

Minutes of the Meeting of the Academic Council
Thursday, September 28, 2017

Don Taylor (Chair, Academic Council / Sanford School of Public Policy):

Welcome, everyone and thank you for coming to the first meeting of the Academic Council for 2017-18. I hope everyone is having a productive semester so far. My name is Don Taylor and I'm a professor in the Sanford School of Public Policy and I have the honor to be the Chair of the Academic Council this year. I look forward to trying to serve the faculty and the university in this role. Welcome to new members of the Academic Council. Thank you for agreeing to give your time. Thank you to all the members of the Council. I would just remind us that all faculty are welcome and we would really covet their presence at these meetings so when we go back to our respective faculty meetings, tell them that we would love to have them here and we endeavor to make these meetings important enough so that they will be viewed as worth their time. We welcome Vince Price to his first Academic Council meeting as President. He came last spring as President-elect and we had a discussion. So welcome, Vince, and we are so glad that you are here.

I want to recognize our Executive Committee of the Academic Council that has been meeting weekly since the end of August. We have four members who are

completing their second year, the last year of their term:

Kirsten Corazzini (Nursing) – she's also the faculty secretary of the Executive Committee of Academic Council, which we call ECAC;

Gráinne Fitzsimons (Fuqua School) – she is the Vice Chair of ECAC;

Andrew Janiak (Philosophy);

Mari Shinohara (Immunology / School of Medicine) – Mari is traveling and could not be at our meeting today.

In addition to myself we have three members who are starting their first year:

Claudia Gunsch (Civil & Environmental Engineering);

Erika Weinthal (Nicholas School) – she's traveling today;

Larry Zelenak (Law).

So the eight of us endeavor to produce a meaningful agenda for the Council and also to conduct a certain amount of business so that this body does not have to worry about that.

One person I really want to introduce is Sandra Walton, the administrative coordinator of the Academic Council. For anybody that has ever leaned in to

Academic Council, you realize when things go really well, it's usually because Sandra made sure that we did what we were supposed to do. She has a grace under pressure, an institutional memory, and really a commitment to trying to make us all succeed and do a good job, so thank you so much. (applause)

I also want to recognize Nan Jokerst, the past Chair of Academic Council. (applause) And all the members of ECAC who completed their service on June 30, and who, like Nan, are continuing members of the Council. There are several difficult issues like this incredibly complicated, detailed Appendix N Faculty Handbook revision that would have been very easy for Nan to have punted to this year's Chair. (laughter) I am eternally grateful that you did not do that. (laughter)

The attendance sheets are being circulated, so please be sure to initial these and return them to Sandra at the end of our meeting. If you can't attend, we would ask that you would let us know. Email myself or Sandra, and many units, or at least most units, have a substitute who is available to come in your stead.

We are open to suggestions of topics. There is certain normal business that we deal with all the time, like we always hear new programs and things of that nature. But if there are things that you think the Council should be considering, let us know. You can go to the Academic Council website and send us an email. You can email me at Don.taylor@duke.edu, and we

will endeavor to look into that. The Academic Council also has a tradition of allowing faculty members to submit questions that the President or the Provost or the Executive Vice President would then come and address here at the Academic Council. So if you have topics of that sort or that nature, send those to us as well and we will communicate with those officers.

At the May 11 meeting, the Academic Council gave ECAC the right to conduct business over the summer on behalf of the Council. So the meeting minutes in May have already been approved and ECAC approved on behalf of the Council the granting of summer degrees. So normally we would have a call for approval of minutes but we don't need to do that today.

***FACULTY HEARING COMMITTEE:
APPROVE NEW MEMBERS***

Taylor: We do have our first item of business, which is a traditional first item of the semester business, which is electing new members to the Faculty Hearing Committee. Sam Buell has agreed to serve as Chair, Craig Henriquez and Maggie Lemos, as you see here (refers to slide). This is a very important committee that we hope is very bored during the year. This committee gets involved in issues of academic freedom, intellectual property disputes, harassment, grievances, things of that sort that have not been able to be worked out through administrative functions. Our bylaws state that the Faculty Hearing Committee

will consist of 12 tenured faculty members nominated by ECAC and elected by the Council at large to serve three-year terms. So this has generally been done as a consent item and so at this time I would take any comments anyone may have about the three members.

(New members approved by voice vote without dissent)

So these are our Faculty Hearing Committee members and I thank them for their service. As I said, let's hope they're bored and not that busy this year.

PRESENTATION FROM THE VICE PROVOST FOR FACULTY ADVANCEMENT

Taylor: Our next agenda item is to hear from Duke's Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement, Abbas Benmamoun. Abbas has come to Duke from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign where he had a job with the title of Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and Academic Policies. I'll just read a very brief snippet of the press release announcing his hiring in the spring, and then I'll invite him to come and give us some insight into what his role is going to be at Duke:

"The Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement will provide intellectual leadership, guidance and oversight of university-wide strategies and programs to enhance faculty excellence. Because diversity and inclusion are considered essential aspects of faculty excellence, a core component of his responsibilities will be to promote diversity and inclusion

in the faculty, and ensure that high standards and fair practices are employed in faculty recruitment, appointment, promotion and career advancement."

So, with that, Abbas, please come up, and welcome to Duke. (applause)

Abbas Benmamoun (Vice Provost, Faculty Advancement): Thank you, Don. Thank you all for giving me this opportunity to talk with you. I have been here for four months and I really like being here. I'm excited to have this opportunity. In my previous job at the University of Illinois, I worked very closely with the equivalent of the Academic Council here. So I do value shared governance and the voice of the faculty in how we manage our affairs here at the university. The voice of the faculty is very important and very critical, so I hope that this is just the first of many conversations to come. Let me just share with you some reflections from the first four months here, and also some things that we are already rolling out, and also invite your input about how to move forward. Let me first start with an articulation of our vision. These are the values that basically drive the work of the university and the office in this space of faculty advancement (refers to slide). The key words that you see there are strength, community, commitment, and inclusive excellence. For us to build inclusive excellence, we need the commitment of the institution to that, and we also need to build a sense of community in this space for people to thrive. A space that is welcoming, where people feel like they

own a piece of the institution. So this is the value that drives the work of my office and those are values that I know are shared by everybody in this room. So some elements of progress on inclusive excellence, and this is from why I took this job here at Duke and why I am really excited about what we plan to do in the years ahead. One is that you can see it, it's palpable. There is an awareness at Duke about the value of inclusive excellence. In teaching, it is critical for our students to have an inclusive environment, to have students from different backgrounds to interact with and to learn from each other. For research, the research has shown that inclusive excellence enhances the quality of the research and the innovation that drives that research. And service and engagement: more opportunities open up for engagement and service when we have a diverse and inclusive community because we can reach out to many more communities, many more segments of our society and there is of course a real need out there. Having a diverse faculty will enable us to do that. I know that there is ethos here at Duke to be engaged with the community and with the world at large. So having a diverse faculty is important in that regard. I have also seen a sense of commitment here at every level of the university, from the departments, centers, institutes, all the way through the schools and at the university level. So there is that sense of awareness and the sense of commitment. And of course, commitments are good, but you need to back them up with resources. The university is putting resources in this area

and I'll be talking about some investments that we're already making in this space. Here are some major components of my portfolio. Don mentioned some of those earlier but when I looked around and I looked at my job here and from my interactions with schools and other stakeholders here at the university, I have identified these six components and of course we can add more or we can expand some of these. One is to build inclusive excellence on our campus. I include inclusion and excellence because they are not contradictory. They actually enhance each other. Having an inclusive environment enhances the excellence of the institution and this is an elite institution and we want it to be even better. We do that through faculty hiring. We need to hire the best, we need to cast the net wide, find the best talent in the country and the most diverse talent, and when we bring those people here, or if the people are already here, we need to ensure that they have an environment and the resources to succeed here at Duke. We also want to keep them here. We want them to develop their careers here because that is good for us and good for our students. So that's one component. Building capacity: making sure that the capacity is used to its potential and that it stays here. Second is leadership. It is very important that, in order to be effective in this space of faculty advancement, that there is buy-in and there is commitment from top to bottom. At the department level, whether it is various committee chairs or the chairs of department or at the deans' level or at the Duke campus level. We'll be working on that. We'll be

working on faculty and leadership development programs and resources. We want to hire faculty but at the same time we want to give them the attention that they need. That's where leadership comes in. We are also interested in the development of the leadership pipeline so we can diversify our leadership. That means leadership development programs for faculty. The other one is building community. Because for those faculty to thrive, you need an inclusive community. So we will be working with units, building on what already exists here. There are some good practices that are already here at Duke to build an inclusive climate for our faculty and for the community at large. We will be working on that and talking about some initiatives that we are already putting in place to do that. We know that our efforts for diversity are effective when there is buy-in from everybody and I know that, here at Duke, there are many places where we have investments and resources to make some progress on these efforts. So we will be working with those offices and those stakeholders in pooling our resources, pooling the talent, pooling the expertise, so that our efforts can be more effective and can reach a broader audience. So that's very important to us. The other thing I do, and it is more on the routine side of things, is managing some processes like Bass selection. I sit on the committee and I think we want our efforts to be evidence-based. So we need to be able to look to collect the data that can inform our decisions so that we can track progress and know if something is working or not working. We will be

looking very closely at that. So looking at the data that we have in place and if we need additional data, we will work with the Office of Institutional Research to develop tools to do that, evaluate the data, and also I want my office to be transparent so we will be disseminating a lot of that from my office where we want the data to be shared with people who can make key decisions about these efforts. The initial steps that I have been taking over the last four months: I have been basically reading the reports from the Academic Council's Diversity Task Force, the implementation reports, the climate surveys, the data and institutional research, and I have been meeting with the various stakeholders. I've met with almost all the deans or faculty deans, I have met with department chairs or groups of chairs, I have met with faculty. I have also met with students and I will say why later, why I think this is important for my office. Students are key actually. And staff as well. Because we live in one ecosystem. These groups are interacting with each other. So we need to make sure that we also have the perspective of the staff and the students as well. Looking at that and also trying to identify the needs and priorities at different levels of the institution that may be places where my office can be more of a facilitator, can be more of a place to disseminate best practices that exist elsewhere. There are areas where we can partner with units and there are areas where we can take the lead. That's part of this exercise now, to identify those priorities, what makes sense to be done at the local level where it can be more effective, what makes sense

to have a partnership, and what makes sense to have leadership at the campus level. The other thing is, that is an opportunity that you also need to try to identify the local leaders and partners and I will talk about that in a minute. Some new initiatives that the Provost's Office has rolled out already based on those reports – the Implementation reports and the things that have been discussed here at Duke. So this is based on your input and the input of the community here at Duke. One is a new initiative that was launched last week. Sally sent the call for proposals to the deans and that is the Strategic Hiring for Faculty Excellence Initiative. That is an effort to make a push towards hiring underrepresented faculty in our academic units. The Provost's office will be providing the resources for that initiative. The second one is something that will be rolled out soon: a visiting faculty program. The idea here is that, especially when you are looking at mid-career or senior level, people might not be ready to commit. It's time to develop that kind of relationship. This is one way for us to build those relationships. People can come here for a semester or a year and we are also open to entertaining the possibility of coming for a short timeframe. People have other commitments, personal commitments or professional commitments, that might prevent them from coming here for an entire semester. So we are open to entertaining shorter visits but a little bit extended so that these faculty can interact with our students, our faculty, and the university at large so that we can start the

conversation about the possibility, if the opportunity comes up, for them to join Duke. The other program that we are working on is the pipeline program. We are not doing a post-doc at our end at the moment and the reason we are not doing that on our own is because that is a conversation, I am part of that discussion, with the Ivy Plus group. We are talking about pooling our resources. Everybody recognizes that it doesn't make sense for us to be competing with each other. There is zero sum gain. We have somebody from Harvard, Harvard has somebody from Cornell, Cornell has somebody from Duke, and it has been going on and nobody is moving the needle on many significant areas. So it's almost like a ceasefire and everybody has decided this makes sense for us to pool our resources and work together. So there will be a possibility of us doing a post-doc program together or setting up a database for the consortium. We are discussing that. It is something that the Big Ten has that is really successful. I think there is a possibility that the Ivy Plus group will do that. So we will see how this Ivy Plus discussion goes, and then we can make a decision about our own post-doc program. The other program that will be supported by the Duke endowment is a leadership development program. This is what I talked about earlier about working with chairs and leaders at the local level. We need to make sure that they are on board with us on these initiatives. So with the Duke endowment we will likely support these efforts and we'll probably pilot it at the beginning in Trinity and Pratt and then if it works out after we do the

assessment, we can scale it. We'll start a leadership development program maybe in the spring semester. On the faculty development front, we have launched an initiative, Faculty Advancement Seed Grants Program. This goes to what I said earlier about how it's not enough to hire faculty. You have to provide them with the right environment for them to thrive and flourish and do what they do best. That is creating a sense of community and a welcoming environment. The Seed Grants Program aims to do that. Now you see that, in fact, these programs are uneven across the institution and this is not just Duke, it's everywhere. They are uneven. There are some that are good at something and others that are good at a different thing. What we thought is that we'll call for proposals for units to experiment. Some units might want to start a mentoring program. Some units might want to do some workshops on writing books or writing grant proposals. Some might want us to have small group discussions about some significant issues that we are dealing with as a nation and as a community in order to start building that kind of trust among the faculty and create a sense of community among the faculty. I invite units to submit proposals to us. We will evaluate those proposals and then hopefully will launch a number of them or support them and then we will see what ideas emerge, test those ideas, and take the best ones that can be scaled and do them at scale. Some might not be necessary to do at scale. But, we want to experiment to see what works in this space. The other things that are going on are some faculty development programs

and resources. We are working on some workshops, some in partnership with other units on campus. We are developing resources for search committees. I have been working with Ben Reese's office to meet with search committees to talk about how to do inclusive searches, best practices on how to do the nuts and bolts of searches. We have also subscribed to two databases that include underrepresented candidates, some post-docs and some faculty already in some positions. As soon as we have access to those resources, we'll make them available to all the search committees on this campus. I'll also send the resources to the search committees when they approach me. We'll be going around meeting with groups to talk about how to do inclusive searches. It is hard, it is tough, but it is doable. It needs intentional efforts. Some key partners and liaisons for these efforts are the Office of the Provost, and I mean by that my colleagues who have different portfolios, whether it is students, undergraduate education, or interdisciplinary studies, or research, international studies, various portfolios. Because it makes sense for us in some areas to partner with other units. Just to give you a simple example, mentoring can be difficult to do in a small unit when you have few faculty. But here, interdisciplinary centers can be very important because they create that kind of network where we can set up a mentoring environment for those faculty. Some mentoring may be better done in those interdisciplinary centers rather than within the small academic units. So these are the reasons why partnership is

important. With Larry Carin's office we can partner on grant applications and best practices and all those things. So my colleagues in the Provost's Office are going to be very critical. Other academic units of course are very critical to these efforts. Your group is very critical. Your voice is welcome and your input is very welcome. Office of Institutional Equity, I have been in touch, we meet on a regular basis and we talk about how we can coordinate our efforts and use their expertise in this area. HR of course is very important as well. There may be some issues where we need to interface with HR to make sure that our environment is hospitable to faculty and that we deal with issues when they come up and we deal with them effectively. Faculty Ombuds: I reached out to the Faculty Ombuds, we met to see how we can work together. We're both here to support faculty so we are going to be coordinating our efforts within the boundaries of our portfolios, of course. And Student Affairs, that is very important because I want to make sure that the faculty development part also takes students into account. In these efforts, we'll be working with some units on developing programs for inclusive classrooms. Student to student dynamics in the classrooms or learning spaces in general, labs, fieldwork, all that. Also student to faculty dynamics. So we will be working on that. I was just in a meeting in the School of Nursing where we talked about that as well and we may end up partnering in those efforts. As I said, the voice of the faculty is very important so I welcome your suggestions. I am working on setting up some advisory

groups that will include faculty deans, diversity leaders from the various units, and also faculty. And here, I mean faculty writ large. Tenure system faculty, non-tenure system faculty, because they are also important to the institution. They teach our students, they interact with our students, and they are our colleagues. So we need to make sure that our faculty development efforts touch those groups as well. I'll be reaching out to you and to your colleagues to help me set up some advisory groups because I would like to make sure that whatever we do, that it is in response to faculty needs. The success of my office, our efforts, and the Provost's Office, are measured by your success. That's the bottom line, really. I welcome your questions, and as I said, I hope this is just the beginning of many more conversations.

Taylor: We have time for a couple of quick questions. Anyone?

Benmamoun: I know I am still in my honeymoon period so people are still nice to me. (laughter)

Steffen Bass (Physics / Chair, Academic Programs Committee): I just wanted to make a statement regarding leadership training for faculty because this is a theme that we have recurrently seen on the Academic Programs Committee. Departments, when they are up for an external review, show up and there are issues that could have been dealt with on a departmental level before it comes up for external review if the departmental officers had had some leadership training

that allows them to handle situations related to personnel issues, misbehaving faculty, for example, and it is crucial that these problems don't fester. So having this training for departmental officers is very important. Could you perhaps elaborate in a few sentences how you envision this to take place?

Benmamoun: Yes, and this is something that I did in my previous job. I was involved in two programs, one at the University of Illinois and one at the consortium within privates like Northwestern and Chicago. That was basically to work with chairs and also to develop a pipeline of leadership. Work with chairs on how to handle the job. We are all faculty. When we were in graduate school we were not thinking about administrating. When you are a faculty you are not thinking about administration. Suddenly you are parachuted or you are selected or you volunteer for a leadership position. So you have to change the way you work with your colleagues and your role at the university changes, to come extent. Sometimes people do not have that kind of background. They are experts in their fields, they are good teachers, good researchers, but they are not really experts in those areas. So you get sometimes where you see some difficult situations and you don't know how to navigate that. That is my role, and I dealt with this, and I actually really welcome people to contact me if there are issues. Because I prefer to deal with issues when they are smaller rather than when they become crises. Because that's the best

way to not retain faculty. When you have a climate like that. When people feel that the institution is not intentional about these issues or the chair is not paying attention or their concerns are being dismissed. There are concerns that are legitimate and sometimes there are concerns that may not be legitimate. Let us sort through those and make the decision about what needs to be dealt with at the lower level and sometimes we might have to bring in other resources and sometimes it's more like being a sounding board for the faculty to help them navigate a particular situation. Sometimes it's really the chair doesn't have the experience and you may have to ask this person to be paired with another person who has the experience who can share the best practices, be a mentor, and things like that. So that's the way I see it. I think it is very critical to hiring, development, and retention because this is sometimes how units can degenerate to being dysfunctional. We have to deal with those issues at the beginning. I'm very serious about those things.

Taylor: Thank you. I think we'll try to have Abbas back later this year. Thank you so much. (applause)

MASTER'S PROGRAMS UPDATE

Taylor: Next we will hear a report from Jennifer Francis, the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. She's going to give us an update on master's programs across the university.

Jennifer Francis (Vice Provost, Academic Affairs): Thank you, everyone. This is an analysis that I put together in the spring that was a follow-up to a number of discussions that Academic Council and other groups had at the university last year and a little bit before that about, generally speaking, student body growth and program growth around Duke. This is a little bit deeper dive into when the growth happened, where it happened, what types of programs it is happening in, and the way I think about this is to give a picture of how the face of Duke's student body has changed over the past roughly 13 years. So to put this together, let me just note that I needed data from two relatively large data sets and anyone who has worked in the space of understanding student growth, it has to be measured at an exact point in time. These databases are not measured exactly but I've satisfied myself that the data coming together is actually very close in terms of that so I don't think there's a problem with the data. There is one piece of data that I'll talk about in a little bit that I gathered directly from the schools and got some verification that that was fitting with the other data that we have. Let me first start off with talking about total growth across Duke. As you can see from this chart, (refers to slide) the Duke student body growth increased by roughly 22% or slightly less than 3,000 students between 2004 and 2016. As you can also see, the vast majority of that growth, or nearly 80%, came in the light gray area, which is master's growth. By the way, I'm going to try to use this same color scheme throughout here. So black

will generally be total, orange will be PhD, blue is undergraduate, and gray will be master's growth. As you can see to the far right, that actually breaks down the growth for you and as we said, most of the growth has been in master's programs. One thing that I wanted to get a handle on is one of the reasons why this issue of growth has come up. It has come up about use of campus resources. One of the things I wanted to check on here is, as some of the schools and departments know, there is some activity and programming here at Duke that does not necessarily happen here at Duke. So I wanted to get a sense of what, I'll call it, loosely speaking, the online degree component, is at Duke. Probably the most significant, without question, space in the online, is the School of Nursing. So if you look at the red chart here, the red line represents the School of Nursing, purple represents Fuqua, and green represents Pratt. Those are the three schools that I went to to get their information about online. That is not to say that other groups do not have that but those other things are so small in relation to these that, frankly speaking, the only one that's going to matter at all is going to be the School of Nursing, that we'll turn to later. So you can see on the far graph, the black line represents the online component of growth and the rest of the chart represents the campus group. So for the most part, the growth has been on campus, but not exclusively so. Finally, starting to give a sense of the relative shift between undergrad and graduate students, the chart here basically shows you the sheer number of students, so

that's going to tie back to the original chart of about 2,700 students. As you can see, the percentage shifted from about 49% of the student body being graduate students back in 2004, to somewhere around 54-55% in 2016. So definitely a shift there. In terms of the different types, what I've computed here is, basically, if we smooth out the growth and came up with a constant growth rate per year, what is called a CAGR, or the compound annual growth rate, what would that compound annual growth rate be for the undergraduate population, the master's, and the PhD? And again, none of this is surprising, given that we saw most of the growth was in master's, but the master's growth is a little bit higher than about 3% growth every single year. PhD growth has been around 1%, and the undergraduate growth has been around 0.5%. The next two slides are going to show you when this growth happened, and then I'll show you it by school, combined over time. I take away two things from this particular chart. First of all, there was a very large growth in 2005 relative to 2004. So a very large growth in master's, PhD, and undergraduate during that period. I actually looked back relative to a graph I'm going to show you in a little bit, and in that 2005 period, there were five schools at Duke that had double-digit growth rates in that year. So this is not driven by one school in that first spike there. Things went back down a little bit after that. And then you can see again, not surprisingly, we had a lot of growth in programs during what we'll call the financial crisis period. As you can see, most of that growth occurred in the master's program

areas in 2008, 2009, 2010. After that, things got fairly quiet with a little bit of growth happening in 2015 and then a decline in 2016. I haven't fully seen the numbers yet for 2017, but I would guess, based on what I have seen, that that gray bar has gone up in 2017. If we want to look at where that growth occurred, what we've done here is break down the growth by school, as well as by the three main groups: undergraduate, master's, and PhD. One of the things that jumps out at you from this is, most of the growth, if we had to pick the largest growth area, has been in Engineering. With that growth really coming, both in terms of master's and undergraduate, and a fairly significant amount of PhD, you could capture at least 50% of the growth if we simply added Medicine and Pratt together. By the way, Medicine also excludes in it the group that we're calling Allied Health over here, which is a separate set of programs. So most of the growth for the most part has occurred in Pratt School of Engineering. Some of the data I'm going to show you next are going to try to bring in some demographics of the student body so you can get a sense of, for example, gender and ethnicities, in a little bit. This chart shows you the percentage of women over time. For the most part, the percentage of undergraduate women versus men has roughly stayed the same over time, right around 49-50%. In the master's program that percentage is also roughly constant at around 45%. But if you do look at the orange line, there has been a decline in the percentage of female PhD students from basically about 47% back in 2004 to

almost a monotonic decline to about 43% right now. One thing that I did to check this, to take a look at what was driving this, is I wanted to look back and see if there are portions of our schools, our student bodies, that are more women or more men. The obvious one here is the School of Nursing, where quite a large percentage of the students are female. One of the things that I did is I removed, in the bottom line here, the dark gray line, I removed the School of Nursing entirely from the chart to see what it would look like in terms of the master's programs. Because that's really the largest part of it. Once again, you can still see roughly the same numbers without the School of Nursing. One piece here, I didn't run the test on it but I'm pretty sure it's statistically significant, the percentage of female PhD students has declined from 47 to 43, and that 4% is fairly significant. I will also say that 4% decline is not due to the particular increase in Pratt Engineering PhD students. So even if I remove that, I still find the decline. So it is not the case that the apparent decline in PhD students is due to a growth in potentially male students at Pratt. These are one-offs that I did, to be honest, because they jump out at you, to verify that. The next slide I'm going to show you in a little bit tries to break down the growth by citizenship and race. For this purpose, I used the categories that are in the Duke data system which, to my understanding, within the U.S. citizens, those are self-provided by the students. And the categories they can select from are Asian, Black, Hispanic, Other, and White. And then there's the whole group

of everyone who is foreign. Everything in the colors spot here is going to be Americans of different races and ethnicities as we go through this. So this chart has a lot going on but basically what it is showing you, if you look at the things in yellow, it's going to show you the groups that we just had on the previous page, including all of the breakdowns of those either U.S. citizenship as well as the group that is foreign. It also shows you, again, the same blue, undergraduate growth or decline, gray, master's growth and decline, and orange, PhD. And again, here, I think a couple things jump out fairly quickly from this, which is, almost 90% of the total growth in the university, 50% of that has come in the way of foreign students, with most of that happening in the master's. So the gray portion of that bar is quite large, but also a good portion in the undergraduate. And you can also see that, in the category of Asian Americans, that again, students selected, we have about 36% growth there, with most of that happening in the undergraduate. The final analysis that I did here was to take a look because the foreign group is quite large, and one of the issues that has come up is, are we providing sufficient resources relative to our foreign student body? I was trying to get a way of examining what is in the foreign body group. To do this analysis, virtually every country is represented at some point in time over 2004 and 2016. So you're going to have to just trust what I call my ocular analysis and my just looking at the data to say, okay, there's no question, that the single largest country that's represented here is China. It really

is far and away the largest country represented here. So I'm just going to look at China here and compare China, which is blue, to the red bar, which is total foreign. One thing that you see is that the foreign growth has happened over time, no question, as we showed in the previous slide, but so has the percentage of China of the foreign students. It has grown from about 20-22% to nearly 40% in those. And those students not shown are, again, primarily in the master's degrees. So, very quickly, I'll just kind of summarize the few highlights of this. If we just look at campus alone and remove the online piece, our growth has been about 2,200 students. Most of the growth is due to master's students. Most of the growth is concentrated in a few years, notably the economic downturn at a pretty sizeable growth back in 2004-05. About half the campus growth is in Medicine and Pratt. The percentage of PhD students who are women has gone down, and the largest fraction is foreign students, and within foreign students, China is the largest. So that's trying to give people a sense of things. We don't have a lot of conclusions to draw from this, except one thing that certainly came out of the discussions that were happening around campus last year and even the prior year about growth in master's, one of the things these data tell us is where the growth has occurred and when did it happen. It's not like it's been happening consistently over every year. It's clearly in the master's programs. But one of the other things that I think came out of a number of discussions was to have a little bit of more of a control, more

standardization around the process of putting forward master's programs. Over the summer we've worked on a template that several new programs that are coming forward have been using, which ensures that we're all looking at the same kinds of information when we're looking at new master's programs. We're also putting in place to make sure that new master's programs go through a rigorous third-year review so we can determine if any programs need to be sunset. That is, keeping a little bit closer eye both on what's coming in and what we're doing during that process. You may have some other questions, and I may have the memory in my head of the data, so I'll entertain some of them.

Billy Pizer (Sanford School of Public Policy): I was just wondering if you had any sense of what the broader trends are. How does what's happening at Duke compare to what's happening in the U.S. market or higher education in general?

Francis: Billy asked the question of how we compare to what our peers are doing. What's happening with our peers, what's happening in general. My memory from this is, I did not look at that, but that analysis was done by, was it the Master's Advisory Council? Jim, do you recall?

Jim Dobbins (Associate Vice Provost and Director, Duke Kunshan University Program Office): I think Paula (McClain) did that a couple years ago.

Francis: I think the group did that and

what they found is, we're actually very similar to a lot of other universities out there. What I can tell you, because we didn't dig down to this level, is whether their growth occurred in the same places, or at the same rates. But overall, the trend we're seeing is not very different from our peers.

Andrew Janiak (Philosophy / Member of ECAC): It's very alarming to see the percentage of PhDs to women declining, since so many of us are working very hard at gender equity. This might be unfair to ask you, but do you know, is this a national trend? Is this a parochial Duke phenomenon?

Liz Ananat (Sanford School of Public Policy): It's not, I just Googled it. (laughter)

Francis: Do you like how I just threw my voice back there? (laughter)

Ananat: For the last six years, women have received a majority of PhDs. It's around 52% nationwide. So I just Googled it, and according to the National Center for Education Statistics, which is a reliable source, women have been a majority of newly admitted PhDs for the last six years. It had been rising and it is currently a little over 52%. So our trend appears to be both significantly different and the magnitude and the direction are different.

Francis: And we can dig down into these data any way that we want to parse it out.

Ananat: NCES also provides this data by

field so we can compare however we want.

Alex Rosenberg (Philosophy):

Relatedly, a decline in PhDs on balance at Duke could also be a worrying concern since we probably haven't reduced the allocation of funding for PhDs so this may reflect some difficulties in attraction or retention and it would also be worth comparing it to other universities that we compare ourselves with.

Francis: All good points.

Speaker: I couldn't hear that question.

Francis: Alex remarked that we should look at how we compare in terms of PhD allocations and funding with some of our peers to see if that is a cause of it.

Rosenberg: If they had a similar decline in PhDs, it struck me as surprising that we should have had a significant secular decline in total number of PhD students completing at Duke.

Francis: Everything has grown, just not the same. So if we go back a year, PhDs have grown by 9%. What's changed is the portion of those that are women has declined from 47 to 43%.

Rosenberg: I thought I saw a slide in the 2016 year in which there was a decline in total number of PhDs.

Francis: The declines are relative to the previous year.

Rosenberg: So this is a decline relative to the previous year.

Francis: It's a year to year change.

Rosenberg: That's my question. Is that significant or is it merely a data point which is blocked out by more years of comparison?

Francis: Short answer is I don't know. I'd have to look to see whether there was something anomalous in 2016 that caused that big orange drop there.

Sally Kornbluth (Provost): In some cases, I don't know that it's competitive market so much as the intentional choice by some PhD programs in a given year to reduce the number of students they admitted, in part because of grant dollar support, et cetera. That's just a conjecture but my guess is that's what's going on.

Jennifer West (Biomedical Engineering): I'm wondering if the change in female PhD students tracks at all with the change in female faculty over that period of time.

Francis: I don't have the answer off the top of my head. I don't know if female faculty, whether that's the same trend for that, but we could take a look at that. Thank you all very much. (applause)

Taylor: Obviously this is a topic of interest so we will keep this in mind going forward.

***PROPOSED MULTIDISCIPLINARY
GRADUATE PROGRAM BETWEEN PRATT
SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING AND ARTS
AND SCIENCES***

Taylor: Next we actually have a proposed new graduate degree program between Pratt and several departments in Arts and Sciences. Adrienne Stiff-Roberts from Pratt and Stephen Craig from Chemistry are going to present and then take some questions. Following our normal convention of the two meeting rule, we will not vote on this until October.

Stephen Craig (Chemistry): While this is loading, let me just say from the outset that I'm here largely as a symbol of the cross-school, multidepartment nature of the enterprise. This has really been Adrienne's project from the beginning so I just want to make that clear.

Adrienne Stiff-Roberts (Electrical and Computer Engineering): Thanks, I appreciate that. It is my pleasure to be here this afternoon. It has been a large number of faculty from Pratt and Trinity working on this effort for some time so it's a pleasure to be here to present it to you today. What we are presenting is a new graduate program across Pratt and Trinity to offer MS and PhD degrees in Materials Science and Engineering. So we're calling this a university program to highlight the fact that it is across two different schools. I think the place to start in terms of motivating this program is the research that we do in Materials Science and Engineering on campus. We have strength currently existing in

biomaterials, computational materials discovery, electronic and photonic materials, energy materials, metamaterials, soft materials. All of these efforts exist across campus. They're not in a single department, they're not in a single school. So in terms of the participating departments for this program, what we envision are all of the four Pratt Engineering departments and then four of the Basic Science departments in Trinity: Biology, Chemistry, Mathematics, and Physics. So we have people doing materials research in all of those departments across campus. In terms of what the graduate program would offer, we do envision this being a cohort experience so that we are creating a Materials Science and Engineering community across campus. We would ensure that through our curriculum. Just a couple of features: one would be the fact that we would have a graduate seminar in Materials Science and Engineering that all of the students would attend as part of their requirements. Also we have four core courses for the curriculum that would be offered each semester and these are courses that would be taken in the first year. They're offered by different departments. In terms of having buy-in from the stakeholders across campus for this program, we do have an MOU providing financial support for this program from the Provost and from the deans of Pratt and Trinity. We have MOUs from the departments that would offer the core courses describing their commitment to providing these courses on a long term. And we do have letters of

support from each of these department chairs describing that they are supportive of this program and participating. In terms of what we envision for the master's program and the PhD: the master's program is pretty straightforward as you might imagine. We would have admissions directly into this master's program and they would take the core courses. The PhD program is a little bit more complicated because of the different financial models that we have in the two schools. What we're actually proposing is a phased approach to developing this graduate program. In the first phase, which we imagine would happen between years one and five, we would offer a degree-granting PhD program. So students would be admitted into their home department, one of those eight departments that I showed before, and they would opt in to this program, meaning they would decide to take the curriculum, follow the curriculum offered by the university program in Materials Science and Engineering, and they would get a PhD degree in Materials Science and Engineering. That would not be the best long-term option and so our goal is to try to work towards what we're calling phase two, in which case this program would be an admitting and a degree-granting program. So we would admit directly into the program and provide degrees from the program. What's the transition from phase one to phase two? There are some things that have to be in place. One, we would need to get some type of external funding to support first year fellowships for these PhD students so that we're not having any negative impact on existing

departments. We want to bring in our own money to support these PhD students and we need some time to get that. We would also need to grow our graduate program to roughly five PhD students and ten MS students who are matriculating annually. That's to provide the funding that we would need to support these PhD students and also to have the environment that's present to show that we can bring in PhD students directly to this program. And then we would also want to complete the successful program review in year three of this program before we transition to phase two. Just some more details about the timeline: we're hoping that we'll be able to get approval from you all in October and then also from the Board of Trustees in December. We're working to have our first cohort of graduate students in fall of 2018. We would go ahead and start looking for these opportunities to get external funding to support the PhD students. Again, in the third year of the program is when we would have this external review at the Graduate School and we would hope to be able to transition to phase two by 2022 if everything is in line. In terms of the rationale for the program: why do we think we should offer this? One, from the student perspective, it provides job preparation. I was talking here mainly about the master's program, not so much the PhD. In terms of the master's program, it provides job preparation, and can also provide transition to graduate school in Materials Science and Engineering for students coming from different backgrounds. So students who

are doing an undergraduate in Math or Chemistry or Physics. If they're interested in doing Materials Science and Engineering, a master's degree can help with that transition to graduate school. In terms of Duke University and the faculty, there are three main reasons to do this program: visibility, community, and opportunity. In terms of visibility, we have all this excellent Materials Science and Engineering research spread across campus. To have an external-looking face for that excellence, so people can see that, yes, Duke is very strong in this area. And having this graduate program could help facilitate that. Also, being able to appeal to outstanding graduate students who are really coming from other backgrounds that are not currently serviced at Duke. Chemical Engineering, traditional Materials Science and Engineering, they may not find a program here that fits their needs. This program would offer that. In terms of community, having critical mass and a mechanism to coordinate Materials Science and Engineering education and interactions across campus, and then just making opportunities by having a program like this. One, building on the success of the existing Mechanical Engineering and Materials Science department degree, which would have more of a focus on structural materials, complementing that expertise in other areas of Materials Science. Also having students with different backgrounds, then bringing new skillsets to campus to help advance the research that's being done here. A mechanism for new multidisciplinary collaborations, and this would also be

part of a larger university effort in Materials Science and Engineering. Also, in terms of rationale, again, especially for the master's program, what would these students do and what's the market? Just as an idea of what the market would be, this is data from the American Society for Engineering Education. This is the master's degrees that have been awarded either in Chemical Engineering or Metallurgical Materials Engineering from 2007 to 2016. You can see there is a large growth in this area. We think that Duke is missing out on these students because we're not offering a degree that they would be interested in. Also, in terms of what students could do after they finish with the master's degree, the median salary for materials engineers is about \$93,000 and these are some of the industries where they can find jobs. These are some of the top industries where they can find employment after graduation. Finally, I just want to show what our financial projections are for this program. I've just highlighted what the expenses would be (refers to slide). This is personnel. That would basically be a director of graduate studies and a director of graduate studies assistant. And then operations. One important thing to mention for operations is that we do have a scholarship that's tied to the incoming tuition at 15% to provide financial scholarships to students. In terms of the income, these are projections for tuition and the tuition return that comes back to this program would be 35%. The balance would be split evenly between Pratt and Trinity. So of this money that comes back to the graduate program, all that goes

toward a reserve fund. So some of that is just general program reserve, but the most important part of that is a reserve to build up to support our PhD students when we transition to phase two, to provide backstop funding for students in this program. That's what I have to show for today and I'm happy to answer any questions.

Jane Richardson (Biochemistry): Aside from the four core courses and the seminar, I'm not sure exactly what constitutes either the master's or the PhD.

Stiff-Roberts: So they have the exact same coursework. The curriculum is the same for master's and PhD students. What would be different are the exams they would have to take. So the master's project exam versus the qualifier prelim and the defense. And then, of course, the amount of time. But master's students would also be doing research projects.

West: What are the courses besides the core courses?

Stiff-Roberts: There are also three elective courses that they would take. That would help them facilitate whatever they have interest in. That structure of the curriculum is the same for both.

Dan Rittschof (Nicholas School of the Environment): Would your courses be open to other graduate students?

Stiff-Roberts: Yes, most of these courses are already existing. So they have a lot of room for growth. They would be open to

other students in other departments. They would be offered by other departments.

Craig Henriquez (Biomedical Engineering): I'm curious, maybe I read it wrong, but I thought the students would take four of six core courses, they could choose. Is there no common class? It would seem to be useful for the students who are in Trinity and Engineering to somehow have a common course that would be beneficial to both groups.

Stiff-Roberts: That's right. There's certainly the graduate seminar which is required for the first three semesters. That would be common for everyone. We're trying to reach a balance between implementing the cohort system but providing flexibility, especially for PhD students whose advisor in a particular department might really need them to take a specific class. We're trying to reach that balance.

Richardson: Just to comment on that, it's incredibly useful when you're trying to build community to have a common thing which can be a discussion group of literature discussion or something, where all the students interact with each other.

Stiff-Roberts: We envisioned that's what the seminar course would be. Actually, Volker Blum is going to be leading that effort for the graduate seminar and he has a very nice vision that would have exactly that. So this would not just be external speakers coming in, but also

opportunities for students to interact with each other.

Taylor: If anyone has other questions, you can send them to us and we will get them to Adrienne and Stephen and we'll have time in October to also address any questions that folks may have submitted in writing. Thank you so much. (applause)

UNIVERSITY PRIORITIES COMMITTEE PREVIEW

Taylor: Next we will have a report from Professor Lori Benneer from the Nicholas School. She is the Chair of the University Priorities Committee and she's going to give us a preview of the work they're going to be doing this year.

Lori Benneer (Nicholas School of the Environment / Chair, University Priorities Committee): Thanks, Don. So as he said, I'm Lori Benneer. I'm an associate professor in the Nicholas School of the Environment and it's my pleasure to chair the University Priorities Committee. My understanding is that once a year the chairs of what I'll refer to as "alphabet soup" committees (laughter) come to you to report either what they're going to do or what they have done. This will be a little of both. A little bit about what we did last year and then more on what we're going to do this year. Let's talk first about what is UPC. It is a President's advisory committee. So there are both Presidential and Provost advisory committees in this sort of alphabet soup of university-wide committees. University Priorities Committee is a President's

advisory committee. It's designed to provide information feedback on important budget and priority-setting initiatives at the university, ideally, obviously, while there are still decisions being made and before things are finalized. We have ten faculty including myself that are on the committee. We have two deans, right now it's Dean Vincent from the Nicholas School and Dean Levi from the Law School. And we have two students, an undergraduate representative and a graduate student representative. And then there are a variety of staff from the Provost's Office and the Office of the Executive Vice President. We meet every other week on Mondays from 3:30-5:00pm. There are some things that we do every year in UPC. Every year the representatives from DUMAC who manage our investment funds and the endowment come and give a report to UPC about how the endowment is performing and what their expectations are for performance over the next several years. That happens every year. The Board of Trustees meets four times a year and before each of those meetings we get a briefing about what will be presented to the Budget and Finance Committee and also to the Facilities and Environment Committee at the Board of Trustee meetings. As the Chair of UPC I actually sit on the Budget and Finance Committee. I'm one of the two faculty representatives on the Budget and Finance Committee for the Board of Trustees. And then while it's not really required, we seem to do it every year, so I just put it on this slide. Every year we talk about undergraduate financial aid and

how much we're spending on undergraduate financial aid and if it's sustainable and how we're going to afford it. It comes up every year. Quickly a little recap of what happened last year. Don was our fierce Chair last year. One of the major things that happened last year is that there was a subcommittee of UPC that did a detailed review of the financial plan of DKU for phase two before we all voted on it. In this body, we considered the implications and we will continue to this year, of reduced expectations about the endowment return. DUMAC has told us that we should not expect the 12 or 15% real returns that we were seeing before the crash and even in some of the years after, during the recovery. Our expectations about real returns should be lower, in the 5% range. That has real implications for the university's financial future that we wrestle with there. We received a report last year on the Duke Forward campaign results and now you've probably heard that the Duke Forward campaign ended with more than \$3.85 billion, which was more than the goal. We also got more detailed information about how that money was coming in: how much of it was coming in as an endowment and how much was coming in as expendable, what pace it's coming in, some of it is pledges, when we expect to see some of that. So we got a little bit more granular detail about where that money was coming from. Then we passed the new Strategic Plan. We need to have some money to do those things so we talked a little bit about the plans for how to fund that. You'll see that will continue this year. This year, again,

the campaign has come to an end but that doesn't mean that all of the people who were working in Development and Alumni Affairs that helped bring in \$3.85 billion disappear. We have to review and discuss a post-campaign plan for funding that office. That's one of the very first things we're going to do this fall. The university has some capital ambitions that we need to discuss. There are some dorms here on West Campus that are original equipment with no air conditioning and we may not care that much as faculty, but it turns out that the alumni care a lot and the students care a lot. So there needs to be a fair amount of discussion about dorms and how we're going to handle the financing of that. As well as there's some new plans for the Science Initiative and other things that will require funding. That's, again, kind of connected to this continued discussion of how we finance the Strategic Plan. And then the big thing that I want to spend the rest of the time highlighting for you is one of the first things we're going to do this fall, after we talk about Development and Alumni Affairs, is dive into the finances of the University Institutes and Centers. This is something that was a request from Provost Kornbluth that this particular committee tackle this year. You might ask, what are these UIC things? The University Institutes, Initiatives, and Centers, UICs, there's actually two I's but we combine them, are university-wide units on campus. They include the seven signature Institutes which many of you have heard of: The Institute for Brain Sciences, the Duke Global Health Institute, the Nicholas Institute for Environmental Policy, so all

of the Institutes. Then there are also four Initiatives and one Center. If you think about what they do, this is the quote from Interdisciplinarity at Duke, which talks about what these things are. They "have the roles of convening new scholarly configurations, catalyzing new research agendas and pedagogical frameworks, and connecting faculty and students across disciplinary, divisional, and school boundaries. They also furnish an array of cross-cutting infrastructures that facilitate the work of faculty and students within Schools. Thus these organizations supply university-wide public goods to Duke's many and varied intellectual communities." So the idea is that they are to provide university-wide services and connections that span the Schools. They were created as part of the last Strategic Plan. The why and the what of UPC's review of the UICs. I will inevitably switch those up somehow. The why: we currently spend \$24 million in central strategic funds on the UICs. \$18 million of that is core funding and an additional \$6 million is sort of ad hoc funding, requests that come in for additional faculty hires or whatever it might be, staff hires, that get funded. Provost Kornbluth thought, and I agreed, that it was time to conduct a detailed review of each of the UICs to make sure those finances are being well aligned with their mission and that the funds are being spent optimally. What exactly are we going to do? What we're not going to do is a sort of programmatic review. Those happen and have been happening at the APC, one of the other alphabet soup committees, the Academic Programs Committee, where they go and

have an external review of what the Centers and Institutes are doing and they do sort of a full programmatic review. It's coming to UPC to really look at the budget. Now, of course, budgets are tied to outputs and to programs and to values. So we're not able to just look at the numbers without thinking about what are the things that we're actually getting from these dollars. So we will do a review, focus on the financing tied to what those outputs and achievements are. Trying to have sort of a balanced look at that. What's the plan? The directors have been asked to provide standardized financial data and then they will come and present to our committee in person this fall and potentially extending into the spring. They have been asked to self-identify their top three high-impact programs or operations and to talk about where the funding comes from for those and how much they're spending on different things. And then all their other programs that they do. So we will have a standardized matrix of financial data across the 11 different UICs that you saw on that first chart. Then UPC will review those data and write a report with recommendations to the Provost and the results of that review will be made available to Academic Council. I may come back in the spring or I'll present next fall. We'll bring it back to you in some way. So that is our plan for the year. I'm happy to take any questions.

Prasad Kasibhatla (Nicholas School of the Environment): I understand there are large flows from the central administration to the schools that might

be possible to tease out, but to put that \$24 million in context, what is the transfer of central strategic funds to Schools, compared to Institutes? Is that \$24 million negligible compared to what goes to Schools?

Kornbluth: It's like a small School. It would be like the smallest of our Schools if you took all our UICs in aggregate.

Kasibhatla: I'm not talking about the budget, I'm talking about the transfer of funds from the strategic funds.

Kornbluth: Oh, that's a little hard. What's the total transfer of strategic funds every year?

Benear: I think he means specifically to the Schools. I don't have that answer.

Kornbluth: I don't know the answer to that but I can find out. I just don't know off the top of my head because it's all wrapped up into the total budget.

Benear: Any more questions? Alright. From budgets to history and memory at Duke, right? (applause)

PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON MEMORY AND HISTORY UPDATE

Taylor: Next we will have a report from Gráinne Fitzsimons, who is the Vice Chair of President Price's Commission on Memory and History that was created last month and Gráinne is also the Vice Chair of ECAC.

Gráinne Fitzsimons (Fuqua School of Business / Member of ECAC / Vice Chair, President's Commission on Memory and History): Thank you, Don. My name is Gráinne Fitzsimons and I am a Psychologist, Professor in the Business School, and also secondary in Psychology and Neuroscience. I am here today to discuss this Commission on Memory and History. To remind you, President Price announced this Commission earlier this month via email that presumably you all read and have readily available. I am here today to basically remind you about the content that was in that email and also encourage / beg for your participation in our process. I'm going to begin just by explaining the mission of the Commission. We have three basic goals. First, primarily, we are tasked by the President with developing a set of principles that can be readily used, available to the President and the Board of Trustees as they face any decisions in the future around building names or memorials. So this would be a set of principles that reflects Duke's values and Duke's mission and place in the world and would basically be something that could guide decision-making when things arise as they do. Second, we are to apply those principles to help us make recommendations to the President and the Board of Trustees about what Duke should do, if anything, with the vacant space in front of Duke Chapel that formerly housed a statue of Robert E. Lee. Third, we are to help the President and the Board come up with procedures that they could use in the future, should any similar issues arise with anything else

here at Duke. So those are our three goals. We aim to achieve those goals by November 17, which is crazy, frankly. (laughter) I'll come back to that timeline a little bit later when I ask for your help. Let me just briefly discuss the members of the Commission. We are chaired by Frank Emory Jr.; he is a Duke alum and a trustee emeritus. We have representation from our alumni, from the trustees, we have several faculty, myself, Adriane Lentz-Smith, and Thomas Pfau. We also have deans of the Law School and Duke Chapel. We have representation from our students, one undergraduate student, Michael Ivory Jr., and one graduate student, Jacqueline Robinson-Hamm, and we also have an outside member, William Ferris, from UNC, whose scholarship is relevant to the issues in our charge, so he is helping us with that. And we also have Barker French, he is a Duke alum and he plays a significant role in the local Durham community so he is helping provide that community perspective. As you can see, we have a pretty diverse range of people on the committee but we are definitely going to need to hear from the rest of our community if our Commission is going to be successful. So here is the time when I ask for your help. I am hoping that, if you have any expertise, any knowledge relevant to any issue that could come up as we try to think about what principles Duke should use going forward, what kind of procedures Duke should have going forward when an issue like this arises, or specifically to the issue of Robert E. Lee or what could go in the statue, Duke history, et cetera. Any knowledge or expertise on any of those

issues, we would be extremely happy to receive your wisdom. So please consider sharing it with us. We are open and welcoming. We really want to hear from our community. We have been reaching out to the local Durham community, to members of civic groups and religious groups in our Durham community, we have been reaching out to staff, students, and alumni. So Jacqueline is giving a presentation at the Graduate Student Council, Michael is giving a presentation at the Undergraduate Student Council, and we're really hoping to hear from as many of our community members as possible. My job today is to hopefully increase the faculty voice by asking you to consider submitting comments and also to ask your constituent colleagues back in your home departments and schools to do so. So if you know anyone who has any expertise, please convince them to help us. We are putting together a list of people whom we know have expertise in these issues and we know have knowledge relevant to them, but we're going to need some help. We have such a huge body of knowledge here at Duke and so we're really just asking you today to think about whether you've ever heard someone say something interesting on an issue related to this, and if so, ask them to tell us about it. We are interested in receiving any resources, materials, information, as well as just opinions. You've got opinions, tell us those opinions. You can do so on the website, memoryhistory.duke.edu. you can also email memoryhistory@duke.edu, and you can also email me. My email is very easy to remember, my name is impossible so

don't try to Google me, but my email address is g.f@duke.edu. I had to fight with IT to get that one but if your name was Gráinne Fitzsimons, you would also win that fight. (laughter) I think that's it. I really just want to encourage your participation. I hope that message is loud and clear. We really depend on the faculty here because so many of you have knowledge that we don't have represented on the Commission. With that, I'm happy to take any questions or hear any suggestions.

Harvey Cohen (Clinical Sciences): First let me say I have no expertise. (laughter) I notice there's no representation for the Medical Center on the Commission and it strikes me that there are lots of buildings and other things getting named in the Medical Center and it might be helpful to have some perspective from that group. I suggest one place to check in with would be the Trent Center people, History of Medicine. Jeff Baker or maybe others who might have some perspective on that.

Fitzsimons: That's great, thank you. I really appreciate that.

Mary Fulkerson (Divinity School): I've already sent in a suggestion to put Pauli Murray in that blank space right now. At the risk of simply repeating myself, I want to say it would be great to have a female African American there, rather than another White guy. Just a thought. (laughter)

Fitzsimons: Pauli Murray has been suggested by several others as well, so

you're not alone on that one. Thank you.
Anyone else? I'll be outside, please
contact me and let me know. Thanks very
much. (applause)

Taylor: That is the end of our meeting.
We have a reception in the hall. I'd like for
everyone to stay a few moments and have
a drink. Thank you for coming.