

Minutes of the Regular Meeting Of the Academic Council

Thursday, September 25 2003, 3:48-5:10 PM
139 Social Sciences

Nancy Allen (Clinical Sciences, Chair of the Academic Council) called the meeting to order, welcoming Council members to the first meeting of the new term.

Approval of Minutes of May 8

The minutes of the last previous meeting of the Council were offered for approval. There were no corrections, amendments, or discussion, and they were approved by voice vote, without dissent.

Announcements

EC AC (the Executive Committee of the Academic Council) has selected Paul Haagen (Law) as Vice Chair, and he has accepted this responsibility.

We welcome back Donald Fluke (BIO), who is returning as Faculty Secretary at this meeting. President Nannerl Keohane and Susan Roth (PSY-SHS) this week have announced a Women's Initiative Report, with our congratulations and thanks to them and to the committee. Council members and their colleagues are reminded of Founders' Day, to be observed October 2, and are encouraged to attend this Convocation event.

You may wish to know that the U.S. House of Representatives has granted the Federal Trade Commission the authority to establish the do not call list, with Senate approval still pending (last she had looked).

President Keohane has announced the formation of a Search Committee for Vice Chancellor of the Medical Center, chaired by Trustee Emeritus Roy Bostock. Other members include Nancy Allen (ClinSci, Acad. Council), Blanche Capel (CB), Elizabeth Clipp (NUR), Charles Hammond (OBGYN, and V. Chair of the committee), Daniel Kiehart (BIO), Will Mitchell (Fuqua), Joseph Moore (MED), and Dale Purves (NEURO). There are also representatives from the community, one student representative, and additional trustee representation. A letter dated August 26 from Roy Bostock was sent to all faculty soliciting suggestions and help in identifying candidates. The committee held its first meeting last week, and she (Nancy Allen) will continue to welcome faculty input as we are preparing a statement of criteria and qualifications for that position. Robert Saunders was introduced as the chair of GPSC (the Graduate and Professional School Council), who is doing wonderful things and has been elected to a second term. Matt Slovik, chair of DSG (the Duke Student Government), is out of town but may attend at some future meeting to be introduced.

Emily Klein (NSOE, O&ES) was then recognized to speak briefly about the changes in the Faculty Commons, anticipated at an earlier Council meeting. Director of Food Services James

Wulfhurst has engaged a new caterer for the Commons, Amy Tornquist of Sage and Swift. The food is vastly improved and the ambience also. Second, with the closing of the Oak Room, a campus restaurant where faculty and students could eat together, it has been decided to encourage faculty to invite any guests they wish to join them in the Commons, students or others. Payment options now go beyond the faculty card or an IR to include student options as well, Duke points and flex cards. And menus are published in advance, and by e-mail. She invited questions. There were none, but her accomplishments were acknowledged by applause. Other announcements were invited, but there were none.

Approval of Degrees in Course Earned Over the Summer

Following usual custom a representative of each school or college was recognized to offer the names of students to be approved in behalf of the faculty and recommended to the Trustees, their names being recorded on lists delivered to the Faculty Secretary. The numbers for each degree were as follows:

Trinity College of Arts and Sciences	
Dean Robert H. Thompson, Jr.	
Bachelor of Arts	47
Bachelor of Science	16
Pratt School of Engineering	
Dean Kristina M. Johnson	
Bachelor of Science in Engineering	6
Master of Engineering Management	6
School of Nursing	
Dean Mary T. Champagne	
Master of Science in Nursing	9
Nicholas School of the Environment and Earth Sciences Dean	
William H. Schlesinger	
Master of Environmental Management	4
Fuqua School of Business	
Dean Douglas T. Breeden	
Master of Business Administration	113
Divinity School	
Dean L. Gregory Jones	
Master of Divinity	5
Master of Theological Studies	5
Master of Theology	3

School of Law		
Dean Katherine T. Bartlett		
	Juris Doctor	6
	Master of Laws	1
School of Medicine		
Dean R. Sanders Williams		
	Master of Health Sciences	3
	Master of Health Sciences in Clinical Research	3
	Master of Health Sciences in Clinical Leadership	5
The Graduate School		
Dean Lewis M. Siegel		
	Master of Arts	25
	Master of Arts in Teaching	10
	Master of Science	14
	Master of Public Policy	2
	Doctor of Philosophy	52
	TOTAL	332

The lists of names having been received Joshua Socolar (EC AC, PHY) made the two customary motions, that the candidates for the various degrees be approved in behalf of the Faculty of Duke University and forwarded to the Board of Trustees for final approval, and that the Provost be empowered in the name of the Faculty to make any last minute adjustments to the lists of candidates, so that no person fully qualified should fail to receive a diploma, nor should any be granted to a person who is not fully qualified. The two motions were approved by voice vote, without dissent to either.

Faculty Scholar Award Committee Report

Benjamin Ward (PHL), reporting as chair of the Faculty Scholar Committee, was unable to be present by reason of a conflict, and the report was read by Nancy Allen from the chair. It was gratifying that eighteen departments this year, more than usual, offered a total of twenty-three nominations for this highest award bestowed by the Faculty. The criteria are (1) an impressively high overall grade point average, (2) evidence of truly independent work already completed, in course, or projected for the current academic year, (3) potential for innovative scholarship, and (4) an avowed intention to pursue a scholarly career in an academic setting. Nancy Allen added that the award has developed a most distinguished record as evidenced by two of our Scholars last year having won Rhodes Scholarships as well. The committee offered three candidates for approval as Faculty Scholars by the Academic Council. These three seniors — on paper and in person — stand out as exceptionally impressive young scholars who epitomize the very ideals which this Award was established to recognize and promote.

Ethan Duff Eade (Computer Science & Mathematics), "Analysis of Overlay Description"
Sarah Kiersten Hudson (Program II: Latino/a Studies), "History of the Book and English
Literature"
David William Marks (Mathematics), "Derived Categories. Little-Higgs Mechanics."

Two students were named for Honorable Mention by the committee, also: William Tyler Gibson (Biology) and Jinendra Raja Jain (Electrical Engineering, Computer Science, and Economics). Ben Ward thanked all those who had helped this year, and the other members of the committee: Carol Eckerman (Psychological & Brain Sciences), George Truskey (Biomedical Engineering), and Peter Wood (History). The report was then approved by enthusiastic voice vote of the Academic Council, without dissent.

Election to the Faculty Hearing Committee

The Council had received listings of the continuing members and proposed new members of the Faculty Hearing Committee, (FHC). The members continuing into 2005 include:

Trina Jones (Law),
Carol Meyers (Religion),
Christopher Schroeder (Law), and
Peter Wood (History).

The members continuing into 2004 include:

John Baillie (Gastroenterology/Medicine),
Thomas Bashore (Cardiology/Medicine),
Robert Mosteller (Law) CHAIR, and
Kenneth Reckhow (Nicholas School of the Environment and Earth Sciences).

The nominees for new member, continuing into 2006, include:

Lawrence Carin (Electrical & Computer Engineering),
Sally Kornbluth (Cancer Biology),
Ralf Michaels (Law), and
Christina Williams (Psychological & Brain Sciences).

After opportunity for discussion the nominees for new members for the FHC were approved by voice vote, without dissent, and with the thanks of the Council for this service to the University.

Academic Council Bylaw Change (see minutes of May 8 and April 24 for background)

Nancy Allen commented that the next agenda item had been before the Council at its two previous meetings. On April 24 the Academic Council heard a report from Fred Nijhout and EC AC on the extension of eligibility to serve on the Academic Council. This change was then approved at the May 8 Council meeting. At that time ECAC also distributed the language pre-

circulated for today for the proposed bylaw language changes. It's a bit complicated in that there are two sets of bylaws which require changes. The Council can vote on changing the Academic Council bylaw language today, and then at the Annual Faculty meeting on October 16 the faculty needs to ratify the bylaw change in the University Faculty Bylaws. The Council has both sets of bylaw changes, with the parts underlined that will be deleted, and italicized for the revised language. She invited comments and there being none called on her colleague and predecessor as Academic Council chair, Peter Burian (Classical Studies), to help out with this matter.

Peter Burian asked if everyone had a copy of the resolution. Some indicating that they did not, he proceeded to read out the resolution, to wit, the action just described to the Council:

"In order to implement the extension of eligibility to serve on the Academic Council to regular rank, non-tenure track faculty, as approved by the Council on May 8, 2003, the Council accepts the amendments of its Bylaws proposed by EC AC and circulated at that time. These changes will become effective upon approval of the corresponding changes in the Bylaws of the University Faculty to be voted upon at the October annual meeting of the faculty."

That is the resolution. Not supposing that it's in any way controversial, he'd like to say a little about it at this time. First, he wanted to thank a couple of people. One was present, Richard Riddell, the regular rank non-tenure track faculty member who has made this issue his *Carthago delenda est*, and has kept reminding him that this is something that we ought to pay attention to and do something about. "We finally have, Richard. Thank you." He also wanted to thank his colleague and friend, Fred Nijhout, who could not be here today. Peter Burian was sorry to have left the Council chair without having got this done, and it was Fred who took up the ball and did get it done, "so I'm very grateful to him as well." This action is part of a process, the penultimate step in broadening this Council and democratizing it. It is also a recognition of the importance of regular rank non-tenure track faculty. Many of these colleagues have made this University their home for a long time and have contributed enormously to the well-being and progress of Duke University. Some are artists, musicians, and performers in the realm of dance and theater who have distinguished themselves and done wonderful things here both as teachers and as artists. Others are dedicated and highly professional teachers in the increasingly important area of foreign language instruction. There are professionals in areas like Public Policy who bring the benefit of practical experience in the world to their teaching. And there are skilled professionals who are willing to undertake onerous and essential duties, Directors of Undergraduate Studies and similar responsibilities. In implementing the possibility of service on the Council to this group of faculty we recognize the growing and increasingly important role of these wonderful colleagues. So, he asked, at this point whether there is further discussion of the implementation of the motion?

Nancy Allen thanked Peter Burian for those eloquent words in behalf of our colleagues and put the Council Bylaw resolution to a vote. The ayes having it, and with no dissent, she declared the resolution unanimously passed.

Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Committee Annual Report by the Provost

Provost Peter Lange first noted that while there was nothing remarkable this year in this annual report the effort to push down responsibility to units and deans for making the critical decisions on tenure, the hard job, is having success and should continue. Changes in procedure under a "rule of reasonableness" with respect to requirements is helping spend the time on the more difficult cases. He wanted publicly to acknowledge the excellent service of members of the APT Committee:

Meg Grier (Romance Studies), who has stepped down to become Chair of
her department,
Rick Lischer (Divinity School), who has completed his term,
Ken Surin (Literature), who will return next year after serving a part of this
year as acting Chair of his department, and
Weitao Yang (Chemistry), who has completed his term.

He wanted also to acknowledge last year's chair of APT, Paula McClain (Political Science), now stepped down, who instituted some excellent new internal procedures that further enhance the quality of deliberations and the interactions with departmental chairs and with deans. He also acknowledged the superb assistance of Jeane Bross and Robert Russell in the committee's operations.

He turned next to the data, referring to a series of overheads. For 2002-3 there were only 14 cases requiring tenure decision, but there were ten in addition who requested early reviews. With the withdrawal of one candidate and negative departmental decisions on three, the APT Committee had 19 cases to review, compared with 16 in the preceding year, and a somewhat higher number in the two preceding years. The committee recommended that tenure be granted in 17 cases, that it not be granted in one case, and could not reach a definitive decision (an absolute majority of the thirteen members) in one case. He had reviewed all the cases, agreeing with the committee in their one negative decision, and deciding to grant tenure in the non-definitive case. There was one additional case voted negatively by the committee but which was not completed because other circumstances intervened. Overall, the percentage receiving tenure may seem high. The large number of early decisions, which are generally strong cases because of the one-time limit on being considered for tenure, contributes to that impression, as well as there having been three negative decisions made at the departmental level.

Two further observations may be useful. Over 89% of committee votes on all internal tenure cases were unanimous or unanimous but one, consistent with past years. This was true of all types of cases, although there were more mixed votes than in past years. Also, this year there were no unanimous or unanimous but one *negative* votes, something which had occurred in the two previous years. This difference likely reflects better decision making at the departmental level.

A more meaningful measure is our success in initially hiring, subsequently nurturing, and then carefully selecting faculty for tenure is the percentage of any cohort of faculty who enter as Asst.

Profs, and who achieve tenure. Arts & Sciences is large enough to provide meaningful data, considered in two-year cohorts. Of the most recent such cohort (1995-97) 48% received tenure, slightly below our twelve-year average of 55%. Remembering that the numbers are small for drawing confident inference, in this most recent such cohort we saw a somewhat larger percentage leaving in the first four years, such that only 62% reached the tenure year, the lowest among the six two-year cohorts here considered. Correspondingly, this cohort had the second highest percentage receiving tenure among those reaching the tenure year, 83%. What might this pattern in the data reflect? It may hopefully be better discrimination and signaling by departments. It may be an improved reappointment process. We have tended to reappoint a higher percentage but have also tightened the process of reappointment to assure extremely clear evaluations of work to date, including guidance about what will be necessary to attain tenure, and signals about prospects of tenure given the current trajectory of research and teaching.

For promotions to Full Prof, a change was introduced two years ago in a review of APT procedures, so that excellence is required in two of the three areas of research, teaching, and service, and good performance in the third. The committee approved 13 of 15 cases this year and he had approved the one case with a non-definitive committee judgment.

For external recruitments with tenure, APT reviewed 27 cases from departments and schools, with an additional five from the Law School, reviewed solely by the Provost according to the rules. Of the 27 reviewed by APT two subsequently withdrew. Of the remaining 25, APT positively recommended 21 and provided a non-definitive vote in one additional case. Ultimately, 28 cases were approved by the Provost and recommended to the Trustees, including four in Law and 24 from the rest of the University, a somewhat higher number of external tenures approved than in the preceding year.

In sum, the process is working well, but we need to be ever vigilant that we use the process to develop the best possible faculty we can, to assure that the process rewards the quality and types of activities on the part of our faculty which advance both their careers and the research and teaching missions of the University.

Under *discussion* Barbara Shaw (CHM) noted the approximate equivalence of numbers for internal and external candidates. What are the implications for up through the ranks vs bringing in from the outside? Is there a change in policy? The Provost said there was no intention toward making a change; the numbers vary from year to year. He asked Dean William Chafe (A&S) to comment, and Dean Chafe said that there were a number of senior slots to be filled this year, senior leadership in cases needing it. In response to a question about evaluation of teaching in tenure review, Provost Lange said that having machine readable student evaluation forms was providing good detail. And the service contribution is based on the department chair's letter and evaluation, what the Dean may know, and a self-evaluation, which brings in more about outside professional activities.

Srinavas Aravamudan (English) asked for more about reasons why people leave, and the Provost said that exit interviews were hard to track and may not get reliable answers. We do not lose very many junior faculty we want to retain. Dean Chafe agreed. Reminding the Council that the

Clinical Sciences APT is separately reported from time to time, Nancy Allen thanked the Provost for this report, and the membership of APT for their hard work.

Response to Reports from the Task Force on Diversity and the Women's Faculty Development Task Force (presented in May), by the Provost

Peter Lange: "The conclusion of last year's report on the Black Faculty Strategic Initiative (BFSI) is a good starting point for us on this occasion. In concluding that report, I noted that the time has come to devise a new diversity plan appropriate for Duke University in the early 21st century. That intention, combined with the efforts of the Women's Initiative, led directly to the establishment of the two task forces on whose work I am following up today. With the steps I am announcing here, we will take the next steps toward fulfilling that intention and realizing that goal.

"Significant changes have occurred in the racial and ethnic demographics in the United States and in our own region, and we are substantially more engaged with the world, both in terms of research and teaching, and in terms of the composition of our students and faculty. These changes themselves suggest both challenges and opportunities for recruitment, retention, and curricular initiatives, so that we are well positioned to take advantage of the opportunities that a broadly diverse community offers. Ultimately we wish to achieve three interlocking goals: to draw the best faculty to Duke, along with the best students, to create an environment that engages, and hence retains, these talented teachers and researchers, and to ensure that our education prepares our students for life in a diverse society and a complex, interdependent world.

"It was only 41 years ago that Duke admitted its first Black students (1962). Our first Black faculty member, Samuel Dubois Cook, was hired even more recently, 36 years ago (1967). The 1994 Black Faculty Strategic Initiative, which led to the BFSI, emphasized the growing diversity of the American population and called for 'making the University responsive to the pluralistic society in which we live and work and to do so with the same excellence and distinction that has characterized this grand institution from inception.' It concluded with a statement that can serve us well today: 'Much more needs to be done to create the kind of academic environment which prepares our students to assume positions of visionary leadership for the new Century in a rapidly changing world. The achievement of the goals of this initiative is central to the achievement of the mission of the University as it confronts the 21st century.' (A Strategic Plan for Black Faculty Development, p. 15)

"The 21st century is now here. The mission of the University embraces diversity as an intellectual, educational, and social good as well as a cultural reality. As the current strategic plan *Building on Excellence* puts it, 'a community built around diversity in all its dimensions is critical to the quality and success of the contemporary university... Diversity leads to fresh thinking, innovation in problem solving, aesthetic creativity, and renewed wonder about the manifold aspects of our world.' (*Building on Excellence*, pp.54-55.)

"To formulate a broad faculty diversity plan for the next decade, I instituted task forces on faculty diversity and on women's faculty development. The chairs of those task forces reported

to the Council on the results of their work in the spring and I offered some initial reactions. I want today, as I promised earlier, to outline specifically the steps that will be taken in response to those reports. In introducing those measures, I wish to affirm here that, as we undertake this new initiative, we intend to see the progress we have made to date with the BFSI continue and be extended, creating the conditions for the future that will allow us to build on the successes we have achieved over the past decade and more."

1. The Provost, with the approval of the Executive Committee of the Academic Council, will form and charge a standing committee composed of faculty and administrators to advise the Provost on issues of faculty diversity, and to review unit efforts to recruit and retain women and minorities. The committee of 8-10 members will meet at least twice a year, and a subgroup of the committee will meet more frequently with administrators (Provost, V. Prov. For Academic and Administrative Services, and selected Deans). In the first year, this committee will evaluate every unit by using pool data that have already been collected, as well as collecting any additional needed data (e.g., by interviews with department chairs).

"The membership of this committee will include faculty from the Schools of Medicine and/or Nursing. It will assist in developing general policy guidelines and annual objectives, including areas on which to focus annual efforts. I state that because we need to recognize as we pursue this initiative that we cannot do everything at once. We need to target and have a strategic direction on an annual basis. It will also help us to evaluate the annual results of our policy efforts. There will also be a smaller faculty/administration operational group [that] will regularly identify effective administrative interventions and faculty interventions. [T]heir results and work with the administration [will help] on assuring that we are appropriately targeting our efforts."

2. The Office of Institutional Research will repeat the data collection process outlined in the Women's Faculty Development Task Force Report every other year, and combine with data traditionally presented in the yearly Black Faculty Strategic Initiative Report (Final report to be delivered to the Academic Council in October or November). A report will be issued in alternate years with the salary equity study.

"[This] refers to the role that data plays. As you all are aware, the Women's Faculty Development Task Force [especially] produced a good deal of data which we had not really been following in a close way. And we regularly had very good data on the BFSI which I've reported on annually here. What we want now to do is institutionalize the process of data collection, and what we're going to do is a follow-up on the data of the kind we used in the BFSI and the Women's Faculty Development Task Force every other year, alternating that with the salary equity study which is done in the alternate years. The Office of Institutional Research has the capabilities to do that and having done it once it will much easier to do in the future."

3. Deans of the Schools, or their academic dean designees, will conduct exit interviews on all departing faculty (tenure track and POPs), with the exception of retirees. The

interview protocol from Johns Hopkins will be used for the purpose. Results will be submitted to the Office of the Provost by June 30th.

"This is something I mentioned in response to Srinivas Aravamudan's question. The exit interviews can be most useful in learning what we are doing right and what we are doing wrong with regard to our faculty, and where there may be department, School, and University issues to be addressed. These exit interviews will not only be done with minority or women faculty, but with all faculty before leaving. At the same time, we recognize that not all departures can or should be prevented. In the case of the School of Medicine, with its very large annual turnover, especially on the clinical side, a more targeted policy may be in order and I'll be working with the Dean of the School of Medicine to figure out how best to implement such a policy in that setting."

4. The Provost's Office and the Standing Committee will review the annual documentation provided by the Deans on the number of women and minorities in the applicant and finalist pools of faculty searches.

"One of the areas we've identified as needing work is simply our follow-up to see how we're doing in the applicant and finalist pools. We will make this a formal part of the annual search plan requests that we receive from the Deans. I know many of the Deans have been collecting this data and we formally have to request and collect it anyway for Federal regulations. What we haven't been doing is using the data in a creative and constructive way. We do not intend to set any specific metrics but instead to assure that strong, good faith efforts are being made, reflecting as well the pools and the fields in which we're doing the searches. We will also provide assistance to Deans and search committees regarding how best to assure that the pool is diverse in ways appropriate to the field for which the search is being conducted."

5. Each Dean will establish a well thought out and clearly articulated mentoring process for faculty and for graduate, professional, and postdoctoral student with interests in entering the professoriate.

"The word 'mentoring' has come up so often with regard to Black faculty, to women faculty, and to men faculty that we need to undertake even more steps than we have. This issue initially arose in the report of the Task Force on Black Faculty Development that led to the BFSI a decade ago. In fulfilling the BFSI successfully, more attention was given to the numerical goals, although mentoring was also addressed in some units and was discussed several time in the Deans' Cabinet in the last couple of years. And we had very explicit discussions in the Deans' Cabinet about what was going on in each school.

"It is now time to give this matter even greater and more focused attention. The need for systematic mentoring came up frequently in the focus groups and other interviews that were part of the Women's Initiative and the work of the Diversity Task Force. It is also an integral part of our efforts to foster the development of our entire faculty. In fact, we have generally found that where mentoring in units is effective, it is effective for all faculty, and where it is not effective, that too is true for all faculty. This goal represents a further focusing and intensification of our

efforts, taking advantage of what we've learned from the Women's Faculty Development Task Force and the Diversity Task Force to enhance our mentoring efforts across the faculty as a whole. Again, with regard to the School of Medicine there are particular challenges because of the number of faculty in that School and the way the individual department -just to give you a sense of this, in case you had any questions, the Department of Medicine is more than half as large as the entire Arts & Sciences. So we have challenges in the School of Medicine with respect to implementing the procedures and will be working with the Dean and his staff to do that."

6. The Deans will develop mechanisms to improve recognition of faculty women and minorities as distinguished chairs, and as recipients of awards and honors from professional societies.

"This point really speaks for itself. We had substantial success in the last year simply by raising the issue to a higher level of consciousness among administrators and faculty leaders. That effort will be continued. I should also stress that this process comes from the ground up. It is the recommendations of faculty to Chairs, Chairs to Deans, and Deans to Provost and the Distinguished Professors Committee that makes this process successful. We don't want to be [collecting] from the Provost's Office [the] faculty for these kinds of honors. We think it should be generated by those who know the work best. But we need to pay close attention to the [possibility] that there are not subtle gender or minority [biases] being reflected in a pattern of the award of these matters. I should tell you that in general - this won't come as a surprise I'm sure to all the women in the room ~ we have discovered that male faculty tend to be somewhat more assertive about their right to certain of these things that do women faculty."

7. Through group meetings and one-on-one sessions, the Provost will provide ongoing leadership and encouragement to Deans and Department Chairs regarding diversity goals.

"This next goal speaks for itself. Many have recognized that our institutional commitment to diversity, as embodied in the University's mission statement and in *Building on Excellence*, is best underlined by the publicly expressed commitment to the value of diversity by the senior leadership of the University and by the steps we take to follow up on that commitment. We will certainly do that."

8. The Provost's Office and the Standing Committee will collect and publicize examples of successful Duke programs for building pipelines for minorities.

"There was considerable discussion particularly in the Diversity Task Force about pipelines for minorities. The pipeline issues seem to be extremely salient in certain groups. The research of the two task forces has revealed that pipeline issues are more salient for minorities, on the whole, than for women but are relevant for both at different stages of the faculty member's development. We should devote attention to building these pipelines along the age spectrum and thus ensuring a stream of minority faculty in under-represented fields, when possible; we should also seek to assure that women too are comfortable entering academic fields in which they have traditionally had lower representation. Indeed, we are already doing so in several areas around

the institution, and promulgating information about these programs can be instructive and inspirational. In some fields, programs for post docs as one example, [there] will prove to be especially fruitful targets for our resources. And I should mention, by the way, that the Dean of the School of Medicine and I have recently approved a new program to create an organization for the post docs at Duke University to pay greater attention to the needs and issues of post docs and give them a forum where they can be well represented and have their interests well represented with respect to their individual departments and schools."

9. Through the provision of funds to support grassroots networking activity of women faculty, the Provost's Office will facilitate the development of their personal and professional connections that cross departmental boundaries..

"One of the issues that regularly came up was networking. Now, again, it is not the responsibility of the administration to create networks among faculty. But the administration can be helpful in providing resources, in this case the money so you can eat together, [by providing] the resources to allow these networks to thrive. And that's what this provision really refers to. If the networks don't develop among the faculty themselves, we are not going to create them."

10. The Provost's Office will provide central financial support for the new faculty diversity initiative, with up to \$1M of funds per year to enhance the strategic hiring of women and minority faculty.

"Finally, my Office will provide central financial [support] up to \$1M, which is an increase of about - it depends on the year - somewhere between \$450K and \$300K over the current [level] to enhance strategic hiring of women and minority faculty. The basic mechanisms are an extension, with increased funding, of the efforts we have undertaken for the BFSI. The Schools of Medicine and Nursing will not be covered under the Provost's incentive funds but I am in discussion with the Deans and the Chancellor [of Health Affairs] regarding whether and how financial incentives might be made available and structured in those schools and more generally, how minority and women's hiring will be promoted in those Schools. We intend strongly to continue our efforts to hire Black faculty and to increase the intensity of our efforts to encourage the hiring of women and faculty of other minorities, thereby further promoting the goal of building an outstanding faculty. As the reports of the Diversity and Women's Faculty Development Task Forces made clear, our new efforts must continue the example set by the BFSI, but must use a more varied set of means to achieve our goals, ones that are tailored to the specific character of the field and unit. Financial incentives will be appropriate in some cases, but so too will administrative encouragement without such incentives in other situations. As the commitment to a diverse faculty becomes an even more integral part of our institutional culture and of our recognition of how best to attain excellence in teaching and research, fewer of these central initiative should become needed.

"Let me now conclude. Diversity of our faculty is a critical asset to our capacity to develop excellence in teaching and research. Our commitment to it assures that we seek out talent wherever it is to be found and hence build the best faculty we can. Our achievement of it assures

that we best prepare our students for the kind of world in which they will need to live and work. The plan for the new Faculty Diversity Initiative that I have announced today allows us to pursue these goals in a manner consistent with our core values and mission. It will contribute to the continued improvement in the quality of Duke University as a place where research and teaching thrive in an intellectually vibrant and challenging climate. I look forward to working with you to achieve these goals." Thanking the Council Provost Lange invited questions.

Under *discussion* Roxanne Springer (PHY) noted that three key leadership positions are falling vacant next year. In relation to the 10-point plan the commitment of the new deans will be important. In particular, we're looking for a new Dean of Arts & Sciences. Can the Provost perhaps say what the search committees are doing, and maybe what he personally can do, to influence their decisions in accurate gauge of the commitment of the candidates [to these goals], impressing upon them how important it is that they really own this initiative and show by their own personal past behavior and experience that they are really committed to it.

Provost Lange said that he had the responsibility for one of these searches, that for the Dean of Arts & Sciences, and that he certainly had been strongly encouraging that search committee that they seek the widest pool of candidates and be aware of this commitment. The point will be crucial as they interview these candidates, especially in the second round. He agreed with the concern raised and could speak for the President - who is present and can speak for herself— that we will certainly consider this matter as one of our strategic priorities for the University. It's something to which he had committed some time, effort and resources to assure that we find a Dean who also reflects those values.

President Keohane said that in the search for Chancellor of Health Affairs also, yes, we're trying to do what the question has asked. We realize that there will be a pool of potential candidates that will include some women and minorities, but by the nature of the job, there will not be as many as we might wish. It will be very important to make sure that whoever is chosen will be sensitive to these issues and committed to making a difference. One of the members of the search committee, Blanche Capel (CB), is also a member of the Faculty Women's Leadership Group. One of the things that she sees among her responsibilities as a member of that committee is to make sure that the questions and concerns of women faculty and administrators in the committee are voiced.

Nancy Allen assured the Provost that since she, also, sits on both the Presidential Search Committee and the Chancellor Search Committee she takes the comments to heart. She and her colleagues on both of those search committees will be well aware of the direction of questions brought up by the Provost.

Randall Kramer (NSEES) remarked that mentoring has been a goal we've thought a lot about as an institution, but without perhaps as much progress as we would wish. "Could you share your thoughts on why this has been difficult and what we could do different in the fixture?"

Provost Lange could share some thoughts, at least at a personal level. One of the issues is that there is some reluctance [about whether mentoring is OK.] It's not about the part of mentoring

where the Chair has a formal meeting every year. It instead depends on the inclinations of faculty in the department to undertake those activities. Appropriately, we don't tend to come down too hard on individual faculty members to do these kind of things, so part of it means changing the culture. During his now 22 years at Duke, he had encountered faculty colleagues who think it is inappropriate to mentor younger colleagues. "I made it," — we all know that particular discourse. Other faculty members are simply reluctant to mentor, feeling that they may perhaps endanger themselves. If they give someone advice, and the person doesn't get tenure, they might be sued. There are many stories that can be spun. What we really need to do is first of all make sure that our administrators empower faculty to play this role properly, and that we make full use, as described earlier, of the reappointment process. That is one important mentoring step. It sets out criteria which then a Chair can use, because the year after the Chair can say, look, you got this letter last year - let's talk about what you've accomplished. Fundamentally though, mentoring is a cultural thing. The grass roots mentoring of faculty, rather than its administratively mandated form, really depends on the culture of the institution and good will of faculty members one on one to engage their colleagues in their departments to talk about their progress and careers. Cultural change is slow, especially in a place where we all believe, as faculty members, that we are entitled to do our own thing.

Barbara Shaw (CHM) asked about point 10, and the \$1M for recruiting relevant new faculty. Does that include start-up funds, all the things it takes to get started? Provost Lange answered that it does not, although in exceptional circumstances there has been some assistance with start-up funds. The basic mechanism that was used under the BFSI was full financing of the line of the faculty member in the first year and then a walk-down over 3-5 years into the school's budget. In our decentralized budget system, the Provost's Office cannot carry a position over long periods of time, because we don't have the resources to do that. But even so, we have occasionally helped with start-ups. The advantage of doing the salary part is that eventually the funds return to us. As we stop walking down salary funds we retain more of that money and can turn it to another purpose. Once we spend funds for start up, they're gone. Barbara Shaw remarked that also the \$1M total is not even half of the start-up funds needed in some cases. The Provost agreed that that's true occasionally. One other thing is that start-up funds presumably are recompensed by indirect cost recovery, from grants that people receive. But indirect cost recoveries almost all go to the schools, so crudely put, if the Provost pays the start-up funds all the [resultant] indirect cost recoveries go to the schools. Eventually the Provost has no money. The schools are better off, but the cycle doesn't repeat.

Ann Brown (Clinical Sciences) wanted to thank the Provost for his extraordinary efforts to bring the Medical Center on board, which the Provost appreciated, also acknowledging Dean Sanders Williams as an outstanding partner in these efforts.

Nancy Allen thanked the Provost for the comprehensive list of action items from two very challenging and lengthy reports. She was also grateful for his working out some of the stickier issues with the School of Medicine, which represents a large number of faculty. EC AC will continue to work with him about the issues of the Diversity Standing Committee and will look forward to seeing the full report and final document.

Framework for Comprehensive Athletic Reform (Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics)

Nancy Allen promised to be very brief with the last item on the agenda in view of the hour (5:01). The Council may have wondered what an item on a Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics was doing among the pre-circulated materials. Well, a big part of ECAC's summer was spent on athletic issues. The Council heard one report last year from Kathleen Smith (BIO, Athletic Council, Chair) on an updated athletics document for our University. And about a year ago a number of faculty senate members or Academic Council-equivalent leaders in the Midwest got together with the seed idea of starting a coalition on intercollegiate athletics, which actually by e-mailing throughout the winter and spring got up and running. Robert Eno at Indiana University and James Earl at University of Oregon are co-chairs of this coalition, which appointed a steering committee. We submitted Kathleen Smith's name to them, with her approval, and she served as one of the Atlantic Coast Conference representatives in a meeting in the spring that also included a keynote address by Myles Brand, the head of the NCAA, and included representatives from the Association of Governing Boards, made up of trustee organizations of colleges and universities around the country. The coalition has come up with the pre-circulated framework document, which EC AC has reviewed in couple of its iterations over time. We wish to make the Council all aware of this coalition and its work toward some reform at the level of national university athletics, a reform that has faculty input on a larger scale than just our faculty athletic representatives going to regional and national NCAA meetings. President Keohane has been very supportive of these efforts and we have kept her informed about the materials we have received. She is supporting one of our faculty to attend a joint meeting of the Association of American University Professors (AAUP) and its coalition on intercollegiate athletics in October in Indianapolis, where again, Myles Brand will speak. The leaders of this new coalition did ask faculty councils to consider and discuss both the framework document and this organization at some point in our fall meetings. Included in your packet are the framework document, a little bit of background, and a resolution for our consideration today:

Be it resolved: that the Academic Council endorses the general principles outlined in the "Framework" document of August 2003, and supports involvement of faculty leadership in the Coalition of Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA). While we may differ in the wisdom or efficacy of some of the specific reform proposals included in the current document, we applaud this effort to initiate a productive national discussion among leaders (faculty, administrative, trustee) and support this ongoing effort to insure that intercollegiate athletics be conducted in a manner consistent with the academic mission of higher education.

There being a second, and opportunity for discussion, Richard Burton (Fuqua) asked what would be our plan for reviewing this in some timely way, to know kind of what is happening, and what have we signed onto as it were?

Nancy Allen said that one thing we've signed onto is for herself getting e-mails every week or two, reviewing them, and discussing that with ECAC. And now we thought would be an appropriate time to bring the information here to the Council. We plan to update the Council when this goes forward. Our faculty representative to the conference in October is Paul Haagen

from the School of Law, our vice-chair of the Council, who has been involved in all of these discussions. She had met this week with Joe Alleva, Director of Athletics, to review the document and get his thoughts on it. She thought that Duke in general is in very good shape as far as many of the points that are outlined here, reflecting the fact that we have a strong President who is involved and very thoughtful about these issues. We have a very fine Director of Athletics who works well with the academic side of things. And we have Kathleen Smith as our faculty athletic representative and Chair of the Athletic Council, as well as having EC AC trying to get up to speed in learning about these issues. It is taking some doing, and we take that process to heart.

Peter Burian (Classical Studies) wanted to speak at least briefly in strong support of this resolution and of our involvement to the extent that Duke is largely at any rate on the side of the angels on these issues. It seems especially important that our voice be a strong part of this movement. It appears that an opportunity has presented itself, one that doesn't come around too often. A whole concatenation of events have received a lot of publicity recently, producing not only talk, but action. This is perhaps the moment when some real change in the interest of the academic missions of the universities can happen. And it seemed to him a very good thing indeed that Duke should be an active part of this change.

Thanking Peter Burian, Nancy Allen asked President Keohane if she wished to make any comments. President Keohane wanted simply to underscore what Professor Burian just said and what our chair has said as well. This is a very opportune time in the history of intercollegiate athletics to be focusing on reform. She sensed a real tipping point at hand as the pressures for commercialization, the pressures on student athlete welfare, the pressures for removing athletics more and more from the classroom are quite strong. But, they also now are being countered by strong leadership at the level of NCAA for the first time in recent history, with a number of parallel efforts by conferences like the ACC, and with increasing faculty involvement. She saw a real potential for putting those pieces together and slowing, if not reversing, the momentum of change, particularly on issues of student athlete welfare, which is what she worries most about. It would be very appropriate for Duke's faculty to be among a hoped for large number of faculty in the country who go on record as saying that this is a source of concern to us as professors and as educators. The resolution is very carefully formulated, without offering any particular panacea we're signing onto, but identifying an issue that matters for Duke University.

Thanking the President for these comments Nancy Allen recognized Paul Haagen, who invited anyone who has specific comments to address these to him before he heads out on October 9. It would be very helpful to have these and keep them in mind as he is participating in Indianapolis.

There being no further discussion Nancy Allen called for a vote on the resolution, with the ayes having it, and no dissent. Remarking that it's still a beautiful day outside she also called for a vote on adjournment, which also passed, and the Council adjourned, at 5:10 p.m.

Prepared or consideration by the Academic Council, Donald
J. Fluke, Faculty Secretary