

Minutes of the Meeting of the Academic Council
Thursday, March 24, 2016

**Nan Jokerst (Chair, Academic Council /
Electrical and Computer Engineering):**

Welcome, everyone and thank you for being here today. I would like to call the meeting to order.

For those of you who have been on the Council in the recent past, you know that typically the March Council meeting has also been listed as the Annual Faculty Meeting, with an address by President Brodhead.

However, the President, Provost, and ECAC all agreed that we needed an Academic Council meeting devoted to a comprehensive discussion of Duke-Kunshan University, particularly focusing on the plans going forward for the Phase II undergraduate degree, which we, the Academic Council, will vote on in the Fall of 2016. So, the President has agreed to forego his address for the Duke Kunshan conversation, and he will instead offer some thoughts about Duke at the end of our meeting. We will hold this part of our meeting in executive session.

**APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 18TH
MINUTES**

Jokerst: To start our meeting, we'd like to get to the approval of our February 18th Academic Council meeting minutes. These minutes were posted with today's agenda.

(Minutes approved by voice vote without dissent)

**VOTE ON THE REQUEST FOR HIRING
AUTHORITY OF NON-TENURE-TRACK
REGULAR-RANK FACULTY AT THE
FRANKLIN HUMANITIES INSTITUTE**

Jokerst: We will now vote on the request from the Franklin Humanities Institute to have hiring authority for non-tenure track, regular-rank faculty. The supporting documents, which were part of Director Deborah Jenson's presentation last month, were posted again with today's agenda. Deborah is in the audience today. Are there any questions for Deborah before we move to our vote?

ECAC received a request to conduct the vote by a paper ballot following last month's presentation. The vote is for Council members for the current academic year. We have invited our incoming Council members to this meeting as well, so if you are here as a member recently elected for next year, please do not take a ballot as your term is not effective until our September 2016 meeting. If you will raise your hand, our colleagues Cam Harvey and Sara Beale will give you a ballot. After you have voted, please pass your ballot to the end of the row to be collected. I will announce the result a bit later in our meeting.

PROPOSED NAME CHANGE TO AN EXISTING PROGRAM IN THE WOMEN'S STUDIES DEPARTMENT

Jokerst: We are going to move on to our next agenda item, which is the proposed name change to an existing program in the Women's Studies department. I now call Professor Priscilla Wald to the podium, who is here today to present a request from the Women's Studies department to change the name of an existing program in that department. The supporting documents were posted with your agenda and we will vote on this at our April meeting.

Priscilla Wald (Women's Studies): Thank you. I will keep this very short. I think it's fairly straightforward. Women's Studies originally, as a field, began in the late '60s, early '70s to address both the exclusion and misrepresentation of women across disciplines. It was originally a fairly activist program and it spread pretty quickly across the country and actually worldwide. In 1983 Jean O'Barr founded that program here and it still had a lot of that agenda. Increasingly over the years, however, it became more of a methodology and an approach and a series of questions, more in line with some other departments. It has now, definitely in the US and increasingly elsewhere, had some kind of combination of the requests that we are making, which is, the program in Gender, Sexuality, and Feminist Studies. These are the terms that are characteristically circulating. I'll do a quick summary of the document you got. There are intellectual, institutional, pedagogical, and pragmatic reasons for our wishing to make this change. First of all, as I just said, the name of the field is changing. I'm on a National Women's

Studies Associate chat list and this is happening everywhere. The only group that did not change their name were the very first Women's Studies program and they decided, for historical reasons, to leave the name. This is in line with what our fellow universities are doing. It more accurately describes the scope of the program's research, pedagogy, and service. There is consistent support among our stakeholders. Our undergraduates actually requested the name change and they feel we'll attract more majors with this more inclusive name change. We have had approved a Sexualities Studies minor, so it is fitting that that become part of our name and we feel that there is strong interest in Sexualities Studies on the campus. Our graduate students, as well, feel the name is particularly important. Gender and Sexuality are the terms that are used everywhere and some programs are including Feminist. Feminist tends to signal a more scholarly and theoretical approach that our department is known for. Our program hosts the largest annual feminist theory conference in the world. It was three weekends ago and we had more than 300 registrants and 66 countries represented and that's fairly typical. Those are our reasons and I'm very happy to entertain questions.

Thea Portier-Young (Divinity): My concern with Feminist is that, given the critique of white feminists, particularly in womanist approaches, that it seems to narrowly identify the work of this department with white feminism and to exclude other feminists.

Wald: We discussed that. Actually, I wasn't yet in the department at the time this was decided, but I know this was

discussed by the program and there was a strong sense that, while there are some debates that include that critique and that critique can be made of any of our terms, we feel that there is widespread acceptance of the term Feminist, not just as a white term, but increasingly it has become very broadly inclusive and widely used. Again, we have a lot of institutions around the country that are including Feminist or Feminism in their titles. So we entertained that, but we don't feel that's a problem.

Portier-Young: I just want to register that concern because I'm not absolutely persuaded that it's not a problem.

Wald: Is there something I could say that would persuade you? (laughter)

Portier-Young: No, I don't think so. I hear the critique on a regular basis from black colleagues at my school and in my field; that we're behind the curve somehow.

Wald: Again, the National Women's Studies Association, that debate was one that had happened and I have seen that the association has moved past that debate and has pretty widely adopted the use of Feminist and Feminism in their program anthologies and so on, that are multi-racial anthologies.

Karla Holloway (English): Tangential to that concern, am I correct that there are no faculty of color in your department?

Wald: Frances Hasso considers herself faculty of color...

Holloway: But, I'm talking about regular-rank faculty.

Wald: Yes, and we're going to try to correct that with the upcoming hire this coming year. We have adopted Black Feminism as a theme this year coming up. We are hosting our post-doctoral candidates in that theme. We have not discussed exactly what the hire is, but it's possible that that will be our hire. In some fashion, we have all agreed as a unit, unanimously, that it's something that we want to address.

Holloway: It just doesn't inspire confidence, although I agree with the program change, but you're saying that a department with no faculty of color is going to host Black Feminism. It seems a bit oxymoronic. I don't have problems with the change but I have problems with the substance that you raise. This has been a history at Duke for many years. Evidence of that address before we change the title might have been helpful to some of us who feel that this field still has a good ways to go.

Wald: I appreciate that and, as you know, that's an area that I work in, so I completely agree with you. Again, it is something that, to say we're going to address it is only to say we are seeking to address it in terms of the course offerings that we already have but also, we have in place a faculty that's already there. We can't change the faculty that we have and we don't want to. We want to retain who we have. I can say that since we all agree that this is an issue, it's our plan for our next hire. But I completely appreciate what you're saying and I agree with it.

Jokerst: Thank you Professor Wald.

Karla Holloway: Nan, one more comment. I know we have a full agenda so

this will be quick. The recently publicized events regarding the department employees at Duke; the Parking and Transportation and the Duke Police, and Duke's administrative managers, could leave the campus community perplexed as to what occurred and what cultures are being encouraged and nourished in staff departments and what investigatory procedures are practiced when complaints emerge from employees whose reporting structures might complicate a judicious review. As a faculty that's appropriately concerned with the institution's cultures of respect and fairness, we must have confidence that institutional review is not compromised. The commendable Chronicle investigatory articles give us enough detail to trouble that confidence and to excavate questions that implicate the values we want our campus to practice. Some of this matter is appropriately in the hands of legal counsel of the parties involved, but some of it is also relevant here, specifically those that address department cultures that may have unacceptable patterns or practices of privilege, procedures that don't produce independent review of complaints and habits that might contribute to disparate treatment of Duke University employees, so, to that end, I would like to move, formally, that the Academic Council direct its representatives on the Board of Trustees Human Resources Committee to request an independent review of the matters brought forward in the Chronicle, and also for them to present to the campus community a thorough assessment of this matter and, if appropriate, recommendations as to how the integrity of our mission to foster a respectful spirit of dialogue and understanding in the Duke community is

always confirmed by our conduct. That's a formal motion.

Jokerst: Do I have a second?

Speaker: Second.

Jokerst: I hear a second. So Karla, I would love to be able to discuss this motion now, but what I would like to request, respectfully, is that we have the Duke Kunshan discussion, and we do have time, that President Brodhead has requested that at the end of our executive session today, to address some of the inclusion and culture and process questions. I would like to have, subsequent to his remarks, a discussion of this motion, and the motion does need discussion. But I would like to go to our Duke Kunshan discussion first, and then move to that discussion.

Holloway: So there's a plan to discuss this today?

Jokerst: President Brodhead has agreed to make some remarks this afternoon.

Holloway: I would be willing to table this motion and its second until after that discussion.

Jokerst: That would be great. Let's go on to the DKU discussion and we'll return to this motion.

Holloway: Thank you.

***RESULTS OF THE VOTE ON THE
FRANKLIN HUMANITIES INSTITUTE
PROPOSAL***

Jokerst: First of all, I'd like to announce the results of the vote on the Franklin

Humanities Institute proposal. The proposal has passed with 46 yes, 8 no, and 4 abstentions.

Moving on, I 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. Anyone who is a reporter or not on the Duke faculty, I need to ask you to leave the meeting at this time and I appreciate that you depart. I ask that members of the Duke faculty please stay for this important conversation. Last time we had executive session, someone tried to sneak out and I called him back. But I won't call anyone out today (laughter).

(Remainder of meeting conducted in executive session)