



Minutes of the Meeting of the Academic Council
Thursday, February 18, 2016

Nan Jokerst (Chair, Academic Council / Electrical and Computer Engineering): Welcome, everyone and thanks for being here today. I would like to call the meeting to order. A big **Thank You** to everyone who opted in for the Academic Council election, and to those of you who will continue your term next year. Our online election will begin next week, and we will elect new members to the Executive Committee of the Council later this spring. Today, we will continue our ongoing tradition of this year's Council meetings by hearing about the work of an important group on campus, the President's Task Force on Bias and Hate, and by offering our insights and ideas to the co-chairs of the Task Force, Dean Kelly Brownell and Dean Linda Burton, as they pursue their work. Once again, we're going to be able to offer input to this very important Task Force as they pursue their work, not just hearing the output at the end. So this is our opportunity to have an impact and input into their work. We will also vote on two programs today that we heard about at our January meeting, the proposed PhD in Integrated Biology & Medicine at Duke-NUS, and the proposed name change to an existing Master's degree in Art, Art History & Visual Studies. It's a full meeting: we will then hear about the Franklin Humanities Institute's proposal for hiring authority of regular-rank, non-tenure track faculty. We

will complete our meeting with a presentation and discussion in executive session on computer security at Duke.

APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 21ST MINUTES

Jokerst: But before we have Deans Brownell and Burton talk with us, let's first approve the minutes from last month's meeting, which were posted with today's agenda. Are there any corrections or edits to the minutes?

(minutes approved by voice vote without dissent)

CO-CHAIRS OF THE PRESIDENT'S TASK FORCE ON BIAS AND HATE AT DUKE

Jokerst: I am pleased to introduce Linda Burton, Dean of Social Sciences in Arts & Sciences and Kelly Brownell, Dean of the Sanford School of Public Policy. They are here today in their role as co-chairs of President Brodhead's Task Force on Bias and Hate to talk with us about the plans going forward for the work of the Task Force, and to listen to the input of you, the members of the faculty, on this topic that is so critical to our culture and to our community.

Kelly Brownell (Dean, Sanford School of Public Policy): Hello. Linda and I are happy to be here before you. As you'll find out in a few minutes, an important part of our Task Force activity is to do a listening tour and all members of our committee are beginning to engage in that listening tour and we consider this one stop in the tour. We'd like to tell you just a little bit about the impetus for the committee and President Brodhead and Provost Kornbluth can fill in as they wish. Then we will talk to you about where we stand in our deliberations and what the key questions are that we are right now thinking our final report might address. First, the members of the committee (refers to slide). The committee was established by appointment from President Brodhead and as you can see, it represents an interesting mix of individuals from around the campus. The interesting mix continues when we discuss the student members of the committee and the staff members who are helping the committee as resource individuals. President Brodhead appointed the members of the committee and then Linda and I, working in concert with the presidents of the graduate student and undergraduate student organizations, selected the student members. Our task there was to get a diverse mix of individuals, about half are graduate and professional students and half are undergraduates. We wanted people who have had some experience with bias and hate issues or have had some special insight into the issues that we gleaned from reading essays that they wrote in applying for the committee. We believe about 170 students applied to be on the committee, which we thought was a very good sign of interest in the topic, and

passion for the topic, and the people that we've chosen to be on the committee are just fantastic. So we're very pleased to have the students working with us as partners. In addition to that, we have a number of administrative people from around Duke who are extremely helpful in working with the committee as resource individuals. The task is to look at the present state of Duke's response to bias and hate issues, to define the issues, to conceptualize the issues, in the context of impact on individuals and the concept of free speech and to come up with solutions for what the university sees as problems or challenges that we face. We have, right now, a working draft of the four key questions that we're hoping to address as part of the committee's work. You can see them here. The first is pretty obvious: a review of where Duke stands right now with these issues and how Duke defines bias and hate and what practices the university has in response to these issues occurring. Second: should Duke establish a policy for all of the students that addresses these issues? Here you get into some very tricky territory, of course, with freedom of expression and bias and hate issues. The bottom two issues, Linda will talk about more.

Linda Burton (Dean, Social Sciences): Good afternoon, everyone. I should start off by saying that this is probably going to be my all-time favorite committee to have ever worked on at Duke University. I remember when Kelly and I were brought together and we were thinking about these issues. I talked with one of my colleagues at UCLA who had been responsible for all of the work that they had been doing there with respect to changing the climate around issues of hate

and bias and race. She said, "Girl, what are you thinking?" (laughter). So I thought about it for a little bit and the next day I thought, why wouldn't I do this work? It is so incredibly important, not only to our faculty and staff, but more importantly to our students and our commitments to train them not only academically, but to be incredible contributors to society. In doing so, to know what hate and bias means, to know what it means when they see it, and how to respond in kind. The second set of questions that we have really focuses on the issue of hate and bias as it is experienced in the everyday lives of students who are our primary focus on this Task Force, but also faculty and staff, to the extent that we can. What actions can be taken to aid students experiencing bias and hate incidents? Here, we're talking about issues of primarily micro-aggressions. Those incidents that seem to pile up cumulatively. To have an effect on students either on a daily basis or weekly basis, and we let it go, we let it go, and then finally it explodes. We want to focus primarily on what actions can be taken to deal with those kinds of issues specifically. We also want to focus on the issues of what actions can be taken to prevent bias and hate incidents. We not only want to be there when the conflict erupts, we want to be able to help Duke develop a climate where we raise the consciousness of everybody here and help them to be aware of the fact that working on bias and hate issues is a daily task for us to be vigilant about. We recall the non-episodic type vigilance with respect to these outcomes, to make sure that we avoid the high-intensity conflict situations.

Brownell: We realize that there are a number of incredibly complicated issues

built into this. How does one define hate and bias? What are the legal parameters that surround us in the university setting? What sort of a climate and culture does one want to have at a university? What are the limits, if there are any, of free expression? And then, of course, what actions the university can and should take in response to these issues? There are certain issues that cross a threshold where the university now has policies under harassment, for example. So we will evaluate the university's practices in response to those sorts of things. But also, the smaller actions that can happen in day-to-day life. It may not cross an existing threshold, but it still may be very important in the lives of people who are being affected. We would like, ultimately, to think about an environment where people can discuss these openly. We can discuss them in terms of their scholarly importance but also their personal importance in the lives of individuals and decide on the practices that we can recommend to the President and Provost that the university may consider following. We will think about structures that may be created that will follow the work of our committee which will end with a report in April. Connections and ongoing structures that we'll have with diversity activities on campus that exist now so that some coordinated response can be built. We decided to break ourselves into working groups and we thought we could give you a sense of the groups just because it will help you see some of the primary issues that we see ourselves addressing. We can go through these pretty quickly but they're all pretty self-explanatory. If you have input that you think of after the meeting or if we don't have time today to hear all the ideas from people, please feel free to get in

touch with Linda or me, or the people who are chairing these committees. We can say something very quickly about each of the working groups.

Burton: Kelly and I are both in charge of three of the groups so I'll cover my groups primarily, first. A point that I want to make here is that in the working groups or the committee as a whole is where you actually get to see the beauty of what is called Duke. Because you have these incredible minds that all come together to deal with a very difficult issue, but do have the commitment and the temporal sense of urgency about it and move through it in a very cooperative way. The first committee is what we call the Best Practices Committee. Currently, what that committee is working on is trying to identify exemplar cases of other institutions, two of which have actual policies on hate and bias, which we do not have here at Duke, and two of which don't. We look at how they handle issues around campus climate and compare that to what we have at Duke. As a second part of what that group will be doing, they will be doing what we call Duke Reflection. Paying attention to what we already have in place to deal with these particular issues. The second group that I help to lead is the Communications group and that's where creativity really is abuzz. We have a website that is either coming up today or tomorrow that is focused specifically on what the Task Force is doing. On that website, there will be tons of information about best practices, what other schools are doing, but you'll also be able to follow what we're doing in the group. We're very transparent in that way. You will have notes from our weekly meetings so that people know the issues we're addressing.

We're also hoping to have a component on that website that allows people to be able to comment or make suggestions about what we should be thinking about. This group also deals with making bridges between platforms for communications, so working with specific student groups to use all the wonderful technology that they have and know more about than we do, to get the message across, particularly as we deal with this issue of hate and bias from an everyday perspective. We also will be launching a campaign which will be our first burst related to these issues but hope to, in our recommendations, highlight other campaigns that should follow after our group completes its work. The third group that I work with is the Prevention, Learning, and Resources, with respect to hate and bias. That group is specifically dealing with the psychology of hate and bias. Contributing to the report what we should know about understanding what those words actually mean. At our first two meetings, we struggled so much with understanding the definitions of hate and bias because they are so incredibly broad. That group will address that as well as looking for ways that we can maintain and sustain a cultural climate that is a welcoming environment to everyone.

Brownell: I'll just briefly mention the other three groups. The Data and Survey Information group will be looking at what data Duke now has available, taken from surveys done around the university that may be instructive to our task and they'll address whether new information should be collected at the level of the university that would be helpful to us. The Legal Speech and Definition issues, you could imagine what that would cover. We have some good legal minds and other people

on the committee who have thought a lot about these issues. In some ways, that committee is really at the very heart of what we're addressing. Finally, the Listening Tour, we're going on a listening tour of campus. We'll meet with as many student groups as we can and we'll meet with faculty, staff and students in each of the schools. So I've been in touch with all of my fellow deans and we're now making arrangements to visit each of the schools. So we hope between the listening tour, the input we have from an email address and a website, that we'll have maximum input from the community and we'll be transparent about what we're hoping to do and what we're doing along the way. By the time we finish this, we hope we'll have a good product that will be beneficial to Duke as an institution. Dick, is there anything you'd like to add to that?

Richard Brodhead (President): Well, I know the background of the creation of this committee. I'll just mention a couple things. There's a question about the name of the committee. The time when it was created, the words "hate" and "bias" were the words that described what was such a sore subject at the time. So we decided to stick with them. I think what you understand and what was very precisely rendered in the eloquent comments of Kelly, is that this committee has a broader and narrower scope. It's not in charge of solving every possible problem at the university. Especially in the world of students, what are the ways in which bias, possibly even, especially unconsciously used bias, is experienced, and what would be the best steps that could be taken to alleviate that? More specifically, whether our code of conduct language should have specific call out for bias and hate. I myself

am incredibly grateful to everyone who was asked to be on this thing and agreed to serve on it. It can't be because they had a lot of extra time on their hands, but because people understood the importance of this issue. I personally think it is modeling just what should happen in committees. Hard questions should not be repressed, nor should they just gather up steam and then run across the landscape. Things should be raised, they should be brought into focus, people's understandings of them should be debated, and out of that they should come to a solution. So I'm very grateful to the people who are doing this. Should we entertain questions?

Jokerst: Yes, absolutely, we're here for questions.

Roxanne Springer (Physics): I want to ask about your purview, in particular, the question of surveys. As you know, Congress has given attention to sexual assault amongst and between students on campus. There have been surveys proposed, I think that AAU has one that is controversial, I know MIT has one that people seem happier with. Do you intend to address this problem? Is that part of your vision, and if so, are you going to request a survey of that experience of harassment and assault amongst students?

Brodhead: Let me say a word. That is not the specific purview of this group. It is a matter of, of course, deep concern to this university. As you know, we have had a Sexual Assault Task Force with 30 faculty and students working on this. We are well aware of a survey which about 20 or more schools decided to run. Everybody is always super critical of the instruments

while understanding that it's super important. Our group here worked with a different team that was in coordination with the Department of Justice, in contract with RTI, to do a survey of this sort, and those results are being harvested now. I think at that point we'll be in a position to learn what worked well from the MIT instrument, what worked well in the Stanford one, what worked well in the AAU one, and what worked well in the DOJ one, and to put together something comprehensive. It is an extraordinarily important issue and since people have been unclear when they hear figures cited on what evidentiary based the rest, in the past it has been a challenge. The schools that used the AAU survey found that their results were pretty similar to what had been before. So it really is a problem of trying to bring objectivity and figure out how to best attack. If this group were charged with solving that problem, as well as the ones it's got, I think we would have doomed it to do too many jobs with too little focus to be successful.

Brownell: But if you or others feel that there are lessons to be learned from what we know about that, that would be helpful to the work we're doing.

Mary McClintock Fulkerson: (Divinity School): Thank you all so much for this. What about sites, locations, places where a denomination refuses to allow the full humanity of certain groups of people? Like LGBTQ folks? Or denominations that will not ordain them? I'm the faculty leader of our Sacred Work group, which is an affirming group, and we are meeting tomorrow because these students have had negative experiences here. How can that be a part of your work, or is it, or

could it be?

Brownell: Thank you for bringing that up. We're relatively early in our meeting phases. We've only had three meetings, I believe. Our working groups have just begun their work. This is the first time that this has come up in our conversations, so thank you for that. We will introduce that into our various working groups and have them discuss this.

Jokerst: So, Mary, because of the Diversity Task Force that looked at this in some detail, could you say a few more words about the challenges that these students face?

Fulkerson: Well, I don't want to speak for them. We're meeting tomorrow to discuss specifically this year. I've been faculty sponsor for a long time and it's varied over time. It has to do with lectures they will hear by faculty, or just the positions of the denominations. I don't know what other subtle forms, but there are several faculty that are meeting with them tomorrow, including our interim dean. So this is good, we've gotten some traction, but it hasn't gone away.

Brownell: If you think it would be helpful for us to make the group of students you're talking about part of our listening tour, would you please get in touch with us and give us the information?

Fulkerson: Oh yes, thank you very much.

Amy Bejsovec (Biology): Do you have a clear timeline for when things will be presented and action will be taken? We want the students to see what we're doing, but if all we do is talk and we don't

actually come up with action items, they're going to be very frustrated.

Burton: I would have to say we have a very action-oriented and productive committee and one of the things we unanimously agreed on in our first meeting is that if we weren't all committed to having a very specific product to render when our committee ends on April 16, then we shouldn't be here. So we are very much committed to doing that. We're doing it, like I said, on the fast track, but we definitely intend to have not only a report, but recommendations as well.

Brownell: By the way, that point of view has been expressed abundantly within our committee, aligning very specific outcomes to be detailed and the students have pushed hard on that so that's helpful. We also want to be aware that students may not realize how long it may take to accomplish some of the things that are recommended so we thought about the possibility of, when we make recommendations, saying whether they are short, medium, or long term possibilities. We may even mention where the university responsibility for addressing them might fall. And then Provost Kornbluth had a good idea when we met the other day, saying that maybe we can recommend a six-month and a one-year follow up to the committee as a check in to see what's been accomplished.

Jokerst: I actually have one input that follows up on Mary's input and this came out of the Diversity Task Force. I think the focus on students is very important. I serve on the President's Committee of Black Affairs, PCOBA, and through that and the Diversity Task Force, we heard from

students that there are many instances where the students do not feel respected and valued in the classroom. So I think understanding, particularly the faculty group, the interplay of respect between faculty and students going in both directions is very important. Because it really sets the tone for all of the students and so while I think a focus on students is important, it's really important to look at that faculty-student interface as well.

Brownell: That's come up quite a bit, so thank you.

Karin Reuter-Rice (Nursing): I think this is a wonderful endeavor and it's something that we talk about often in the School of Nursing. One of the things I wanted to shout out is, I hope that you'll reach out to Nursing because it wasn't one of the schools in your faculty list and I think we have a lot to offer. Two, if you could think about the International House, because we know that some of our students really are struggling, both with bias and with hate, and I know that many of them have gone to the International House for support. So we have a lot of diverse students at the School of Nursing, both LGBTQ, as well as men in nursing, as well as our African-American students and students who come to us from abroad, actually. I think all of them struggle with much of what we're seeing and what you said, the interaction between faculty and students, having that interface is very important. So, I hope you'll reach out to us.

Brownell: We have, and will continue to do that. I sent out the message to my fellow deans, and Dean Broome was the first to respond. So we're connected with some of the diversity activities occurring

in the Nursing School and the idea about connecting with International House is something very important to us.

Brodhead: Li-Chen Chin, who is the head of International Activities and Student Affairs at Duke is one of the resource people on this committee.

Kathy Franz (Chemistry): Thank you for doing this work. You mentioned the transparency that you want to have and I would like a little more clarification on that process and what students are hearing about it. The specific question is: we've had a number of students in our department who I've heard rumors about dealing with micro-aggression types of things; but it's hard to get specifics because they don't want to elevate it past a certain stage. So I'm searching for places that they can go and voice that. Is your committee a place they can go? And if so, how do we communicate it to the students; please report those kinds of activities to this group; you don't have to elevate it up through the administration, but here's a place to go. I would love to hear that information.

Burton: I definitely think that students who are having those experiences, we would love to meet with them and talk with them. In addition to talking with students in groups, we both have talked individually with students about these particular issues. They provided for us incredible information, especially on these issues of micro-aggressions and how they affect their functioning on a daily basis. They can either contact us or Natasha Eaves, and set up appointments. We're always happy to talk to them.

Franz: I'm wondering if, on your website

that's going live, is there a place that's not like, oh, I have to email this contact person, because that just shuts it off for some students. Is there a low threshold, okay, here's a website where I can go in and do something? That's what I'm sensing from some of the students.

Burton: On our website, we will have a place where students or individuals can talk about their particular issues but our contact information will also be very visible so that they don't have to go through lots of layers of situations to get help. Also, as our website continues to develop, we will have links to very important existing support organizations on Duke's campus because there are so very many, but people don't often know how to access them. They should be able to reach people through that mechanism as well.

Brownell: There's about to be a communication blast that will happen. Ultimately what we would envision is possibly a flow chart that will say, if this happens, here are the different possible ways to proceed. If it rises to this level, this happens. We're working on that now.

Rochelle Schwartz-Bloom

(Pharmacology and Cancer Biology): As the website piece includes the transparent posts or comments, have you given thought at all about how that also is viewed by the rest of the world, since things may be taken out of context and then spread all over the place? To me, that seems to be an important issue.

Burton: At least, in the initial planning, we're still a work in process. We have a set of ideas and then we have to trim them

down. With respect to comments that people want to make, we have decided, because of issues of confidentiality and the like, what we likely will be doing is summarizing those comments every week and just writing up a summary of what people see as the most challenging issues that they have to deal with but also what are the good things that are going on at Duke with respect to that. So no names will be attached to those kinds of things because we want to make sure we protect people's confidentiality along those lines.

Josh Sosin (Classical Studies / Libraries / Member of ECAC): I believe there is already this mechanism in DukeReach to handle both confidentiality and the sort of air traffic control. You don't want to necessarily put on the students' shoulders the decision of where on the flow chart they are. They just want to be able to send an email and have it go to the right place. I really like the idea of a one-stop shop for students and I think the uptake in that is pretty good. The design seems to be pretty good. You might want to think, in addition to harvesting comments like that or collecting them in your own website, maybe piggybacking that existing infrastructure because I think it's pretty good.

Burton: What is it called again?

Sosin: Maybe it's not pretty good if we don't all know about it (laughter). DukeReach.

Jokerst: Thank you so much, Kelly and Linda (applause). On behalf of faculty, let me wish you the very best in your efforts on this task force. Thank you again for coming today.

VOTE ON THE PROPOSED PhD in INTEGRATED BIOLOGY & MEDICINE AT DUKE-NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF SINGAPORE'S GRADUATE MEDICAL SCHOOL

Jokerst: We will now vote on the two proposals we heard at last month's meeting. Both proposals and the supporting documents were posted again with today's agenda for those who may not have been here to hear the presentations at our January meeting.

First, the proposed PhD in Integrated Biology & Medicine at the Duke-National University of Singapore's Graduate Medical School which Dr. Patrick Casey, Senior Vice Dean of Research at Duke-NUS, presented to us. Dr. Casey could not return today from Duke-NUS, so we have other representatives of the program, including Mike Merson, here to address any additional questions before we proceed to our vote.

Are there any questions?

May I have a motion to approve the request for a PhD in Integrated Biology & Medicine at the Duke-National University of Singapore's Graduate Medical School?

(Motion approved by voice vote without dissent)

VOTE ON THE PROPOSED NAME CHANGE TO AN EXISTING MASTER'S DEGREE IN ART, ART HISTORY & VISUAL STUDIES

Jokerst: We will now vote on the request from the Art, Art History & Visual Studies department to change the name of the Master's degree approved in 2013 by the

Council, then approved as a Master's in Historical and Cultural Visualization, to be changed to the Master's in Digital Art History / Computational Media.

Are there any questions before we proceed to our vote? Caroline Bruzelius and Vicky Szabo are here to answer any further questions you might have.

May I have a motion to approve the name change to this Master's degree?

(Motion approved by voice vote without dissent)

FRANKLIN HUMANITIES INSTITUTE'S PROPOSAL FOR HIRING AUTHORITY OF REGULAR-RANK, NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY

Jokerst: I would now like to welcome Deborah Jenson, director of Duke's Franklin Humanities Institute, to discuss the Institute's request for hiring authority of non-tenure track, regular-rank faculty. The proposal and other supporting materials were posted with your meeting agenda. We will vote on their request at our March meeting.

Deborah Jenson (Director, Franklin Humanities Institute): Hello, everyone. As Nan said, I'm Deborah Jenson, the new director of the Franklin Humanities Institute. The Franklin Humanities Institute is one of Duke's six signature institutes. It is named after Duke's famous African-American Historian John Hope Franklin, who also was an important scholar in Global Studies. The first form of the Franklin Humanities Institute back in 1999 was a center for the study of global race and racisms. That remains very much

at the heart of our mandate. We also work in all fields of the Humanities that exist in all of the Humanities departments and programs and in interdisciplinary relationships amongst them. We report to the Provost's office via the Vice Provost for Interdisciplinary Studies, but we're also very strongly connected, of course, to the Dean of Arts and Sciences, the Dean of the Humanities, and the Vice Provost for the Arts through the 18 Humanities, Arts, and Interpretive Social Science divisions, departments, and programs. The FHI is currently seeking the same permission for appointment capacity that has been granted to the university institutes that have made this request previously. The Social Science Research Institute in 2007, the Duke Global Health Institute in 2008, and the Duke Institute for Brain Sciences in 2009. The FHI first began the steps toward this request for the authority to recommend appointments in 2013 when we changed our bylaws around our work with the office of the Dean of A&S on a retention case. But when that did not come to fruition, it went back on ice until this year. The two remaining university institutes, the Kenan Institute for Ethics, and the Nicholas Institute for Environmental Policy Solutions, have not requested this authority. The Nicholas Institute is associated with a school with full appointment capacity. As is the case for the other institutes with the capacity to recommend regular-rank, non-tenure track appointments, the question of regular-rank appointments must be seen as separate from the different question of the capacity to recommend a secondary or tertiary appointment for a tenure track, tenured applicant through agreement with a hiring department. Secondary appointments made through agreement

with a hiring department seem to depend on institutionally backed financial capacity, noticeably through grants or development such as endowed chairs and the collaboration with the hiring tenure home department. The Kenan Institute, for example, with its endowment, was able to work with the Philosophy department to make a brilliant hire, Walter Sinnott-Armstrong, for which regular-rank appointment capacity was not required at Kenan as it was a tenure track appointment in Philosophy. But Dr. Sinnott-Armstrong found the combination of departmental and institute faculty roles compelling in his recruitment. The Franklin Humanities Institute does not have an endowment so we are starting from the tiniest starting point in our request for this authority. But we would like to take our place as an institute at the table of Duke's combined campus, professional schools, and institute educational culture. We believe that the capacity to propose structural innovations is important to our pursuit of grants and development to strengthen the position of the Humanities within Duke, nationally, and internationally. My own home department is Romance Studies, where I teach French Literature and Culture and Haitian Studies, but I have a secondary appointment in the Duke Global Health Institute and I also work closely with the Duke Institute for Brain Sciences. I have been highly impressed by the faculty culture in DGHI, which, in many ways, seems to have solved some of the problems that my department in the Humanities is still grappling with, which I believe are legacies of the past and of a certain non-communication between different parts of our administrative structures. I don't think that the authority

to recommend appointment of regular-rank, non-tenure track appointments will contribute to a drift toward non-tenure but rather, having the Humanities existing in an analogous relationship to institute appointment possibilities that exist in the Sciences and Social Sciences would be healthy. The Franklin Humanities Institute is particularly interested in a few priority areas in terms of the capacity of these appointments to help us use our interdisciplinary mandate to move ahead to greet the structures that are emerging in the evolution of several fields at a time. These include Global Studies, and especially Global Postcolonial Studies, Public Humanities, and we are particularly interested in questions of the Public Humanities here in Durham. We recently had our event on reflections on Charleston and our John Hope Franklin Afro-diasporic Legacies series that was a successful outreach to our community for participation. Digital Humanities is another area of priority and we hope to be able to work with Art, Art History and Visual Studies and the Literature program in the logistics and culture of the proposed PhD in Computation Media, Arts and Culture. Documentary, Creative Arts, and Media Practice is another of these areas. We're working with Mike Schoenfeld and the media fellows to work with journalists, including journalist Jonathan Katz to make access to journalistic techniques and ideas of how to exist in a social media world more accessible to our undergrads, especially, but to all members of our culture. Human rights are very important to us. We have the Duke Human Rights Center at FHI and we also think that this will be very useful in museum, library, arts center and humanities center collaborations. In the short term, we

anticipate that this will, as I've said, be a very small initiative and likely initially focused on a few pre-identified areas and also the possibility of interacting with the Dean of Arts and Sciences on important recruitment and retention needs that are important to the departments that we serve. Ultimately, we hope to be able to develop a larger strategy around the relationship of the Franklin Humanities Institute to entrepreneurial strategies for our growth and our ways that we can assist departments in their own growing pains, their own attempt to make the best of their humanities futures.

Jokerst: Thank you very much, Deborah. This proposal is open for questions.

Earl Dowell (Mechanical Engineering): What's the annual budget for these appointments?

Jenson: Currently, the budget is really something that would have to emerge through agreements with other departments and the Dean of Arts and Sciences and the Provost, at her discretion, can consider these issues. We're working with development, we are always in the process of seeking future grant opportunities and foundation relations. But this is an attempt to have the structure in place so that we can build the practice of this.

Dowell: If you had a choice between a tenured faculty appointment and a non-tenure track appointment, which one would you prefer, assuming the decision is entirely yours?

Jenson: The decision could never be entirely ours.

Dowell: No, but that's the hypothetical question.

Jenson: I would always see the impact of a tenure track faculty member in the Humanities department as being the highest possible impact and we are very interested in being able to work with Humanities departments to create innovative opportunities to attract some of the most desirable scholars who have many choices at their disposal and who are eager to personalize the balance their research and teaching.

Dowell: Since we agree on that, why are you proposing the non-tenure track appointments?

Jenson: An institute cannot propose a tenure track appointment and the only thing that we can propose is a regular-rank, non-tenure track appointment.

Dowell: So that policy forces you toward a non-tenure track appointment. Is that correct? Is that a good thing?

Jenson: I'm not going to speculate on that (laughter).

Tina Williams (Psychology and Neuroscience): This is a question that's really a reflection of a change that I saw in policy to the Faculty Handbook that is a difference in ways that regular-rank, non-tenure track faculty will be evaluated in the future; hired and then also evaluated. I notice that in the new description, the mention is that there will be a committee formed and faculty will vote on the committee report. I'm wondering, in an institute, like the Franklin Institute, how

would one define the faculty who would vote on such an appointment?

Jenson: That's a question that I've also asked myself. However, our application is identical to the other institutes' applications on that point. This is something that occurs at any first moment of the development of a new structure. I was not a faculty member in the Duke Global Health Institute in the first year or two of its capacity to recommend appointments. So I don't know exactly how that worked outside of its advisory board. Our advisory board of tenured and tenure track faculty members would initially be playing an important role as we built up to the critical mass that would allow us to obey the rules of the Faculty Handbook. But I would like to point out that that same little sort of leap into space has occurred in all of these other scenarios as far as I know.

Jokerst: Let me comment and I'll ask Provost Kornbluth to perhaps comment on this. I think that the new language of the Faculty Handbook that is being proposed around regular-rank, non-tenure track faculty is still under discussion; but you bring up a good point, in that policy really should deal with...

Williams: I had wondered whether or not this was part and parcel of a larger question of when institutes gained this ability to hire regular-rank, non-tenure track, whether they would also be asked to modify their bylaws to indicate who the faculty were who would be the voting faculty on these kinds of appointments.

Jenson: It's definitely in our bylaws that it would be our advisory board.

Sally Kornbluth (Provost): I think that's a really good point in terms of that document that's now being shared with the schools. Part of the way this document has been designed is so that it can be tailored and flexible for each school or institute but I think that part of it is posting on the web very transparent guidelines. I think it would be fair game and we should add who the voting faculty would be and how it is defined in each unit. That should be posted as part of that clarification.

Harvey Cohen (Medicine): In order to avoid a constant turnover of such people, is there a plan to have some specific financial commitment available for x number of years, or at least reasonable for that period of time?

Jenson: Absolutely. This would have to occur with MOUs, with participating departments, and we would have three-year first appointment term reviews and the possibility, if circumstances permitted, of a subsequent five-year appointment term.

Cohen: That would be backed or assured in some way?

Kornbluth: Can I jump in here? It's not different from, in a sense, a renewable appointment. I think that, as Deborah said, there is an agreement on a three-year appointment, whether it be funded by departments or by me or by things that we've built into the budget at the time of renewal, just like if you have a soft money position in the School of Medicine, it will just be considered at the time of renewal. One thing that's in this policy that's coming forward that Tina referred to is

that there has been a sort of confusion over appointment terms versus available resources. So when people come up for review, in the process, there is the question of whether they have done their job well, are they qualified to continue, are you happy with them. This is distinct from, do you have the resources to continue it. So those things both have to go into the renewal process and can be built into the MOU and made very clear, you will be reviewed on x date and possible renewal, given available resources.

Cam Harvey (Fuqua): I have a general question. I'm glad to hear that this is not the beginning of a drift towards non-tenure. I support the proposal and I believe that there is an important role for non-tenure track faculty. However, this is the second time we have talked about non-tenure track. For IMEP we talked about hiring non-tenure track, contract faculty as part of that proposal. My general question, maybe to the Provost, is, has there been any drift towards non-tenure track? Are we headed in that direction? I don't know. There is a role for some non-tenure track faculty. But at some point, we get into a mix situation where it impacts the long term viability of the university in terms of scholarship. I would like some assurance that we're not drifting.

Kornbluth: I don't have the data in my hands but there is no question that there has been an increase in non-tenure track faculty over the years but I hate to give a definitive answer here. We can come back. We've talked with ECAC about looking at faculty demographics so I think that's fair game for later discussion. There's no question that there's been an increase. The question is, drilling down into what those

roles have been and what they're fulfilling. I have a slightly different concern from what you're saying, which is, in some cases we have an increasing non-tenure track faculty because of a differentiation of functions. So that people who are doing more research are getting out of the classroom. So you have tenure track faculty who are really research-intensive and then people who are teaching who are not research active. That's part of the drift that I think we don't want as a university. Because the teaching is so informed by what people do in their research. So I think this is a really important, larger question that we need to look at. But I don't think that the kinds of rules that Deborah is talking about tend to be because the institutes are in a unique interdisciplinary space where they have specific roles that need to be fulfilled that do not neatly fit into a department in some cases. They may not fill a department need at that time, which is part of what becomes the push and pull over these positions. I think this is a slightly different question but I think your point is very important for us to think about strategically as a university about where we want the demographics to go.

Jokerst: I might also add that the Diversity Task Force report has the tenure demographics up through 2013 for both Duke in general, not including the Health System and Duke, including the Health System, and every single one of your schools has a school-specific demographic ten-year data report as well, behind your Duke NetID. The data is there for you on the web.

Garnett Kelsoe (Immunology): I'm certainly not an expert on this, but it

seems to me that the tradition of faculty appointments, whether tenure track or regular-rank appointments lies with the faculty themselves. We are the people who choose our peers instead of some committee of the Provost or whomever. That's one of the great traditions of the University. In the institutes in which they have grants to support the bringing in of specialists, and in the sciences we certainly do that, it seems that we come close to breaching that trust when we bring in someone with a special skill, an x-ray microscopist, something like that. What I'm not quite getting is, my understanding is, this will be outside appointments using university money, not chosen by faculty but by an oversight committee for the Franklin Institute. Is that right?

Jenson: No, I wouldn't say that that is right. I would say that this is the setting of the foundation for a variety of different pathways toward the request for an appointment and one of those would be working with departments. So it could come from a department that was looking to hire a particular type of globally-important scholar on terms that they would be unable to arrange as a department but could arrange as a department working with an institute.

Kelsoe: But, don't the departments already have that authority to make non-tenure track appointments?

Jenson: That's right. But in the Humanities, they can't make that kind of an appointment sharing, having their candidate offered faculty status with a Humanities institute.

Kornbluth: There's a confusion going on here. Let me just jump in. First of all, when she talked about an oversight board, that is faculty. It's the same as saying your department is going to get together and put together a search committee and hire someone. I do think your point, which I had never thought about before, is well taken; we often take someone who is the director of a core facility and give them a faculty appointment. But again, that goes through a department. They all have an appointment in a department. So there is no instance that I know of where anybody is offered a faculty appointment without any faculty input. In this case, what Deborah is talking about, is the distinction between having independent faculty appointment ability in the institute, constituted by faculty of the institute, however they want to put together the search. This came to Tina's point: who is the voting body who decides that? They have to define that. The alternative that Deborah is referring to is, you might say that the English department is going to hire somebody together with the Franklin Humanities Institute and actually have an appointment in the institute and a footprint in the department. That's the difference.

Cohen: Might I suggest you change the name of that group and just call it an Appointments and Promotions Committee in the institute. And then it will be perfectly clear that this is going through that sort of process.

Jenson: The advisory board has another role also.

Kornbluth: We can just say, the role of the advisory committee is x, y, and z, and one

of them is that it is a faculty group that advises and puts people forward and the faculty of the institute will decide based on how it's defined. It's not an administrative appointment in any way. It's all faculty driven.

Rob Mitchell (English): I'm trying to think through practical examples of how this would work and I couldn't exactly imagine that example that you proposed, that we would want to hire a non-tenured regular-rank person. Could you give us a couple scenarios of how this would happen? That might help me. Is it just that it would be more money for someone?

Jenson: No, the case around which it first was adopted by the FHI advisory board in its bylaws was when a valued member of the English department was considering a job elsewhere and his wife, who did not have a regular-rank appointment at Duke, was offered a job elsewhere and she would have actually been perfect for other constituents at Duke to work with, but we actually didn't even know her. Not having had a regular-rank appointment had meant that she hadn't been visible and hadn't found her academic community at Duke, even though it was in Caribbean Studies, which is a field that is very much thriving at Duke. The retention did not work. But that was an example of how it came up. It was a spousal hire that would have made a lot of sense for Duke.

Kornbluth: You can imagine a situation where somebody wants to come to Duke because of some particular research interest or some particular teaching interest that doesn't neatly fit within a department but the English department might be interested in having a piece of,

because you want them to possibly contribute to certain teaching missions or they would be good collaborators with people in the department, but the department is not willing to bring them on independently and may not be willing to offer them a tenure track position. They might fit well in an interdisciplinary space. We don't really have a great mechanism, and we wouldn't want to go to 10% in English, 5% in Romance Languages, 30% in Classics. You see what I'm saying? It provides a home for interdisciplinary people who may be teaching in different areas. It could either be by an independent appointment or the English department might say, we're interested enough to have 50% percent of this person, but we're not committed to having them on our tenure track for the next 30 years.

Brodhead: Could someone from an institute that already has this power give us an example? (laughter)

Mike Merson (Global Health): Just to tell you, we have about 75 faculty now. About 20 are appointed by the institute. They teach in our education program, they may lead a research initiative in our institute. We own them, we have to find funds for them, and their appointment is with us and they are, of course, part of the voting faculty. The rest of our faculty have primary appointments elsewhere on campus, all over campus, and they have what most of you would call a secondary appointment in our institute. The way we are set up, although it is a secondary appointment, they are also a voting faculty in our institute. So the voting faculty of our institute are mostly tenured faculty who wanted to be in the institute because many of them are new, we recruited over 50

new faculty, and when many of them came to Duke, they wanted to have their academic home somewhere on campus but they wanted to be part of an interdisciplinary institute and all the things we do. There are various formulas for each one. We have an MOU for each one. Ed Balleisen's office, the Vice Provost's office, carefully monitors all this and makes sure the financial commitment is fine. What we have is essentially a faculty that is a mix of tenured faculty with secondary appointments in our institute and primary appointed faculty who are non-tenured. It works very well for us. The common theme is Global Health and the common theme is part of the interdisciplinary institute. We have wonderful participation in faculty meetings and committees. We are part of the promotion process. We set up with the Provost's office very clear guidelines for all our promotions. We have promotion committees. Everyone gets the same kind of review. We have to use the Arts and Sciences model. That's what Peter Lange had suggested we use and I think for the most part it works very well. I don't know if that helps you. That's Global Health, it's not English, but it's an example of the way an institute merges the two kinds of faculty, primarily around a common interdisciplinary theme of Global Health.

Jenson: I think that works very well at DGHI. For example, there are several

universities around the country right now that have medical faculty who also have a doctorate in the Humanities and who really want to be working in both areas. I think that this would be one possibility of working towards such an appointment without having to have, from the get-go, the full tenure track funding to hire a physician, a humanist.

Jokerst: I'm afraid we're going to have to stop questions now because we have one more agenda item but what I would like to do is encourage anyone who has further questions to contact Deborah directly. And if you have general questions, I think Mike, since he stood up, might also have answers from DGHI (laughter). We will come back to this in March. You will have an opportunity to ask more questions in March but I encourage you to engage Deborah in the meantime with questions that you might have. Thank you very much, Deborah. (applause)

I would like to now call our meeting into Executive Session, which means that those of you who are not Duke faculty members, I must ask you to leave our meeting. Duke faculty members, please stay in the meeting.

(Remainder of meeting conducted in Executive Session)