we'll also follow that with a report on the recent Board of Trustee's meeting.

Lange: Just on this last point about the individual faculty. I want you to remember that it's not the Provost who is going to make those decisions in any case. It's going to be decided in a conversation between my office, the deans, and the faculty within the schools and with ECAC. Because it will vary by school I'm sure, and the deans will have different views. And by the way, the Law School, it's not in this data. I actually don't fully understand why Law isn't in here, but it's not.

Launch of Duke's Capital Campaign

Lange: Here you see the logo of the new campaign. You heard extensively about the campaign, so much of what I'm going to show you here is known to you. We launched a campaign on September 29th, the goal that was announced was 3.25 billion dollars. On that date we had, 1.325 billion which is slightly better than the metric which is usually used for saying whether or not you're in a good place going through your silent phase to get to your campaign goal. For this year you can see our basic milestones, this is now. To be honest with you now is the slogging stage. We've gotten a lot of big gifts, that's what you always do in that silent phase, now you've got to slog it out. So part of the work you do in this next period is build the structure to allow you to slog it out and to get that additional two, or two and half, or three billion dollars that you'd like to raise. You can see some of the things we've already accomplished and that build a stronger pipeline as part of that slogging it out.

This is where we are as of October 16th. On the left hand side you see the seven year working goal. None of these goals are totally locked in, but they are the working goal that we are going to be using during the campaign. In the middle you see the campaign progress and the percentage of goal achieved. Obviously anything above 33% or so is really good at this point. A lot of units are above that metric, some are below. The Graduate School has the smallest goal, as you'll see, that's fairly characteristic and we're quite hopeful of reaching that goal, but they've started later and we had a transition in the deanship. Paula [McClain] is very determined on this fundraising goal but that's partly the explanation for the fact that they stand out at a lower level than most.

This is the structure of goals which you were shown before. Nothing's really changed here. We're raising money across the interdisciplinary things, that's under the "blazing new paths," there's the "boundaries not included" and how we enrich the Duke experience, and there's the "fueling the uncontainable ideas," which is the momentum, that's where we're investing in core faculty. There are a lot of new faculty positions, well over a 100, in this plan through endowment or other sources.

How are the goals set? Basically the interesting thing is that the discussion of a campaign began in 2008, at that time there was a good deal of concern at that point, which slowed down the process, but even at that point, there was the idea that the campaign needed to be a campaign about Duke as a whole, not just built across school A, B, C, D and E. That kind of campaign was not going to work anymore and we had a couple of peers including Stanford who were also doing campaigns of this type and had been very successful and of course it gives you a real ability to actually present yourself and the kind of university you are and are becoming through the campaign when you do that, rather than just saying we're going to fill school buckets based on loyalty.

The funding priorities and related dollar goals were established within the academic leadership of the University, the academic committees where we went and discussed these things on a repeated basis and with the development leadership. There's always an interaction: what people would love to do, what people could actually realistically do, and then finding the midpoint between those two, because you want to push people, so it's a little beyond what everybody thinks is realistic. The development people are always going at the edges, they're always going to low ball you a little bit and the academic leadership, to be fair to myself, will always high ball you a little bit, so there's a long process in there that went on and then of course it was a similar process at each of the schools, because the campaign is built both around these individual themes and the way they feed down into the planning goals of the schools. So that's the way the goal structure was built up. So far, obviously, we've had a lot of good receptivity to that but there's a long way to go.

This is what is going to happen in the next few years. We've got to get the message out and do that hard slog work: bring Duke and the campaign to 15 key markets around the world, cascade the messaging around this vision and the priorities we have. As we've said a couple times, and I think we've also said in here, the campaign is to some degree our new strategic fund. The way it's been constructed it enables us to pursue our teaching priorities but to make that work we have to get our donors to commit to those priorities and not do whatever they just like to do. Get them to give the same amount of money or more for the things we would really like that advance the priorities of the University. That's really the core trick of the campaign from the standpoint. That's why we also have to get the message out and we have to get faculty out there--we're going to use faculty far more extensively than we have in the past to go on the road with development folks to present what's exciting about Duke and how it relates to the kind of gift opportunity people have. We have to build a very strong volunteer organization and that's part of the effort that is going on now. You can see some of the cities that are on the schedule for extensive events in the next six or eight months. That's the report on the campaign, I don't know if there are any questions about that? We'll be doing these updates on a fairly…

Lozier: We have volunteers for the London trip (laughter). Peter you have another report to give.

Lange: I'm going to get it (laughter). You think I can carry all this paper over there in one time (laughter)?

Lozier: Seriously. We're going to judge your individual effort here (laughter).

Board of Trustees Meeting Update

Lange: My research productivity? The last job I have here in the next nine minutes is to just give you an update on the last board meeting. Usually the President would do this, but since he's away we didn't want to wait until the November meeting. The first thing that happened at the Board meeting was the introduction of the new trustees. We have three new trustees: Jeff Vinik, who is an engineering graduate from 1981, Malik Burnett who is one of the graduate student trustees. He graduated from Trinity in 2007, from the medical school in 2012 and got his M.B.A. in 2012. He's going to become a surgeon. And then Kaveh Danesh, some of you may know him. He graduated from Trinity last year. He was the vice president of the Duke Student Government for academic affairs for two years in a row. He's really a brilliant young man, he's actually now studying on a Fulbright in China. So those were the three new trustees.

Following that, we had an approval of the campaign goal. It was not actually as anticlimactic as you might have thought a) because the goal was pretty well kept quiet and b) because the full board did not actually know what the goal was going to be until the day of the board meeting. There were some members who knew--ones who were on the campaign planning committee. But it was a very good occasion and I think people were very excited about this. There were also discussions in the consent calendar. The two I want to highlight are the addition to the School of Nursing, which is fully funded with an outside gift, which was approved for the new financing plan and construction and an architecture planning and design for Page Auditorium renovation. We don't know how much it's going to cost, we don't know what exactly we're going to do, but we do know that we have the Duke endowment gift to help us do that renovation and we believe it's time to start thinking about it. The Chairman of the Board introduced a new approach to updates at this Board meeting, and actually at the Executive Committee before that. So everybody on the major ongoing themes, produces a one page sort of update sheet, so there we're five updates. One on online courses, I'll come back to that in a minute, although we did report about that at the last Council meeting. What we said at the last Council meeting is what was said at the Board and vice versa. Duke DKU, same thing applies. There was a discussion of where we are in the innovation and entrepreneurship initiative. I think the highlight there is the ramp up of an undergraduate curriculum and rethinking of an undergraduate curriculum in that area and a meeting of the external advisory task force, which will be happening at the beginning of December. And then there were discussions both of what's happening on the West Campus precinct and the implementation of the house model. The implementation of the house model has so far gone well in the sense that we haven't heard a lot of grief about it, which is usually the best sign; unless it's just resignation and I don't think it's just that. And I think Steve Nowicki is staying on top of that, along with Larry Moneta. There's also a lot of planning as you may have seen if you walk toward the Bryan Center on your left, as you're on the plaza, you'll see the construction going on for the addition, which is the enabling building that will then allow us to actually proceed to the West Union shut down for the renovation of West Union itself. I just thought I'd give you the latest Coursera data. So, we now have 313,594 total registrations for our 10 courses. We have one course which is now gone over 100,000 registrants and which is beginning very, very soon, in the next couple days. That is the "Think Again: How to Reason and Argue" which is a course coming out of the Philosophy department. Roger Barr's bioelectricity course is up and running and seems to be doing very well. Following the quick discussion…the way the update discussion happens is anybody can raise questions about any of the update things. There was no particular discussion-- people were, I think, most curious about what was happening on the online education front. We then went on to have an annual report from DUMAC on the financial performance for the last year. I just want to give you a little flavor of that. Tallman Trask basically said that the fiscal year results for 2012 did not much change the University's overall financial condition from the year before, although our assets declined slightly due to the rather low return on investments from DUMAC, which was only 1% and the spending rate of 5%. So you're going to have some decline in assets cause you're not taking in as much as you're spending. The operating results in 2012 especially in the academic area were quite strong. We had a net surplus across all the units in the academic area on the campus side of 14 million dollars to budget. But you shouldn't get too excited about that because we've had down years before and it's also reflective of the fact that there is more health at the periphery than there is at the center right now, because we have some central problems with financial aid and the strategic investment pool, which we've discussed and John Payne you've mentioned here as well, which we need to continue to address. Neal Triplett discussed the overall DUMAC performance, how they distribute their assets. I think the basic bottom line and Tallman you'll correct me if I get this wrong, but I think the basic bottom line on the DUMAC result is primarily the result of the weaker than expected performance in international stocks and in commodities, which are obviously all related. So global demand for commodities is down, and then the commodities don't…you get the picture. Everything is related to everything else and that didn't go as well last year. Then there was a lengthy presentation on the Clery Act. How many people here know what the Clery Act is? Oh, that's even lower than that other question I asked. The Clery Act, among other things, is the annual report on campus security crime and fire safety. You can imagine what a fascinating discussion this was. One of the things that is part of the Clery process is when you get those notices that there was perhaps an assault or something, anywhere on the campus, or in the periphery of the campus, we're required to send out one of those "clery notifications." So this was really, I would say, a responsibility of the Board in its fiduciary role. It has to get a report on this every once in a while to understand how our overall campus security, crime and fire safety is being handled. Dr. Dzau then presented an update on Saturday morning on Enterprise-Wide planning in Duke Medicine. Those of you who are in Duke Medicine probably know quite well what this is. There is a very thorough and extensive process of Enterprise-Wide planning between the School of Medicine and the Health System about how it might be impacted by the Affordable Health Care Act, building out scenarios, most of them very gloomy and then thinking about how the system as a whole and the individual units should respond to that potential, although no one knows will be realized and also thinking in that context about how to set priorities with respect to what areas of the medical school and the health system to prioritize. Finally there was a report done on Undergraduate Admissions. Half of that report was a very fascinating exercise that Christoph Guttentag ran, in which he had circulated the application of one student from a particular private high school in Atlanta, obviously anonymized, both for the school and the student. At the meeting, he brought two others and he basically asked the Board members to look them over, they had a discussion about them and then think about which of those students got admitted. One of the three got admitted, not the one many of the Board members thought was going to get admitted but I think the most telling thing about that discussion was just about all the Board members who went to Duke knew that they would not have been admitted (laughter). That was a pretty fascinating exercise actually. It shows you what an art admissions is at an institution like ours, maybe art isn't the right word--craft? How much experience it takes to really read these things. We read through advisor's letters, how you discriminate in an advisor's letter what is real and what is not, how you read a student essay, what's a kind of mechanical thing and what's a heartfelt and written thing. It was a very, very good exercise. And then that part on admissions concluded, and the Board really concluded with a presentation that Christoph and I did about yield over time, the quality of the class over time, how that's changing, how we can improve yield further on the highest quality students that are now applying to Duke in ever greater numbers. So that is my report on the Board and that is it I believe.

Questions

Prasad Kasibhalta (Nicholas School of the Environment): I remember recently reading about the Clery Act that one of the things in the Chronicle was drug violations have tripled and I think alcohol abuse has increased but that assault had decreased. And I think I also read somewhere that this is not necessarily a real increase, but may be due to better reporting. How do we know that?

Lange: You never know it. Tallman, do you want to answer it?

Tallman Trask (Executive Vice President): This is only about the student drug issue. Almost all of those are reported in dormitories by resident advisors and that recording process is simply a lot more complete than four or five years ago. That's where 90% of them come from.

Lozier: Okay one more issue before we adjourn. If you have not signed the attendance sheets please do so. And I want to remind you that our next meeting in November we will welcome Mr. Richard Wagoner here, Chairman of the Board of Trustees and so now I'm going to adjourn the October meeting and wish you all a good evening. Thank you.