

Duke University

DURHAM
NORTH CAROLINA
27708-0928

ACADEMIC COUNCIL
UNION WEST
cil@acpub.Duke.edu
BOX 90928

phone (919) 684-6447 304
e-mail account-

fax (919) 681-8606

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Academic Council

Thursday, February 16, 2006

Paul Haagen (Law, Chair of the Council): The first order of business is to approve the minutes of the January 19th meeting. [The minutes were approved by voice vote without dissent.]

Announcements

Paul Haagen: Thank you John. The first announcement has to do with the meeting minutes that are circulated to you with the agendas. If there is no objection, in the future we will not circulate hard copies of the minutes. The minutes will instead be posted on the Council website. We will provide the website address with the agenda materials, and this is generally part of a series of initiatives we're going to be taking to move toward a more paperless Academic Council. This is to save on the cost of distributing these materials (there are also parts of the university where mail arrives slowly). So, is there any objection or discussion about this? Peter?

Peter Burian (Classics): Will the minutes be available as pdf files, so I can print them out?

Paul Haagen: I will turn to Secretary Staddon. He's actually going to present how to do this. Get him to answer those questions, which I cannot answer but am very interested in.

John Staddon (PBS and Faculty Secretary):

Reaching the minutes on the web is straightforward.

The URL is:

<http://www.Duke.edu/web/acouncil/minutes/>

— or you can begin by looking at the Duke home page, then clicking on "faculty" and "faculty organizations" and "the academic council".

[Staddon demonstrated on the screen how to get to the Academic Council website.]

Peter was using the label, "PDF" (portable document format), which is just a compact way to store documents on a computer. Acrobat Reader®, which allows you to read, search and print these documents, can be downloaded free from the web.

Peter Burian commented that his printer is very slow; Staddon responded that new printers are now pretty cheap and perhaps reading the minutes on the screen would be best.

ACADEMIC COUNCIL at Duke University

Faculty Forum

CalendarAgendaMinutesMembers & CommitteesInformation & Links

2005-06
2004-05
2003-04
2002-03
2001-02
Archive

Minutes for the Academic Year 2005-2006

- Minutes for Council Meeting September 22, 2005 (pdf)
- Minutes for Council Meeting October 20, 2005 (pdf)
- Minutes for Council Meeting November 17, 2005 (pdf)
- Minutes for Council Meeting December 1, 2005 (pdf)
- Minutes for Council Meeting January 19, 2006 (pdf)

Search Academic CouncilDuke Home | Academic Affairs | Site Map

Provost Lange: I think the big advantage of this is that you can search for your own name!

Paul Haagen: The second announcement was made to you in an email earlier today that we have rescheduled discussion of the proposed changes in the Promotion and Tenure Policies for the Clinical Departments to the March 23rd meeting. This is a matter that a number of your hardworking faculty committees, most notably the Clinical Sciences Faculty Council, Academic Programs Committee, and ECAC have been working on for some time. Happily for all concerned, we have met with an increasing spirit for cooperation and problem-solving from the Medical School administration.

At the last meeting of ECAC, a series of helpful changes were made in the proposal that we could not effectively circulate to the council in time to consider it in this meeting. The revised proposal, along with various supporting materials, will be circulated prior to our next meeting.

Since this is a matter subject to our 2 meeting rule, it will be on the agenda on the March meeting for discussion and the April meeting for a vote.

I would now like to introduce John Burness, Senior Vice President for Public Affairs, who will introduce Duke's new Associate Vice President for Federal Relations, Chris Simmons. John?

Associate Vice President for Federal Relations

John Burness (Senior VP, Public & Governmental Relations): Thank-you, Paul. Good to see so many colleagues again. I'm pleased to introduce to you Chris Simmons, who joined us actually 2 days ago. We picked him back in

December but he officially came on board two days ago as our Associate Vice President for Federal Relations. In that capacity he will be the lead person within the administration working on a wide range of issues associated with the Federal government.

Let me tell you a little bit about Chris's background,



and also mention the search committee who did a great job: Emily Klein from the Nicholas School and Catheryn Cotten from international programs, Bruce Jentleson from public policy, Jim Siedow, Vice Provost for Research and Deborah Jakubs, Vice Provost for Library Affairs.

We had more than 35 candidates for this, several of them had chief-of-staff positions for members of Congress or others. We had several who were at sister institutions in a similar role, and I think the search committee and I and the President and the senior officers all thought Chris was the strongest candidate. He has remarkably varied experience for one so young. He's been most recently Associate Director for Public Relations for Federal Relations at the American Council on Education. Before that, he was with the Association for American Universities. And in almost all of those capacities he focused on a wide range of issues in Washington affecting higher education and research universities. He's a graduate of Willamette University in Oregon. He has studied in China, South Korea, and Japan, got a master's degree in education from Harvard and served while he was at Willamette for a period of time as an Assistant Director of Admissions, so he knows institutions from inside as well as out. I don't think I want to say anything else other than to ask Chris to come up and say a few words if he wishes to. If you have questions fire away. He's been here all of two days so it'll be interesting.

Chris Simmons: Thanks, John. When I talked to Paul last week I guess it was on the telephone he asked if I wanted to say a few things and one of the things that first came to mind was when I was a freshman at Willamette, a

university professor in that convocation said that he thinks it really important to read a passage from the Book of Ecclesiastes to freshman, it substitutes the word "God" for "faculty". That passage reads something along the lines of... as you knew the temple of learning, keep your ears open and your mouth shut. Do not be a fool who does not even realize that it's sinful to make rash promises to the faculty. Do let your words be few when you talk to the faculty and vow to them that you will do something, don't delay doing it for the faculty has not pleasure in fools. Keep your promises to the faculty. It is far better to state that you will do something than to state that you will not do it. Don't try to defend yourself by telling the messenger for the faculty that it was all a mistake. That will make the faculty very angry, and they might destroy your prosperity.



I was sitting next to my father, who's a university professor, and he didn't seem to think that that minor substitution was inappropriate. My sister, who was on the other side of me leaned over and she said, "dad's been confusing those things all his life."

I really see our role as supporting what you do. You have built a remarkable institution here, and I'm thrilled to be a part of it. We want to do everything we can so that you can do your jobs without having to worry about the Federal government. We want to keep the funding coming, we want to reduce regulations, we want support your students – undergraduate and graduate – and be as supportive of your work as possible. We'll do that throughout by advocacy but also do it through being a resource for the Federal government policy majors. As long as I've known about Duke in this role of higher education and policy, I've known Deborah Jakubs and her work in global resource plan with the American Association of Research Libraries. Catheryn Cotten was referred to this morning as the Obi-Wan Kenobe of

Immigration across the United States. All of you that are interested in filling these types of roles, getting involved, and being a resource for policy makers not only on issues that are central to Duke and to relationships to the Federal government, but issues outside of that relationship, I encourage you to get involved. We're looking forward to working with you, and I'm just thrilled to be here. Thank-you.

Paul Haagen: Thank you John and Chris. When I asked him to come a number I heard was that Duke gets something like a billion dollars annually from the Federal government. It behooves us to have someone looking after those interests. We welcome Chris's assistance.

Next on the agenda, Professor Pat Leighton, Chair of Art and Art History Department is here to comment and explain the proposed name change for the department.

Art and Art History Department name change

Pat Leighton (A&AH): Thank-you. I think you all got a copy of the letter that I sent to Dean McLendon, and I think that explains it fairly well so what I'll do is just go over some of the basic concepts related to what we're doing in the Department of Art and Art History, and then if you have any questions I'll be happy to answer them.

When the Department of Art and Art History was founded, I wasn't here, but it was long enough ago that there was a very clear definition of what art history was in those days. It was really quite a lot narrower than we conceive of it today. And there was a focus on a hierarchy of the media so that painting, architecture, and sculpture were considered the most elevated of the arts, and the other arts were actually called minor arts.

In the years following, there have been enormous intellectual changes in all of the humanities that have profoundly affected the way that art history is done. In fact, our faculty at Duke has been very much in the vanguard for some of those intellectual changes: broadening a notion of what constitutes an interesting visual image that can impact on and be related to society, the importance of how humans relate to the kinds of objects that they're creating, visual aspects of those, notions with postmodernism and feminism, and so many changes that have happened, really changing notions about vision as expressive of ideology. So that it isn't just about fetishizing a single work of art, which might be art history at its narrowest. To find something like that, you'd have to go back to the '60's.

In my own work, as a matter of fact, just to give you one example, I worked on Picasso's collages, and it may seem incredibly obvious now and it's hard to reconstruct it, but my work was quite shocking because I suggested that a news clipping that Picasso pasted into his collages might have meaning as a piece of newspaper; that in fact one might read the news and think about how the news related to the larger work of art. There have been people in the Mu-

seum of Modern Art that still haven't forgiven me for that work.

That's one kind of element, the idea that a mass produced consumer object could have a relationship to a work of art that was viewed as having this kind of elevated hierarchical status in society, was very much dependent on viewing it as independent of the influences of culture in every way.

So the Department of Art and Art History is the combined department that has both practicing artists teaching visual arts and art historians. What we want to do now is to acknowledge in our title all the changes that have taken place in the way that we teach the visual arts and art history, the way that we teach this larger field of visual culture, so the *visual culture* concentration that we've just instituted and that has just been accepted, approved, is something that is going to look at visual culture in this far broader sense. It incorporates painting, sculpture, and architecture, but expands out into a field that includes visual imagery of all kinds and you can just think of film, television, and the internet as the kind of ways that the visual culture impinges on all of this.

All art that's made has a relation to that larger social field, and that's really the significance of wanting to change our title – to indicate that that's the way that we think about art history and visual culture now. The term visual culture, indicates the field of the objects of study in the larger context, all aspects of visual culture as they exist, in every society and in all moments in history. Think of Gutenberg's Bible as a moment that comes along at the same instant that printmaking is invented, for instance.

So this is something that is very powerful in our own era, but these kinds of technological changes that are at the center of many aspects have visual culture. Just go back into graffiti on Roman walls, so it's something that involves virtually every member of our Department. Visual Studies is simply the name of that field of study. So what we're suggesting is that we're combining art history, in its larger transformed sense, with visual studies in the department, and distinguishing that from the actual practice of visual arts, although those things, those three in fact, are very synergistic within our department.

"We want to acknowledge that these changes have happened in the field, that our faculty is at the forefront of thinking, researching, writing, publishing, and teaching, in light of these changes for many years, and that we're making curricular changes that will hopefully get that message across more clearly to undergraduates.

We're definitely hoping that there will be people who are thinking along these lines who will be attracted by a particular focus on visual culture.

As far as our future plans go, we hope to turn this concentration into a major, and we're going to be working on that proposal next year. When we do that, we'll also offer a minor in Visual Culture. The move to Central Campus is

conceived along the lines of these changes in our department, facilitating reaching out to various other units that we want to collaborate and cooperate with like the Center for Documentary Studies, like the visual arts themselves, the Nasher Museum. We hope that we'll be near all these things, that we can create tremendous strengths in the academic study of research of art and exhibitions of art, in the kind of outreach to the community that's so effectively performed by the Center for Documentary Studies. I'm still holding on to hopes for a cinema to be on Central but whatever else comes there, we'll be able to link it and to make that part of breaking down a number of walls that might have existed in – I guess we'll just call them the old days. So I don't know if you have any questions related to any of these things, I would be delighted to answer them.

Helen "Sunny" Ladd (Public Policy Studies): This all sounds very exciting. Just a quick question, have other universities gone in this direction, are they changing the names of their departments as well?

Pat Leighton: A few have. Yes, not all. Oh, by the way, a little footnote. We debated lengthily as you might imagine exactly how we should have this name change happen. It was recommended in our external review report that we consider changing the name, partly because the reviewers said, "you guys are leaders in this area, why doesn't your title indicate that?" – you know, nationally. So we thought about that for a while, and debated, we talked about just calling it Visual Studies or Visual Arts and Visual Studies, but interestingly our PhD students in the PhD program in Art History protested, and they said our project is to try to transform the field of Art History with the way that it develops here at Duke, and we want still to become art historians, that's our discipline, and they really requested that we leave art history in the title. Since that's been our project for a long time as well, we were all pretty much been in harmony with that. But that's a kind of sidebar to your question. Yes, UC Irvine, I believe, has a Department of Visual Studies, University of Rochester, there are quite a few places that have either incorporated it into their title or have a unit, Theory and Criticism in Visual Studies. MIT is another example, which is almost wholly focused on architecture, but where they're combining architecture and visual studies. So there have been. There's, I say, not a wave, but there have been maybe half a dozen very key places that have staked a claim in that way.

Paul Haagen: We have a proposed motion that: The Academic Council accepts and endorses the proposal to change the name of the Department of Art and Art History to the Department of Art, Art History, and Visual Studies.

Is there any discussion or questions? [The motion passed by voice vote without dissent.]

Faculty Climate Survey

Haagen: The final item on the agenda for today is the Duke Faculty Survey. Provost Lange and Nancy Allen, Special Assistant to the Provost for Faculty Diversity and Faculty Development, will present the findings.

Provost Lange: Thank you all very much. This is an interim report. You got a preliminary sneak preview, as the memo says, earlier this year. This is the first round of the reporting on the Faculty Climate Survey. It is a mammoth survey, and there are many levels of analysis to come. We'll try to give some highlights today and we want to hear a lot of discussion; we'll try to set up an agenda, which in a way will help move us forward over the coming months.

I just want to remind you that we will have access to additional surveys, which were done exactly like ours, at other schools over the next year. When we add those that will add perspective to some of the responses. We really don't know, in a lot of areas, whether what we're finding is a Duke characteristic or a larger characteristic of research universities, so that's an important thing as we move forward.

We're most pleased to bring this report to you today. I also want to thank both Nancy Allen and the Faculty Diversity Standing Committee. I hope you all understand what an undertaking this has been. Nancy, the committee, and David Jamieson-Drake have just done a fabulous job in collecting and beginning the process. And it is only the beginning. The other day I said "Oh David, we're going to do this every day next year, right?" He said, "This survey!?" So we will be doing this every 5 years, but I just want to thank them because it's an enormous undertaking, it's extremely interesting, but it's an enormous undertaking and they've just done a fabulous job.

I'm going to pass the floor on to Nancy for a little while and then I'm going to come back.

Nancy Allen (Medicine, Assistant to the Provost for Faculty Diversity and Faculty Development): In 2005, as you know, Provost Lange authorized the creation of this Faculty Climate Survey to expand the body of knowledge we had already acquired from an earlier survey by the Ford-Foundation-funded pilot survey of Junior Faculty that was conducted by Richard Chait and Cathy Trower of Harvard.

The Trower and Chait study found significantly higher levels of satisfaction among faculty of color at Duke compared to its peer institutions on several points, including number of courses and students taught, physical setting, and resources for support of research and teaching. However, Duke's junior faculty of color indicated that they were less clear than faculty of color at other institutions about evidence considered in the tenure decision and expectations for and performance in advising and campus service.

In 2004, April Brown, as Chair of the Faculty Diversity Standing Committee, took the lead in planning a climate survey for all regular-rank faculty. A subcommittee of the

FDSC examined such surveys from Stanford, MIT, Michigan, and Rice, and recommended that Duke use a variation on the theme of MIT's survey as our model. April Brown, Susan Roth, and Judith Ruderman from this committee, along with David Jamieson-Drake and Kendrick Tatum from the Institutional Research Office, spent considerable time a year or more ago adapting the MIT survey for our purposes. This survey was discussed at Academic Council about a year ago, and feedback was positive for us to pursue that study. David has also been working at other COFHE institutions to get on board. So far, MIT and Stanford have administered similar surveys. Harvard will administer one to their faculty in the Fall of 2006, and hopefully after that Penn, Northwestern, Washington University, Cornell, and others, including maybe even Duke and Yale will administer surveys in the coming years, so we'll be able to have a wider benchmark for our results – and see where we might work harder in fostering the best climate possible for faculty at Duke.

Our survey was administered last spring in April and May, we left it open for a number of weeks and eventually 55% of regular-rank faculty responded. That was 1367 regular-rank faculty, including 559 from the campus and 808 from the medical center. We looked at data by tenure status, gender, race, and school. (I also want to thank David and Pat without whom we couldn't have done this. They really put their hearts and souls and many, many, many hours into this and tell me they still have other work to do.)

They provided much data for a climate-survey working group, which consisted of April Brown, John Clum, Wagner Kamakura, Monty Reichert, Susan Roth, Judith Ruderman, Ben Reese and myself, to review. That working group has met every two weeks since September to look back on the data that you've given us. The Faculty Diversity Standing Committee has discussed interim information from the report as well as this final report. Provost Lange met with the Faculty Diversity Standing Committee two weeks ago. He and I met with ECAC the next day, and what you see is the final version of the overall report. Peter Lange mentioned just a minute ago that the individual school reports will be sent to each dean for discussion at the school level, and I'm sure that he will charge the deans with addressing areas of concern in their local environments. I now turn the podium back over to Peter.

Provost Lange: Before we turn to the data, there are a number of issues that I would like to discuss with you, because I think it will help to orient the discussion. The question is: how do you approach this amount of data about faculty climate? To some degree it really does depend on whether you are an academic investigator, or a policy person looking for things in the data that you might in fact correct, or seem to correct. To a substantial extent, for the Provost's office, we are looking at these data from a policy point of view: What do we find in these data that will enable

us to improve the climate on campus, and where should we intervene?

So let me say a few things about that. First, we need to ask questions about what units we should be using. And in fact, as you know the data that you received divides into clinical, and all and the rest, so to speak, other than clinical. That's not adequate as an analytical tool for directing policy, because we know that on many of these questions, there will be a very substantial difference between what happens school by school. So one of the things that we are discussing with the Faculty Diversity Standing Committee and the working group will in fact be: what issues by unit should we look at? There are issues which span units, for which either unit-level or university-level interventions might be appropriate. So one thing is to look clinical, campus, individual schools on campus. We have circulated only the all-schools data now, but we will have soon the individual school studies and the committees are looking at those.

Second, what issues within the main categories of issues. Remember there are 5 main categories: satisfaction with Duke and career, workload and work environment, quality of life, satisfaction with resources and services, and mentoring in promotion in tenure. What issues within those seem most worthy of our attention? We cannot possibly address all of them. So that is a second cut on the data which you could use. A third cut on the data is constituency: gender, an obvious one, rank, another, other useful subdivisions may emerge as we go through, especially on a school-by-school basis. You don't want to be departmental...

The other thing that will clearly be needed is more multivariate analysis, once we've identified the central questions and potential areas of intervention. We do not intend to do a massive data-mining exercise looking for relationships in every possible direction. Once we have focused on particular questions with respect to particular constituencies, before we intervene, or try to develop policies to intervene, we're going to want to try to understand some of the dynamics.

So when we discuss the data today, I'm going to illustrate to you some of the reasons why you need to take some care, because you could do really stupid things, in policy terms, by not fully understanding where the right place to intervene is.

So what have I done so far? I've charged the Faculty Diversity Standing Committee to identify the most important issues for short-term and medium-term interventions; in other words to look at all the data and say, "what do we think are the issues that, short-term, we might be able to intervene in and make an effect? What are the ones in which we think medium term might be appropriate?" So we're looking at phased implementation, following analysis, based on a focus on certain kind of issues, which the faculty committee highlights at being ones that they think most relevant.

We also expect to fold these data into the diversity agenda, which will appear in the strategic plan. We're doing the strategic plan now, there may be areas where we can do interventions strategically over a five-year period to correct things and where do we need resources that the strategic planning might specify.

Once the schools' reports are ready, as Nancy as already indicated, we will also charge the deans with actions in their schools and units, where data support substantial concerns on the part of faculty with school-specific issues.

I will highlight one right now: classrooms. Any of you who have looked at the survey will see that there is a general discontent about the quality of classrooms. I can also tell you that if you go school-by-school, that discontent varies very substantially. There are certain schools in which doing something about the quality of our classrooms makes more difference in terms of how the faculty feels about it now, and others where it makes less. Well, the strategic plan is obviously an ideal time to be thinking about classroom issues in the context of construction, renovation, and back-fill when spaces are emptied due to new construction.

So there's an intersection: strategic planning, climate survey, capital improvements. We also plan to have conversations with minority faculty and LGBT faculty. As you'll notice in the survey, we did not have sufficient responses, a sufficient response rate, in fact we probably don't have large enough populations, even if the response rate had been better, to be able to do the kind of analysis which we would have needed to do, to really highlight issues with respect to those groups. So for those groups we will undertake other kinds of information-gathering in order to improve our ability to assure that their encounter with the climate at Duke which is supportive of their work and their lives and careers.

So we're going to start with this table, which is on overall satisfaction. You all have these tables, we're using the tables that are in this thing. Obviously, we were pretty pleased with these overall results. I mean, you know, this is overall satisfaction of faculty members, and what you see here is that our faculty members came up almost to the "somewhat satisfied," which is a pretty good finding. We can be pretty proud of this, we can feel pretty good about it. I want to assure you that I'm not going to spend a lot of time tooting our horn. But this is a good finding.

The other really terrific finding is this one here, the "intellectual stimulation" of your work comes out as the highest. Now you would hope that that would be true at a research university... Nonetheless, you can't do a survey like this and not feel good when that is affirmed at that level.

I want to also note the item which came out for us. I hope you all can read this, it says *current salary*. Big surprise, okay? The interesting thing about current salary is that we keep very close tabs on Duke salaries as compared with our peers. And our salaries are usually somewhere between 6th to 8th in that ranking. And the schools above us

are almost all in much higher-cost-of-living areas. So, on an objective basis, our salaries are not bad, but we are going to take this certainly into account as we move forward and think about how to do Duke faculty development over the next period of time.

We've talked here about not self-censoring with respect to hiring. Well this is an area where that's going to show up in. Turning now to another one. If anybody has any particular comments, this is about current rank, "are you satisfied with your current rank?" Lo and behold full professors are most content with their current rank!

The benefits packet, I think we can feel pretty good about this. Schedule of classes, I want to say, I was pretty happy with that, given that we just changed the scheduling process two years ago and there was some unhappiness about our pushing the classes into a new framework, but we're not picking up a lot of discontent with that new balance ... Advising responsibilities, committee responsibilities, intellectual stimulation we've talked about. Satisfaction with curricular requirements of your school overall.

These two last questions, *satisfaction with curricular requirements* actually I don't completely understand what these responses represent to be honest with you, but we have to look into them a little bit more because there's a little bit lower. It may be, however, and this is what I would hope, that the faculty in the departments are saying, "actually our curriculum is not as good and as interesting and as vibrant as it might be, and maybe it's time for us to spend a little time thinking about the curricular requirements in our department." If that's what the read on this is, rather than "no we have to teach too many courses," but if it is that we feel that our curriculum is not as exciting and interesting as it might be in our department, then this represents an opportunity.

I promised you that I would not spend a lot of time on self-praise, so I won't spend a lot of time on these two items here, academic leadership is *ineffective* and the administration is *ineffective*, which got very low scores.

John Staddon: Did you ask if the administration is *effective*?

Lange: No, are you crazy! But there do appear to be a number of issues on this chart. There's a complementary chart to this with respect to academic leadership, where we found that the clinical-science data are substantially less encouraging, and I think that we have some issues in the clinical-science departments which may well have to do with the size of the clinical-science faculty overall and the size of some of those units, and communications within those units. But that's one of the areas where we have to dig deeper to discover what the issues are.

It also appears that gender is *not* often an issue. In this particular table, blue is male and yellow is female, what you see is that there are almost no items on which there is a statistical difference. There is one in this one, and this is what I want to come back to, *disputes and problems are resolved*

effectively, and women feel a little less happy about that. Although the overall score isn't bad, the female scores are less, the other one here is *commitment to diversity* is demonstrated, women come out a little bit less there. Now what I want to note is that you will find a pattern across all the data that we need to explain with respect to gender. And I'll come back to that in a couple of minutes.

But I want to start that conversation by bringing those two issues to your attention. This is the one where you see that the clinical, the pink bar is clinical, so this is where more, this one is *important decisions are made without much collaboration*, clinical sciences agree more. *Faculty treat each other in an even-handed way*, the clinical sciences agree less. *I received constructive feedback about my performance*, clinical sciences agree less. *I have a hard time obtaining the resources I need*, clinical science is more. You'll see a pattern here of the clinical sciences compared to the rest of the university which, and that's the only really meaningful indicator, which suggests that we have some issues to address. And we will be talking with the Medical School administration about those issues.

Again, we have to look at what the causal issues are. Clinical sciences have been under a lot of pressure in the last few years with changes in medical reimbursement and so forth, so there are issues there that may have to do with external pressures, combined with internal communications about policy. I don't know the exact answer, but those are the kinds of things you want to come back to as you're working.

This is relationships with departmental colleagues. Now the first thing I would note is again this one. This one is the double star *I constantly feel under scrutiny by my colleagues*. The tenured faculty seem to feel that substantially less than the un-tenured faculty! John was reminding me that this makes the whole study worthwhile. But what I do want to note here more generally is the results are fairly much as we expect. There are not a lot of surprises. *I go out of my way to include colleagues in decisions*, tenured faculty do that a little more. *I'm ignored in my department or division*, the untenured faculty feel that a little bit more than the tenured faculty....

In any case, there are a set of issues here that tie into the mentoring questions later in the survey, which we do need to pay attention to. You know we've been trying to do more things with mentoring, but there's clearly work to be done. This results are more positive: *my colleagues value my contributions, my area of research is on the fringe of my discipline*, females feel that more. *My colleagues solicit my opinion about their research*. *I constantly feel under scrutiny*, we talked about that. *My workload is the same as that of other faculty of my rank and of my department and division*. *I go out of my way to include new colleagues in decisions*, that one... *I am ignored in my department or division*, females a little bit more, although not very high. *I have to work harder than my colleagues to be perceived as a legiti-*

mate scholar. That's a serious one. *My colleagues include me in new collaborative initiatives*, that one doesn't show up much. *Bringing up the behavior of my colleagues might affect my reputation or advancement*. These are not good findings.

These are findings which raise concern, but what I want to suggest is that we need to dig down further before we consider what policy implications they might have. There are clear and consistent gender differences with women generally feeling less valued. But we really don't know why this is the case. What are the dynamics that are at work? You will see in other parts of the survey, for instance, that women also feel under more stress about the relationship between their work life and their home life, and especially their household responsibilities or their family responsibilities. So we need to understand the extent to which this is a product of different expectations, and to what extent is a product of different treatment. We cannot immediately leap to the conclusion that every one of these results is a function of the fact that women are being treated differently. It may be that they have different expectations or that their needs are different given the other things which they need to do in the course of their daily lives. So we need to be very careful not to move immediately to a sort of discriminatory conclusion, but we do obviously need to understand these results well. I have two more that I'm going to show.

Nancy Allen: We divided this up, I'm going to do a few slides on Sections 2-4. So this slide is from the workload and environment section, page 15, Table 7 in your report. And you see here that there was a tendency for Latino/Latina faculty to have a larger number of advisees than other faculty, and for African American faculty to have advisorship for more undergraduates. I think that's something that we hear from students. I know Peter and Dick and I heard that from students at PCOBA recently and I think they will be presenting more information to us about that soon. But this just puts some data behind it from our standpoint.

Another surprise, but we can now document it: Women report that they spend more time on domestic responsibilities than men! Just wanted you to see that. Particularly wanted the men to see it! More time preparing for and teaching classes, which is interesting. More time with email, which I'd like to know more about, and less time consulting, pursuing recreational, religious or community activities. So there are some trade-offs women make, some probably of necessity in order to have enough hours in the week to manage both professional and personal responsibilities. I thought this one was very interesting.

Helen Ladd: Will you correct that for age at some point?

Allen: We've looked at that data. She's asking about correcting it for age.

David Jamieson-Drake (Director: Institutional Research, Office of the Provost): We controlled it for rank. It

still came up significant by gender controlling for rank, which is correlated with age.

Allen: Somewhat of an age thing, some of us are older professors than others.

Phil Costanzo (Psychology: SHS): Another question, on corrections. In terms of the differential number of advisees: is that because of the discipline? If individuals who are Latino or African American are likely to concentrate on certain disciplines, and the faculty-student ratio is unfavorable...

Allen: Right. I would have to ask David that question too. For the advisees, is that also compared with other disciplines?

Jamieson-Drake: Yes, we did regressions for the entire institution controlling for academic division as well as gender, rank, and race.

Lange: But not by department, right?

Jamieson-Drake: No, not by department.

Lange: The question is really about department, because what Phil's asking is if you were in a department which has a very high student-to-faculty ratio, and if women were more concentrated in such departments, if blacks were more concentrated in such departments, then all faculty in such department might have an extra-heavy advising load – it need not be a racial issue.

Jamieson-Drake: Yes, we also did regressions separately for every academic division and in those we did use department as well as race, rank, and gender. For the reports that go to the deans, we control for those factors. So, we say, if Latino shows up significantly there, it will be controlling for department as well as other factors. And the institution overall, if you include all the departments, you've got more departments than you do, say, African American faculty.

Allen: Thank-you, David, and thanks for your question. This next slide is on sources of stress in the past two years, where women report significantly greater stress than men, particularly in areas of caring for family, even children or parents or other relatives, as well as reporting higher levels of stress relating to the tenure-relief process. Interestingly, when David looked at this from the school perspective, in Law and Nursing there were not meaningful differences in these areas, so I've come to the conclusion that the Law School faculty are the happiest around and maybe we need to model what they are doing right. We'll see if they're happiest with their salaries also. Is that true David?

Jamieson-Drake: I don't remember, sorry.

Allen: The next slide, again work and family issues. This is Table 13 on Page 25. Overall, women are significantly more likely to agree that women faculty with family responsibilities are treated differently within their academic units. This is consistent with the information that women faculty experience significantly greater challenges in balancing personal and professional demands than do men.

John Staddon: Nancy does that "treated differently" discriminate between being treated better or worse, or is it always worse?

Allen: We just asked about "differently", didn't we, David?

Staddon: You can't tell it from that question, but you can infer it from the responses to other questions, absolutely.

Allen: He's saying you can infer it from the responses to other questions that they mean *treated worse*.

This is an additional table that was not in the report but that David and Pat and I have been going around about in the last few days. A bullet point in the executive summary was added, looking at the issue of faculty members delaying or deciding not to have children. And that is somewhat of a national concern at academic institutions everywhere. I participated in an American Council and Education Sloan Foundation meeting last fall where this information was raised and is of concern to many institutions. The point that we made in the executive summary was that 57% of women overall compared with 41% of men delayed or decided not to have children. And these graphs show this broken down into those with children and those without children. David was able to combine that demographic information with the responses to these questions. And there clearly is a significant gender difference.

Mary "Tolly" Boatwright (Classical Studies): Do you have total numbers, because isn't it true that there are fewer women at the full-professor rank so that means as one reads this it is slightly different...

Allen: Yes, the table with all the numbers on it was too small for us to make an overhead, but that is correct.

Provost: All that would mean is that the number indicated was less stable.

Allen: Right, for example in the totals, for full professor, there were 63 women and 252 men who responded to that question. Associate professor: 61 women, 143 men. Assistant professor: 79 women and 145 men. Non tenure track: 153 women and 214 men for the top chart.

Josh Socolar (Physics): Is it correct to infer from the first three bars there, full, associate, and assistant, that the problem is getting worse over time? That if people who become professors later are deciding not to have children more than they were?

Lange: Belief in that, which I might believe or not, requires you to believe in perfect method...but it could go either way. But we know for survey results in general, for other things, like politics – did you vote in the last election? The further back the election, the more people that voted.

Allen: At least most of us know when we've had children, right?

Provost Lange: Right, but we don't necessarily remember if it was delayed. You might think that...I'm just saying, you can't make that inference automatically. There

is no other cultural change, which is much broader, right, in terms of these issues.

Phil Costanzo: Were these the actual questions or was this a composite of questions? Career considerations were brought up broadly right?

Allen: There was a specific question, right, David, about this issue.

Jamieson-Drake: Yes.

Allen: Yes, so it was from a specific question. And then David went back and Pat went back and pulled out those of us who have children and those who don't and the different ranks and so I thought that was particularly interesting.

Lange: The only thing I would add about this one is a secondary reason why this is a concern: that, to the extent that this is true, we don't know the number of women who, facing the same decision, are dropping out of the professoriate. We know about the so-called leaky pipeline and we know that the leaky pipeline is particularly leaky at the childbearing ages, so this data could be having an inverse implication...

One thing I'm interested in looking at in these data would be the breakdown by division or school, because one the suspicion (although I don't know it to be true) is that in the natural sciences, where the startup of a career is particularly onerous – you're in the lab all day – it may be particularly true. We know that nationally, the leaky pipeline is particularly leaky, so to speak, in the sciences, which is one of the reasons why have a significant drop-out rate of professoriate in science and engineering.

Phil Costanzo: One other question, because of cohort effects, is it the case that one could track whether the introduction of maternity leave had any effect on this process, or does that go back too far? You know, do new policies like maternity leave actually affect these decisions?

Allen: Our first university policy was in 1989 and it was expanded just a few years ago, you know, and we were tracking...

Provost: Did you hear that David?

Jamieson-Drake: Yeah. Yes, we can check that.

Provost: Susan's been waiting. Susan?

Susan Roth (Psychology: SHS): I just want to say that I think that the men's percentage is interesting. It's higher than we expected. And I was just thinking, we don't know why that is. One explanation could be that the younger cohorts are more likely to be partnered with other professional people. Or it could be that they are independently making different kinds of decisions about that because of their own role in the child-rearing process, but I think that's very interesting.

Lange: Of course this is a classic area where you have to ask yourself ... how much difference we could make, overall. ...

Allen: A couple more quick ones about *satisfaction with resources to support teaching and research*. This slide

shows that clinical compared with non-clinical, there are issues again on almost every point where clinical faculty are less satisfied with teaching resources – presentation, lecture, demonstration support. They are more satisfied with classroom space, which Peter mentioned earlier. Clinical faculty are less satisfied with funds for innovation and with TA support. In satisfaction with resources to support teaching, we see here that faculty in Pratt and Arts & Sciences humanities are lowest on the classroom satisfaction. That breaks it out a little bit about who likes their classrooms and who doesn't.

Sunny Ladd: Could you just tell us the color? It's hard to read that.

Allen: The red is Arts & Sciences, humanities; green is Natural Sciences; blue is Social Sciences; and yellow is Pratt on the top chart. On the bottom, professional schools: Divinity is red, Fuqua is green, Law is blue, again the happy campers, and Nicholas is yellow. So, Nicholas faculty are not as satisfied with location of classroom space if you look at the chart.

Lange: I think there's almost a direct correlation between the classroom space question and how recently the classrooms were built.

Nancy: 1929.

Lange: Law has gotten new classrooms in the last two years and it sort of falls back from that.

Allen: And then this last one is *satisfaction with resources to support research*. Again, a few differences in overall satisfaction with research resources and again, less satisfaction with the amount of laboratory space on the clinical side. And less satisfaction with administrative and grant support in clinical compared with non-clinical – I see a few nodding heads there.

Lange: The last slide we're going to put up has to do with the tenure process. Now, I have to tell you that I'm both a little troubled and a little perplexed by these findings. So, what you're going to see here is that by rank, *criteria for promotion are clearly communicated to junior faculty* and the tenured faculty, of course, somewhat agree at most, big surprise. The assistant professors are down here close to the neither agree nor disagree line. The criteria for tenure are clearly communicated to junior faculty, you get the same findings, so I'm not going to go into each individual one.

So, it would appear, if you took these results, that we're not doing a good job of communicating the criteria for tenure. Or at least, not as good a job as we'd like. But what does this actually mean? I need to tell you a little bit about what we do to communicate so we can try to understand what isn't happening or what the source of this is.

Every year, every assistant professor is invited to a seminar, a presentation with five or six deans, the Provost, the chair of the APT committee, at which there is a full explication not only of the formal criteria but also of the underlying process and what the expectations are. That happens every year, so that an assistant professor at Duke

would have six or seven potential exposures to that session during his or her time at Duke. In addition, all the material we have is up on the web and is fully available.

So the question is, what does this response reflect? I have a surmise – but we won't know it until we see what the other schools' results are – and that is that at institutions like Duke and our peers, there is in fact a gray zone which is built into our tenure requirements such that there is an *inevitable* uncertainty, because while we say productivity is important, we always also say, but quality matters. And quality is fundamentally judged by senior peers, internal and external. There is necessarily some uncertainty about that, certainly for a significant number of our junior faculty who are not either so outstanding or so self-confident that they don't have doubts... So I don't know how far we can push this. This is one of those areas where there is a finding which is troubling but where you might not be able to make a major change through any reasonable policy intervention.

I know, for instance, at some of the western schools, that there is a clear cut rule: x number of articles in refereed journals, and you get tenure; y less than x , you don't. We don't operate under a system like that, so there is inherent uncertainty in our system. Whether we could push that number up a little bit, I suspect that there's further mentoring that could go on, although now we do the mid-career reappointment letters, so people are getting very clear letters. Of course, those letters, for some people, generate substantial uncertainty, to be honest with you, because that's part of the purpose. It's to say you need to do these things and if you stay on the track you're on right now, you may not make it. How much of this we can or should eliminate is an interesting question.

I wanted to highlight this because it's something that has come up consistently in studies we've done and we don't seem to be able to really penetrate the process. We might do some focus groups to try to understand a little bit more, but that's the question. So, the floor is open to questions in general.

Steve Baldwin (Chemistry): So you think this is because there's this perception that so and so did everything that he or she was supposed to have done and didn't get tenured, so this is what's in the external letter type responses? In other words, they had the papers, they had the funding, they won the contests...

Lange: I doubt it. I doubt it. And the reason I say I doubt that is because having looked at the last six or seven years of cases and knowing what's gone through, there have been very few surprises. Very, very, very few surprises. And as you know, because of the reports I give you, what we've been doing is pushing things down to the departments and pushing things down into earlier review, so our percentage of people who actually get to the APT process who are getting tenured has gone up, so I doubt that that's the source.

Baldwin: Sometimes people don't get tenured because they never make it out of the department so you might not be, it still could be buried in the external letters.

Lange: Right, it could be there somewhere.

Paul Haagen: I have a request that you both speak up and that you identify yourselves.

Sunny Ladd (Public Policy): This is a follow-up on this informational issue, the way that maybe the suggestion might tease out the result. The information goes just one way. If someone gets tenured in a department, everyone notices they get tenure and can put two and two together. If you don't get tenure, nobody who's been involved in discussions can talk about the reasons for that publicly, so there's no information going in that direction. I'd be interested in having a follow-up analysis here that looks at these differential responses by department, or by division, looking at the proportions of people getting tenure defined in a broad way in the department, so including those who leave early as not having tenure. It just seems we might be able to tease out some things related to the uncertainty because of the method information is spread.

Lange: I agree but remember at the beginning I said there are some questions I'd be interested in but I'm not sure exactly what the policy consequence would be? That's probably one of them, because in fact, even if we found that that was the reason, I don't think any of us would be supportive of the idea that we would have wide discussions about the failed cases with our other junior colleagues. That would be at least one policy possibility.

Ladd: The policy could go the other way. If you found out it was the reason, though, then that would suggest that everything you're doing may be sufficient.

Lange: Yes, that's true. Phil?

Phil Costanzo: Just a question about the psychological meaning of this. I get the impression that you're in a system where two things are happening: you're getting support from the system and you're getting evaluated by the very same system, that's very draining... And there is a sense in which the evaluative part is non-participatory and that may in fact limit even more, because there's sort of an implication of a power. So it seems to me that participation in the construction of evaluative stance at the junior level, some way in which there's a sense of which is evaluated, this is how evaluation should happen. The University has its standards, but there ought to be a way in which, I would think, that individuals have a way of expressing viewpoints about the evaluative system.

Lange: I think that's a possibility. It would be what I hope is happening through the annual conversations that the chairs have with their junior faculty. When I was chair, when I had those annual meetings, it was really about, "Here's how I see your record and here's what we're looking for and here's why and here's what we would expect". Now I don't know what happens in those conferences, but

my guess is that it's that level at which the most effective action can be taken.

Tolly Boatwright (Classical Studies): I understand pretty well why there is uncertainty because, as you say, you can't specify x number of books are sufficient, or whatever. But – I'm thinking structurally, from year to year – are there notes that are passed amongst the deans as to what was said in previous years? Because what I've heard from junior faculty is that they get differing advice from year to year. Not that you have to give the same advice all the time, but, you know, one year you're hearing two books, the next year you're hearing, well a good book. So something like that might be useful, not that you'd have to reiterate verbatim, but something...

Lange: That's a good point. I don't recall that happening, but it's quite possible that it happens. It's really whether the deans bring the same material. You've got to admit that if the deans say the exact same thing every year, it's going to get mighty tedious mighty fast. Yes?

Esther Gabara (Romance Studies): I was wondering if there was some kind of university training for people in those positions of leadership like the chairs, in terms of how these kinds of things are communicated, how those annual meetings with faculty should function, with strategies for communicating information while not unduly increasing the stress level?

Lange: The question is, is there training available to chairs and other leadership about how to communicate these kind of issues. And the answer to that is: there's more than there used to be. Whether there is enough is another question. We now have, in addition to the normal APT training process, which is really just what the rules are, which goes on for instance in Arts & Sciences chair preparation, there's also a separate seminar that my office runs for chairs, which is more of a leadership training type thing in which communication around difficult issues is one of the themes. That said, you know, is it just about this issue? No. Should we maybe be doing one? That's a possibility. I really want to wait, though, until I get those other results, because I really want to understand whether this is inherent in institutions of our type at more or less the same level, are we doing worse or are we doing better.

John Staddon (referring to a slide): What looks like a very dramatic finding was is that people did not agree that standards were the same across the across the units.

Lange: Correct. The standards aren't the same across all units. So if they did agree, they would be indicating that they misunderstood the system. I mean, standards at some generic general level are the same across all units.

Staddon: Well, most people disagree with the statement that standards are the same for all units. Do you have any comment about that? Should we worry about it?

Lange: I agree with you totally, and in fact that's the message that I communicated at that annual session, okay? We talked about, you know, that 35-year decision based on

Lange: No, I don't think so. I think, in fact that evaluation isn't the same across all scholarly units. It is at the general level, but you need to know what people meant here. But we don't evaluate work the same way in the humanities as we do in the engineering school.

Staddon: Of course, the presumption of a question like that is you're going to be expected to respond "yes, everything is fair and square".

Lange: But it didn't ask whether it was fair across all units, it asked whether it's done the same way. That's the way I read that question. We don't know what it means, exactly what that means, I agree.

Earl Dowell (Engineering): Peter, you mentioned earlier that you expected some differences among these issues across schools and that you would be issuing reports to several deans about their particular school. Will those reports to the deans be shared with the faculty at each of those schools?

Lange: I would hope so.

Dowell: Will it happen or are you just hoping?

Lange: Well, let's see. There's a gray area in there, so I will strongly encourage the deans to share those.

Andrew Muir (School of Medicine): A follow-up on that. You mentioned a next step for the Clinical Sciences. Is there anything extra, given the consistent findings in this survey?

Lange: Extra? I'll be discussing it with the Chancellor and the Dean, but we want to get more breakdowns. There are 1400 faculty in Clinical Sciences, there are 350-400 faculty in the Department of Medicine, so we need to break those results down before we have a policy-oriented or an issue-oriented conversation with the Chancellor and Dean. I will alert them, based on these results, but until we get the breakdown by subunits, it won't be as useful. But we did get – how many respondents in medicine? 900? Over 800 responses in the clinical area, so we'll be able to break down the data, perhaps even in some units by division.

Peter Burian (Classical Studies): I'd like to go back to this question of the evaluation process. The way we usually talk about this seems to confuse evaluation and measurement, or both... I think it should somehow be emphasized that the function of the tenure process is to give assurance that a younger scholar is going to be...to continue to do interesting...In the end, it's true, I think, as I understand the process, that a great deal does depend on talented work already published.... And also the degree to which this is evaluated by people and peers, and also the degree to which this seems to be this, and this message is part of what needs to be conveyed, but I would simply say that when I have conversations with younger professors, they want to know you how many pounds of this do I have to squeeze out by when?

6 or 7 years of work and therefore, you know all of those things. It's not surprising, however, that the faculty member asked the quantity question about the quality question, be-

cause your answer to the quality question will be “really good,” or “thought of very well” by your peers, or “high-impact as measured by the external letters we get” and that’s sort of the end of the conversation, right? And there’s not, a real concreteness about it. Because there’s uncertainty, “Well, how do I know what my peers will think of my work?” You know, I think we’re agreeing, basically.

Burian: Well there is a structure for the process? For example, it’s not easy to advise on all the risks, though in many ways that’s probably what we should be doing. It is difficult and complicated when we have a situation in which we cannot have all the answers, but I think perhaps more shared discussion including more consciousness – based on the number of people who have these conversations.

Lange: It might be useful for us to insist on an annual meeting of chairs about this subject, and I think that would be a serious possibility. I think we’re out of time, right? Thank you. We’ll be back.

Paul Haagen: Thank you Nancy and Peter. There being no further business for the Council, we are adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,
John Staddon



Faculty Secretary
March 10, 2006