Minutes of the Meeting of the Academic Council
Thursday, May 12, 2016

Nan Jokerst (Chair, Academic Council / Electrical and Computer Engineering): Welcome, everyone, to our last Council meeting for this academic year. I'd like to extend a special welcome to the Vice Chair of the Duke Board of Trustees, Jack Bovender, who will host a conversation with us shortly about the search for Duke's next President. As you can see, we've got a packed agenda today, so we're going to keep things moving.

Reflecting back upon this year in Academic Council, we aimed to form a partnership with the administration, trustees, and students toward greater transparency and to engage in the critical conversations that will strengthen the bonds of our community. To this end, we have intentionally engaged the Duke leadership in conversations when a committee begins its work, so that this body can offer the faculty perspective to inform the work of the committee. We have had the opportunity to provide our thoughts in the formative stages of efforts critical to the future of Duke, including the Strategic Plan, Duke Kunshan University, and the Task Force on Bias and Hate. I have personally seen these programs change based upon our faculty input, and I would like to thank the Duke leaders who have worked with us this year.

In that same spirit of partnership and collaboration, Trustee Bovender requested a conversation with us at our meeting today, primarily to listen to the faculty, as the search for Duke's next President takes shape. It is through the thoughtful, frank input of you, our Council members that we are able to offer faculty guidance to effect change. In this spirit, I would like to thank each of you for your time and participation this year. In my introductory slides this year, faculty participation was highlighted as a critical aspect of this partnership, and you have stepped up to the plate admirably.

Our last meeting is bittersweet, in that some of you will be leaving Academic Council after this meeting. I would like to particularly thank those of you whose terms end with our meeting today. Your voice has been important to this Council, and I would like to extend my appreciation to you. I hope that you will return to the Council at some point in the future.

To our returning Council members, I look forward to working with you next year. We will have a number of conversations and votes that will have a significant impact on the future of Duke.

I have one announcement before we begin our meeting. Based upon the recommendations of the Academic Council Diversity Task Force, ECAC has been working on revisions to the Faculty Handbook regarding the Faculty Ombuds position. We have made substantial progress on these revisions, and we will be bringing these proposed changes to this Council next year.

ECAC has opted to ask current Ombuds Jeff Dawson to continue in the position for one more year while these changes are being considered and implemented. More on this next year!

NON-APPROVAL OF APRIL MEETING MINUTES

Jokerst: With the very short window between our April 28 meeting and today's meeting, a partial transcription was posted with your agenda concerning only those presentations from April 28 that will require a vote today. So, we will not formally approve the minutes today but will do so over email in another week or so when they are completed.

APPROVAL OF EARNED DEGREES

Jokerst: In accordance with the University Bylaws, I will now call on representatives from the various schools and Trinity College for recommendations of approved candidates for various degrees. These lists will be forwarded by the Provost for approval by the Board of Trustees at their meeting tomorrow.

Graduate School
Dean Paula D. McClain

Doctor of Philosophy	202
Doctor of Philosophy in German Studies	5
Master of Arts	151
Master of Science	145
DKU Master of Science in Global Health	7
Master of Arts in Teaching	1
Master of Fine Arts	16

School of Medicine
Dean Nancy C. Andrews

Doctor of Physical Therapy	63
Master of Health Sciences	96
Master of Health Sciences in Clinical Research	20
Doctor of Medicine	97
Master of Management in Clinical Information	1
Master of Science in Biomedical Sciences	28
Master of Biostatistics	15

School of Law
Dean David F. Levi

Juris Doctor	214
Doctor of Juridical Science	2
Master of Laws	95
Master of Laws, International and Comparative Law	13
Master of Laws, Judicial Studies	18
Master of Laws, Law and Entrepreneurship	15

Divinity School
Interim Dean Ellen F. Davis

Doctor of Theology	3
Doctor of Ministry	8
Master of Divinity	125
Master of Theology	10
Master of Theological Studies	20
Master of Arts in Christian Practice	1
Master of Arts in Christian Studies	9

School of Nursing
Dean Marion E. Broome

Doctor of Nursing Practice	36
Master of Science in Nursing	57
Bachelor of Science in Nursing	74

Fuqua School of Business
Dean William F. Boulding

Master of Business Administration	466
Master of Management Studies	130
DKU Master of Management Studies	24

Nicholas School of the Environment
Dean Alan R. Townsend

Master of Environmental Management	131

Master of Forestry	5

Sanford School of Public Policy
Dean Kelly D. Brownell

Master of International Development Policy	23
Master of Public Policy	63

Pratt School of Engineering
Interim Dean George A. Truskey

Master of Engineering Management	53
Master of Engineering	21
Bachelor of Science in Engineering	263

Trinity College of Arts and Sciences
Dean Valerie S. Ashby

Bachelor of Arts	637
Bachelor of Science	632
TOTAL	3995

(candidates for earned degrees approved by voice vote with no dissent)

Jokerst: Warm congratulations to our graduates.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Jokerst: I will now call our meeting into Executive Session for our next two agenda items. This means that all those who are not members of the faculty must leave the meeting. If you are a member of the Duke faculty, please stay in the room. For those of you who must leave, we will welcome you back in about 35 minutes when we exit Executive Session.

Executive session held for discussion with Trustee Bovender about the Presidential search and also for vote on honorary degrees for 2017

MEETING RETURNED TO OPEN SESSION

VOTE ON MASTER'S IN QUANTITATIVE MANAGEMENT FROM FUQUA

Jokerst: We will now vote on the proposed Master's degree in Quantitative Management from the Fuqua School of Business that was discussed at our meeting in April. Senior Associate Dean Jennifer Francis is here to answer any additional questions. Are there any questions?

Hearing none, may I have a motion to approve?

(Proposed Master's degree in Quantitative Management approved by voice vote without dissent)

VOTE ON THE PROPOSED PhD IN COMPUTATIONAL MEDIA, ARTS & CULTURES

Jokerst: Next, we will vote on the proposed PhD in Computational Media, Arts & Cultures that was discussed at our last meeting in April. Professor Victoria Szabo is here to answer any additional questions. Does anyone have any questions?

Lee Baker (Trinity College): I had asked a question about students moving through the program and, if interests changed, it seemed a little fragile to me. I think, as I understand it, each individual student will be assigned a mentor, and that mentor probably isn't going anywhere, even if the configuration of many different interests in that area moves. So that made me feel better that no student would ever be an orphan because at admission time, they are assigned to a faculty mentor.

Victoria Szabo (Art, Art History and Visual Studies): That's correct. Before anyone could

be admitted, we would identify someone who would be the primary assigned mentor.

Jokerst: Any other questions? May I have a motion to approve?

(Proposed PhD in Computational Media, Arts & Cultures approved by voice vote without dissent)

CONSENT ITEM – REPORTS FROM APC, UPC, GPC AND THE ATHLETIC COUNCIL

Jokerst: Our next agenda item is recognition of the submission of the annual reports for the following committees: Academic Programs, University Priorities, Global Priorities and the Athletic Council.

We did not receive any questions following the email I sent to Council members on May 4 sharing the reports, so I am acknowledging for the record the receipt of these and would like to warmly thank the respective chairs for their leadership and service this past year:

John Willis, chair of APC
Don Taylor, chair of UPC and a member of this Council
Susan Alberts, chair of GPC and also a member of the Council, and
Jim Coleman, chair of the Athletic Council. (applause)

I can assure you, having attended almost all of those meetings in all of those committees, those are non-negligible chair positions.

REPORT FROM THE PROVOST'S IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE FROM THE DIVERSITY TASK FORCE REPORT

Jokerst: At the May 2015 Council meeting, just one year ago, Professor Trina Jones and I presented the Report from the Academic Council's Diversity Task Force regarding

faculty at Duke. Provost Kornbluth subsequently formed the Implementation Committee for the Diversity Task Force, chaired by ECAC colleague Professor Emily Klein. Emily is here today to share a report from the work of this committee for this past year.

Emily Klein (Nicholas School of the Environment / Chair, Provost's Diversity Implementation Committee / Member of ECAC): Nan gave you a little bit of context and I will remind you, for those of you who weren't on the Council at that time, that beginning two years ago, the Academic Council created a Task Force on Diversity, chaired by Trina Jones and Nan Jokerst. A large number of us were involved in it and it produced a report that, a year ago, was delivered to the Academic Council and there were many recommendations in that report. So then Sally, our Provost, created the Faculty Diversity Task Force Implementation Committee, the basic charge of which was to evaluate, implement, or delegate implementation of the many recommendations of the DTF report. So I am going to give you today a brief summary of our work over the past year and a full, written report will be available in a couple of weeks, which we will submit to Sally and we will make available to the Academic Council. I have been truly honored to work with an extraordinary group of faculty in the Implementation Committee. Many of them are here now. Would you please stand, because this work was over and above the cultural tax that is usually asked of our faculty. Please stand. (applause)

They have drive, are passionate, strong-willed, we struggled with a lot of issues, and I think we've come through it with an extraordinary product that we all worked so hard with the idea that we would be able to bring forth procedures, structures, and

people that will make Duke a better place in the future, a more successful place, because it is more diverse and inclusive. I'm going to start with just a quick look at the recommendations that came out of the Diversity Task Force, the goal of which was to enhance faculty excellence through diversity and inclusion. There were eight recommendations, each of which has sub-recommendations, leadership, structural and functional changes, school faculty diversity and inclusion strategic plans, search procedures, hiring programs, retention, training in diversity and inclusion, and data and transparency. As I said, each of them had sub-recommendations and they were all interconnected. It's a big web. Our committee tackled almost all of these. I'm going to highlight just a few of them because I don't have a lot of time and there is a slide for each of these coming up, but I just want to highlight which of these I'm going to talk about. I'm going to talk about the Duke community commitment statement, instructional and functional changes, and the Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement and the office that person will oversee. Also related to structural and functional changes within schools, we called for the creation of faculty diversity and inclusion standing committees, which relate, then, to the schools' faculty diversity and inclusion strategic plans. We've laid out and discussed procedures for best practices as well as incentives during regular faculty searches, and finally, we want to talk about the Provost's strategic opportunity hiring program. So I'm going to take each one of these in turn. I'll start with the top. We're going to vote on this at the end of my speaking. The Duke Community Statement of Excellence, Diversity and Inclusion was introduced last time. By the two meeting rule, we will vote on it in just a few minutes. About the Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement: the Implementation Committee spent a great deal of time fleshing out, trying to figure out how the structure of this office and how this new Vice Provost position would be most successful in meeting the goals that we see. There are many goals but I would say there are two buckets to them. The first one pertains to all of us, and that is to provide leadership, guidance, and oversight of all university strategies and programs that will enhance faculty excellence in general. That includes everything from mentoring, orientation, leadership development, et cetera. The second overall goal is to promote diversity and inclusion as essential aspects and components of faculty excellence. Obviously these are two broad buckets but there's a lot of detail in there. The Implementation Committee, we articulated the responsibilities and the purview of this new Vice Provost position and this office and we drafted the job description and then we turned it over to Sally, who charged a search committee to begin the process of searching for the new Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement, chaired by Paul Magwene. The second part of this that relates to structural and functional changes is that there will be a central Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement in the Provost's office. We want to make sure that there is structure within the schools, if it doesn't already exist, that helps advance faculty diversity at the school level. So we're calling for the creation of what we call school or division or department-based faculty diversity and inclusion standing committees. We would populate them. The overall goal, in a nutshell, is to develop structures that facilitate partnership among the Provost's office, the Deans, and the faculty so that, in a sense, the faculty have a hand in advancing diversity and inclusion with our schools, as opposed to simply pointing to the Dean and saying, you haven't done your job. We will now have a structure and a mechanism in place to try to influence what we do in the schools. The Implementation Committee

produced a document that basically suggested guidelines for the creation and the functions and the purview of these school faculty diversity and inclusion standing committees. We also included in those, suggested guidelines, suggestions for the development of school diversity and inclusion strategic plans. So each school would have a diversity and inclusion strategic plan that faculty would be working in partnership with their Deans to produce. This document was presented at the Provost and Deans Cabinet meeting in November. We provided the documentation follow up from that and Sally sent out an email with that information to the Deans and I would say that, at this moment, certainly some schools were already well on their way, already had structures in place to form these structures or something like them, depending on their culture and their government structures. Some are ramping up and some, like my own, have yet to get started on it. So it will be a work in progress. Moving to faculty searches: the DTF report discussed the importance of using best practices in faculty searches. There is a good deal of scholarship on this now about how to conduct faculty searches, so that they will produce the kinds of diverse candidates that we seek. Most of our peers have on their Provost website some sort of faculty search toolkit that basically says how to make sure you conduct searches using best practices. Typically, there is a long list of suggestions, but just a few of them would be attention to the search committee composition, designing a position announcement so that it is attractive to diverse candidates, and practices and ways that search committees and the faculty, when we bring people to campus, can counteract evaluation bias at each stage of the process. These are best practices during traditional search procedures. Most of our hiring takes place through traditional search mechanisms. We've also been grappling with some way to

provide incentives so that schools and departments hire faculty who advance excellence, diversity and inclusion through their traditional search mechanisms. We haven't come to a conclusion on that, but incentives might be, perhaps, an additional hire in a future year or other funds to advance diversity and inclusion in other ways. We're still struggling with the incentives for this. Last, the slide is called Dedicated Hiring Programs. You might consider this the slide that talks about targets of opportunity. What we're speaking of here is hiring regular-rank faculty without a traditional search. We've had, as you know, targets of opportunity programs at Duke. Some have been successful, some less successful, and the Implementation Committee proposes to rename this, in a sense to highlight that this is going to be different. We're proposing that it is different than previous iterations of target opportunity hiring. We're calling it the Provost's Strategic Opportunity Hiring Program. While it is similar to conventional target of opportunity programs, in that it will involve some significant amount of money sustained over several years, it will differ in that we would like to focus it more. We would like to see the use of these funds linked to pre-identified strategic hiring priorities. In other words, this would be the strategic plans that came out of the schools, as well as Duke's Strategic Plan. We're proposing enhanced oversight mechanisms, possibly in the form of a faculty advisory committee to the Provost. So if a Dean or a Chair comes up with an idea for a target of opportunity hire, it would not just be run by the Provost, but the case would be presented to a committee that is looking to use these funds to their best effect. The committee would be advisory to the Provost, not a gatekeeper. Last, typically our target of opportunity hires, at least in my experience, have been dominantly hiring senior faculty, which is wonderful, but we also think that

there is value in trying to hire junior or mid-career faculty and putting more emphasis at that level. In a sense, because it's hard to compete with huge start-ups, et cetera, when you're only hiring at the senior level. This is our concept of reconfigured target of opportunity, or as we're calling it, the Provost's Strategic Opportunity Hiring Program. That was a quick overview of the main parts of it.

Amy Bejsovec (Biology): I didn't quite understand your last slide. Was that to replace the traditional target of opportunity searches to have some more oversight of those, so that it's not just hiring more status quo hires?

Klein: That is the intent. To try to see that the funds are really used in the best ways.

Jokerst: I'd like to thank Emily and her committee for all the hard work that they did (applause). I have also been at many of their meetings and I can assure you that that was difficult work this year.

VOTE ON THE COMMUNITY STATEMENT FROM THE DIVERSITY TASK FORCE IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

Jokerst: Also at last month's meeting, Emily introduced the Community Statement that she and her Implementation Committee colleagues prepared for your consideration. This item was posted again with your agenda and we will now vote on this.

May I have a motion to approve?

Bejsovec: I feel silly making a friendly amendment here, but I love this, but when I read it, I read "respect" as a verb, it looks like an infinitive, and I was going to suggest that we reverse "inclusion" and "respect," not that respect is less important, but I got derailed

because I thought it said "the right to respect." I don't want anyone to get confused.

Sara Beale (Law School): With respect, it was already put out by another body, and we're saying it's another body's statement.

Klein: That doesn't mean we couldn't agree on the friendly amendment.

Jokerst: So is there a friendly amendment offered?

Bejsovec: That was my friendly amendment, to put "inclusion" before "respect."

Jokerst: Is there a second to that friendly amendment?

(friendly amendment approved by voice vote without dissent)

Thank you – the friendly amendment has been approved. It will now say "inclusion, respect…"

Now, the motion to approve the statement was on the floor already.

(statement approved by voice vote without dissent)

Thank you very much. The statement has been approved. Emily, thank you and your committee very much (applause).

FACULTY SATISFACTION SURVEY: PROVOST KORNBLUTH

Jokerst: Again, at the May Academic Council meeting last year, we heard a preliminary report on the results of faculty satisfaction survey conducted in 2015. I would like to welcome Provost Kornbluth to the podium today to follow up on last spring's presentation.

7

Sally Kornbluth (Provost): In the future, I will not be the one presenting this, the future Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement will be presenting this as this will come under his or her purview. Just to comment on that, we do have four finalists that have all been through, so hopefully we will soon come to a decision. This was the hard work of a committee, David Jamieson-Drake, Nancy Allen, Jiali Luo, Jackie Looney, Ben Reese, Emily Klein, Ann Brown, and Judy Seidenstein, and then Chris Freel helped a lot with the presentation analysis so I want to really thank all those folks. When I offered to present this, I was sort of blindly going in, not imagining how much data there were. It is a ton of data. We are only going to see the tip of the iceberg today. Any member of the faculty is welcome to troll through the vast amounts of data. David Jamieson-Drake can give you access. It is an enormous amount of data. There will also be data communicated to each of the schools. So a lot of the things I'll be presenting today are faculty writ large. I will give you a flavor, though, that there's quite a bit of school to school variability, which can wash out differences when you look at pan-university results. You'll notice that we talk about increases and decreases. The kind of magnitude of changes from year to year, I would never let one of my graduate students publish a paper on that. It's 0.1 up, 0.1 down; there haven't really been any vast swings from previous years, for better or for worse. Sometimes, you'll see, that really is for worse. The purpose of the survey was to examine faculty perceptions in seven areas shown here, but we're not going to have the chance to go through all those areas today. I'm going to focus on just a few: satisfaction, departmental atmosphere, and then I'll touch briefly on the others. There was a lot of data comparing differences between schools, across races, across genders. Again, I welcome anyone who wants to really dig deep, because it's not just raw data. We actually, through the work of David and Jiali, have a lot of processed data in graphic form. So there's a ton of information available. I tried, where data were available, to compare to the 2005 and 2010 surveys, to assess whether there's been any progress or regression, and I think, importantly, there was some analysis done this year that I haven't seen previously to really identify what areas you could shout out for improvement. Again, you look at this mass of data, it's really hard to draw out information for conclusions, and you'll see I think we've come upon a pretty interesting way to represent the data that allows you to think about how you take action going forward. The survey was given to all regular-rank faculty. There was a response rate of 56%. You'll see that females are 37% of the regular-rank faculty and males are 63%, but the response rate was 62% of the 37% and 52% of the 63%. Same kind of analysis in the different races and ethnicities. The reason I put this up is I want to caution from generalized conclusions because I was looking at some of the data where you might say, oh, Hispanics overwhelmingly agreed or disagreed with White faculty, but I want you to notice that the numbers are quite different. For instance, in the Hispanic response rate, you're really talking about 30 individuals. So this speaks to our need to increasingly diversify our faculty, but the response rates are fairly similar, but the sizes of the populations are obviously quite different. The first thing is just the really general question of; overall, how satisfied are you being a faculty member at Duke? You got to rate from 1 to 5, very dissatisfied to very satisfied, so higher numbers are better. We looked from 2005, 2010, and 2015. We can call things "largest decline," et cetera, but the differences are pretty small. You'll notice that the largest decline was in Engineering, 4.0. It went up in 2010 a little bit, down in 2015. In

every aspect of the survey, the lawyers are the happiest ones (laughter). I don't know what that means, but they are. And the most unhappy people are in Medicine. Although we have a lot of data disaggregating clinical and non-clinical, when you see Medicine, it's everybody, but we have all that data disaggregated if anyone wants to look at it. The largest gain was Nursing, but again, they got back to where they started in 2005. How satisfied are you with the resources for your research and scholarship? The largest gain was in the Social Sciences in Trinity. Most satisfied overall is the Divinity School. The largest decline, and again, this was up and then down again, was the Nicholas School. Again, Medicine was least satisfied. This just gives you an idea. There's not a huge amount of movement from year to year. But you'll see that there is enough school to school difference that I would recommend, if people want to dig in, to look at what's going on at the level of their school. Gender: now this color coding will recur throughout the slides so you can see; light green is positive change, pink is negative change, blue is no change. So for both females and males, there is a slight drift down overall, looking at the whole population. But you'll see, similarly, there's a positive change in perception of salary. Again, males are still higher than females in their satisfaction. Start-up funds: similarly, there's no change in female, a little uptick in male. Things like access to teaching assistants, time available for scholarly work, slight changes. Race and ethnicity: I probably don't want to dwell on this again. There are slight positive and negative changes, but I will say, in general, we're seeing that White faculty in general have higher numbers. There was a slightly negative change for White faculty in their overall satisfaction, but again, these number changes aren't that great. Salary: everyone is pretty similar; White faculty are more satisfied about their salary. Similarly, White faculty are more

satisfied in terms of start-up funds. You see, actually, a negative drift among Black faculty and Hispanic faculty from 2010 to 2015. This chart (refers to slide), looking at it overall, in all satisfaction items, overall satisfaction, resources, salary, securing grants, intellectual stimulation, and office space, in all cases everyone, Asians, Black, Hispanic faculty, are less happy than White faculty. The lowest rated are in pink. There were only a few places where satisfaction was higher in Black or Hispanic faculty. Teaching responsibilities, access to teaching assistants, opportunities to collaborate with undergraduates in research. So you see an ongoing discrepancy in satisfaction. There has not been huge movement, little upticks and downticks, but this comes to the Diversity Task Force Report, it's not only about diversity in terms of numbers, it's also about the environment and obviously we still have work to do, frankly, for all faculty, but also in terms of different racial ethnic groups and also across gender. Departmental atmosphere encompasses a large number of things. You can't read these. These are the things that were looked at, from "I am proud to tell people I work at Duke" all the way down to "There are plenty of places to meet informally and network my colleagues." One thing you will notice, on a scale of 1 to 5, averages don't look really dire, they range from 3.2 on up. Here, these are places where lower numbers are better. So "I have to work harder than some of my colleagues to be perceived as a legitimate scholar," you want that to be a low number, not a high number. So again, it's not dire. But, you don't even have to look at a granular level at the next slide. This is women versus men. Every single measure, men are happier than women. This is across all the schools. The differences in many cases are not huge, but we're operating in a very narrow range. Clearly there are improvements to be made. Perception: we've seen some drift but the perception of equal

treatment has declined slightly and there continues to be persistent gaps between the genders. On measures such as whether women are viewed or treated differently than men, whether women versus men have to work harder to be perceived as a legitimate scholar, and with regard to exclusion from an informal network in the community. That's consistent with the overall ratings where women consistently rate their departmental atmosphere. Similarly, Black faculty are less satisfied with the commitment to diversity and equality as well as a bunch of things on the same things that women are concerned about here. "Commitment to diversity is demonstrated:" if you look here, these are positive changes, but not for Black faculty. Similarly, "I have to work harder than some of my colleagues to be perceived as a legitimate scholar," considerably higher among Black faculty and this has been fairly consistent but you don't see much traction over the last decade. "I feel excluded from an informal network in my department and unit:" again, Black faculty tend to feel more excluded in their local departmental environments. Non-White faculty are indicating in the survey that they struggle with navigating the unwritten rules compared to White faculty in some areas. Because of the mass of data, I've only been able to carve out individual questions. There are tons of these questions. The only difference, actually, is among non-White faculty in the Social Sciences. You see some uptick. And then in other places, Business for example, you've got a drop between 2010 and 2015 and similarly in Natural Sciences and Basic Sciences. This slide is way too much to go through in this short time, but it was directed at data about receiving adequate mentoring. Again, you had to strongly disagree, strongly agree, et cetera. We're only showing here the percent agreement. These numbers haven't budged too much. If you look at male and female,

males are feeling like they're getting better mentoring. The males have come up, the females not so much. This is the total difference. We haven't seen a whole lot of movement in terms of different ethnic groups. Asians have stayed constant. Black faculty have actually come up somewhat in terms of better mentoring. Hispanics, again, have such small numbers, but there was a 20% increase in Hispanic faculty feeling like they're getting adequate mentoring and White faculty have stayed pretty much the same. The only reason I show these data is just to show you that there is really a lot of unit to unit variability, again with the female lawyers being extremely happy, where 89% of the female Law faculty feel like they're receiving adequate mentoring and only 19% of the males in Divinity. You can see there's a really large scale difference from school to school. When it comes to mentoring and work-life balance, things that we have to think about: are we communicating things like the APT criteria well? There has been a gradual, slow drift up on the criteria for tenure being clearly communicated. Promotion outside of tenure, people actually think there has been some negative change. This is interesting with regard to some of the Senior Associate Deans getting together and now talking with faculty about what the criteria really are for promotion on the non-tenure track. I think that actually enters in to some of this thinking about communication being more clearly disseminated for tenure than for other promotions. "Overall, how satisfied are you with the ways in which your role as a faculty member at Duke and your life outside of Duke fit together?" Other than the ecstatic people in Law (laughter) and then the people in Medicine, everyone else is pretty much in the same place. It makes you wish you had gone and gotten a JD (laughter). "If you could decide all over again whether to be a faculty member at Duke, what would you decide?" Everyone wants to go to Law again,

Medicine is a little low, and everyone else is sort of in between. They were choosing between "I would choose to come to Duke," "I would have some second thoughts," and "I would choose not to come to Duke." So this is people who agree that they would choose to come to Duke. These numbers are not terrible overall, but obviously we can still continue to make positive progress. That was just giving you a very broad flavor. The question is, you get all these data, what do you do with it? Where do we go from here? The Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement has something pretty big to deal with, really thinking about these parameters and how to make progress. What David Jamieson-Drake, Jiali Luo and their colleagues did this year was take all of the data and look at the answers that correlated positively or negatively with satisfaction. What you're going to see is quadrants. Things that are in the upper right hand quadrant show both high satisfaction and high importance. That's what you want. You want people to really be satisfied with things and important things, not trivial things. In the upper left hand quadrant, these are areas of opportunity. Because these are things that are important to people, but don't correlate with satisfaction. They are things that people want to have happen, but they're not really satisfied with. The idea would be, if you could improve the things that are in the upper left hand quadrant, then you would actually have things that you can target and move forward. It will be easier to have an idea what I'm talking about when you see the data. I couldn't resist showing the women in Law, but we have this for every school. All the women in Law are bundled up in the right hand corner here, so there are obviously no opportunities for improvement (laughter). "Colleagues value their research and scholarship," right on the border, "Women faculty with family responsibilities viewed equally," those are right on the border.

Maybe for women in Law, those are things that could be tweaked to make them happier. Now look at overall satisfaction of women in the Social Sciences. You can see there are a lot of things in the corner here that are things you should target for improvement. For instance, some of those are feeling included in an informal network, opportunities to collaborate with faculty in the department, a strong sense of belonging to a community of faculty, chair helps obtain resources, having a voice in the decision making. A lot of these things have to do with intangibles but there are tangible things that have to do with faculty governance in departments and schools, with mentoring, with intentionality by the chairs of departments as to how they treat different members of the department, et cetera. By getting the unit-level data, you can start to think about, within each group, what's important and what's not important. Key factors driving overall satisfaction, for instance, this is non-clinical overall, you see the same thing. Everybody wants a strong sense of belonging to the community, informal network, chair helping them to obtain resources, et cetera. These are Black non-clinical faculty. Similar kind of analysis. I think it would be helpful to drill down in all areas at what pieces you might be able to make progress on. My last slide here is next steps. It will be important for us to share results with colleagues, faculty, and administrators who actually have leverage to pull in response to these observations, discuss with faculty, and generate action items. We are gathering it and we have AAU peer data if anyone wants to see how we compare to some of our peers on some of these measures. We can analyze survey responses by department where possible. We can't always do that because of small numbers of certain ethnic groups, for instance, in some departments. We don't want to do anything to reveal the identity of individuals, but certainly, when the group is

large enough, we can do that. As Emily mentioned, as diversity standing committees are formed in schools, these reports will be shared with them so that they can discuss with their Deans to try to figure out how to address issues that are identified through the survey. That was the whirlwind tour of a lot of data, so I'm happy to answer any questions.

Alex Rosenberg (Philosophy): Do you have an idea whether the AAU peer data is comparable and can you say very briefly how we compare?

Kornbluth: I really have only seen little pieces of it, and from what I can see, we're not really far off from any of our peers. But I have not seen any comprehensive analysis. In the small amount of data I've seen, I think we're fairly comparable, to be honest.

Robert Wolpert (Statistics): I'd like to suggest that there may be some compounding here between length of service and both gender and race and it is possible that you may be misattributing certain gender and race features that are really aspects of junior status.

Kornbluth: Yes. And we actually have all these data also broken down by rank. It just became too cumbersome to pull them out in the presentation, but absolutely. We have the gender data, the ethnicity data, all by rank, time of service, et cetera.

Wolpert: It adjusts for length of service at Duke?

Kornbluth: Yes. That we can do.

Klein: One of the things is to make the data available to schools that allow you on tableau to actually manipulate to look at

subcategories that you want to, not just look at the plots that are given to you.

Josh Sosin (Classical Studies / Library / Member of ECAC): My recollection, and I think it was borne out by what I might have been able to read with some of the questions that went by, is that some of the questions ask the respondent to address satisfaction in a way where it's not clear, there might be two different answers with regard to satisfaction with regard to performance in departments, as against school or administration, somehow differently defined. That's a kind of lead that I don't think you're going to be able to get out of the existing data. But that might be worth looking at, because wherever there is distance in either direction, between department and school or university, that might tell you something important about the kind of remedy that it would be susceptible to. It seems like you can't currently see this on some questions.

Kornbluth: I agree. The other thing is that, even if the questions were framed in a way that always revealed that, frankly, as an individual trying to look at the large mass of data, you really have to focus on those individual points that you're interested in and dig deep into that. It's really impossible to give an overall impression for something like that.

Speaker: The question about criteria for tenure is one of the questions that's a little bit different than questions about how you feel about being at Duke. I think what that question is telling us is that there are a lot of people who don't feel like they know what the criteria for tenure is. Unlike some of the others, it seems to me that that's one that the university has a lot of control over.

Kornbluth: It's interesting because we do have an information session every year for

new junior faculty explaining it, but there are probably a lot of people who may not have had it when they started and have drifted past that point. So I think that's a good point that we can open up further. The other thing is, talking with the APT committee, we had the dinner last night for folks who are on APT, this was brought up, I think it might be worth it for the APT committee to sit down again at the beginning of the next academic year and spend at least a whole session looking through how these things are defined in the Faculty Handbook. A lot of those are somewhat historical documents, even though we do update them, but not in a very intentional way. They need to really go through and look carefully at all of the criteria and then re-communicate them out as a standalone. I found that doing the individual communications like when we had the gathering, I was astounded at some of the misconceptions. I do think doing that in a way that's released to the whole community and then inviting people to sessions for any questions is a good thing to do.

Stefano Curtarolo (Pratt): Those are rates perceptions, but some of the questions, you could also have quantitative data. I'm thinking about salaries, lab space, and stuff like that. Do the perceptions correlate with the quantitative data?

Kornbluth: That's a really good question that I don't think has really ever been looked at.

Curtarolo: For example, one that could be easy to do is salaries between male and female. Is there a difference at Duke?

Kornbluth: Exactly. Merlise Clyde has been looking at this and at salary equity across the university, looking within units. What's the status now on that?

Jokerst: We're going to be doing another faculty salary equity survey next year. We do it every two years so we'll have the analysis of that by the end of next year.

Kornbluth: And we can correlate it. It is interesting to me because I have had conversations with people who do perceive that they're individually way off equity, and when you look, sometimes they're absolutely right, and sometimes they don't realize what the salary standard is. So I think that's a really important question.

Jokerst: Thank you very much, Sally (applause).

INTERIM REPORT FROM THE CHAIR OF THE MASTER'S IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

Jokerst: Following the February 2015 presentation from Dean Paula McClain on Master's degrees at Duke, Provost Kornbluth formed a committee to address some of the findings of that report. Professor Bob Korstad, chair of that committee, is here to give an interim report on the work done so far this year.

Before Professor Korstad presents, Provost Kornbluth will say a few introductory words.

Kornbluth: As Nan said, Paula and her colleagues submitted a report last year on the status of Master's degrees at Duke and it called into question a number of issues that Bob will be highlighting, but what we decided to do was have a group of faculty look at the recommendations of the report and try to think about what we can do moving forward. It will be interesting, if we have a few moments for discussion after Bob's presentation, because there were some questions that were thrown out. For instance: Do we have too many Master's programs? Should we put a cap on Master's programs?

My sense, going into this, was that it is going to be very difficult to have uniform answers to those questions. There is a great deal of heterogeneity from unit to unit, and so, as I think you'll see from Bob, that is sort of, indeed, what happened. Global recommendations on that issue are difficult, as are whether we should financially tax for each service. We don't have yet a good idea of what the utilization of the various services at the university are for Master's students versus undergraduates and PhD students. So I think what you'll hear from Bob, having read through the report, is we really have to think about front-end controls when we approve Master's degrees, and also, what happens at the time of, for instance, the first third year review? I think some of this is going to fall under, as many of you know, Keith Whitfield is moving on to be Provost at Wayne State, so he is probably glad he doesn't have to deal with that (laughter), so whoever is selected for the next Vice Provost for Academic Affairs will be charged with thinking seriously about some of the things the committee suggested, but also to think about whether the time before the third year review is really a provisional period. The committee of faculty really need to decide if the program has begun to fulfill its original promise or not. Front-end controls plus serious analysis of sunsetting is something that we're going to have to think about as one way to control numbers on an individual level rather than make blanket statements. Bob will give you a lot more granularity about what the committee suggested in terms of those kinds of controls. I really want to thank Bob and the committee. They grappled with some difficult issues to try to come up with some sort of recommendations moving forward.

Bob Korstad (Sanford School of Public Policy): Thanks to the committee for all their hard work. This group is really distributed around the university and has a mix of administrators and faculty members. All these faculty members have pretty extensive experience working with Master's programs so that was very helpful. Just a couple reminders here about the various roles of Master's programs: as a terminal degree, a step towards a PhD program, a credential like an MBA, experimenting with graduate-level work. I'm a product of a terminal Master's program in Political Economy that was one of the most challenging and rewarding intellectual experiences of my life. I think these programs have an important role to play in the university and I think we all thought that. We've got two kinds of programs here, ones that are research-oriented that are under the Graduate School, and then the professional schools have a whole variety of Master's programs themselves. You can see the overall numbers (refers to slide). These are some of the issues that were raised by the report. There were a lot of different issues. I tried to divide up the recommendations that we're making in three areas. One is the start. It seems to me that the most important place to make changes in the Master's environment of the university is to do that when new programs are started. We really made some suggestions on a much more rigorous evaluation by Academic Council and other bodies on campus. When new programs are proposed, we've given an appendix, a long list of suggestions on the different kinds of questions that should be answered. And maybe one of the most important ones is, what role do they have to play, both in the discipline, in the school or department, but what role do they have to play in the larger university? So people are really thinking about these things, not just creating them right from the beginning. Better coordination, communication, reporting of existing programs in all kinds of different ways. Making sure that in admissions, that's one of the big areas here,

particularly with a lot of the new admissions of international students, a lot of questions were raised in the report and with some of the discussions we've had about English language proficiency from some of these programs. We had some ideas about that. Making sure programs understand what the resource demands are they're going to be imposing on the university when they start. This is a question that came up in the trustees committee more than anywhere else: making sure that students, when they enroll in Master's programs, where very few have access to financial aid or fellowships, making sure they understand what the financial demands are going to be on them and that they've done some kind of evaluation that there's going to be some sort of payback for them. Better communication and coordination of reporting and sharing information: I was surprised that the person who does all the financials at the Sanford School couldn't really tell me how costs across the school were allocated for the Master's programs. So I put him in touch with people in Nursing and in Fuqua who are doing a much better job of that. There needs to be a lot more coordination. We need to develop a whole range of ways of understanding and reporting who is utilizing a whole variety of university services. There are some ways of doing that already but we probably need to be doing more of that. Tracking students after they leave: very few Master's programs keep track of their students when they graduate. I think the Career Center was particularly concerned about this, because these are people who can help put people in line for internships and jobs and things like that. Then just the coordination more generally of the Master's programs so that people who are running these are meeting and thinking about these issues. The final issue, and I think this may be one of the most important, is the need for Master's programs to go through really

rigorous regular reviews. One of the things we're proposing is, after three years after the implementation of a program, there is an outside evaluation of that program. And if the program is not doing what it should be doing, maybe that's a decision by the Provost or some other people to do that. A more rigorous evaluation every eight years, when departments or schools are evaluated by outside evaluations, we're trying to make some suggestions on very particular questions that outside evaluators can ask about Master's programs. Right now, they're just kind of thrown in with all of the graduate programs. Finally, there should be possibly an annual report. It doesn't have to be a long report that comes to the Provost's office in some form, from every Master's program. So someone can sit down and get a bird's eye view of how the programs are performing every year, what some of the differences might be.

Kornbluth: I think that's to the point. Some of these things, someone will come up with a goal of X number of students and at year three they want to be at 3% of X, and that kind of thing. There will be some flexibility, but each one of these programs requires infrastructure, even though it's a small program. Coming back to really look at a granular level is important. For instance, there are some departments where the Master's students share classes with the PhD students and some that do not. The other thing that I don't remember if you mentioned here that we really have to think about is, there are some departments that are offering courses that are used heavily by other Master's programs, and I do think we need to think carefully about what the compensation mechanism for that should be, because it really overburdens some programs beyond what is sustainable. I do think that the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, working with the departments and schools, is going to have

15

to look carefully about where programs are cross-utilizing courses and figure out an equitable way to compensate programs that are bearing much more of the load for educating people across other programs.

Korstad: Yeah, for example, don't require a statistics course in your Master's program if you don't have someone in your department or school who can teach it and your expectation is to just go somewhere else.

Kornbluth: Unless you're going to compensate them.

Korstad: There needs to be some sort of compensation system for that.

Sosin: Thank you very much. I like the idea of enhanced rigor at the front end. But having seen some of that, there have been plenty of cases where I can't really imagine how much tougher the review committee could have been. I wonder, have you gone back through those initial proposals to see how often department projections about enrollment or staffing or personnel or any of this are likely to be on target? Apart from Fuqua, which, after recent performances, the first recommendation would be that they take us all to school on how to write these proposals, but in order to have a sense of how we can be more rigorous, I would think we would have to know where people tend to fail. Do we know that?

Korstad: My committee didn't look at that.

Kornbluth: We know some of this from the Graduate School Master's programs. It hasn't been looked at carefully in the professional Master's programs. I will echo that I think the template that came out of Fuqua could provide a model for some of the information that we need. I know Paula shows some data that shows that there are certainly some

Master's programs and PhD programs where there's a chronic failure to achieve the articulated enrollment goals. Whether that's because it wasn't marketed, or because the niche that they said they would fill doesn't actually exist out there in the market, requires further review. Part of the problem with the up-front control and the rigorous discussion, as you say, is, to some extent, you trust the colleagues who are proposing that this will work. It's often with very good intentions and honest expectations. That's why I do wonder, is the niche that is defined, actually in demand? That is one of the main things that we need to evaluate. In some cases, it's very clear that it didn't materialize. There are a couple programs, just recently, that elected to sunset because of this. There is some self-regulation that is going on, just providing a more formal structure for that.

Jane Richardson (Biochemistry): I was very taken by your point that they should be tracking their graduates and I think we need other criteria for students enrolled. We want to know whether these programs actually worked for them. I think we need to require people to track that.

Korstad: And we're not doing that. These students aren't even surveyed when they finish their programs on the satisfaction of the program. Never mind, five years down the road, was this something that was really valuable for them?

Kornbluth: They articulate these kinds of goals and what they think students will be doing at the time of graduation up front, and I think it will be really interesting to see if there's actually a match between what people are doing and what they said. We don't know the answer to that.

Jokerst: Thank you very much.

TRANSFER OF POWER TO ECAC FOR THE SUMMER MONTHS

Jokerst: At this point in our meeting, we transfer the power of the Academic Council to ECAC for the summer months. Our bylaws state that the Academic Council meet monthly during the academic year from September to May. At other times, the Chair or ECAC or ten members of the Council may call a meeting.

In recognition of the fact that it could be difficult to convene a meeting of the Council during the summer months, the Christie Rules provide that this Council can delegate to ECAC the authority to act in a consultative role to the Administration when the University is not in regular session.

ECAC now offers the following motion:

Whereas, the Christie Rules provide that at the last meeting of the Academic Council in any given academic year, the Council may delegate to the Executive Committee of the Academic Council the authority to appoint a committee of at least three Council members to serve in a consultative role to the Administration when the University is not in regular session, and whereas the Christie Rules note that this committee should normally consist of members of the Executive Committee of the Academic Council if they are available, ECAC recommends to the Academic Council and moves that the authority to create such a committee be delegated to the Chair and Executive Committee of the Council, and that such committee once formed would remain in operation until the first day of the fall semester of the 2016-2017 academic year.

(Approved by voice vote without dissent)

The May Academic Council meeting is now adjourned – thank you everyone and I hope all of you have a relaxing and enjoyable summer.