



Minutes of the Meeting of the Academic Council  
Thursday, October 20, 2016

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

Welcome, everyone, to the October meeting of the Academic Council. While our meeting agenda is brief, we have two significant agenda items, the DKU Resolution and the Strategic Plan, for discussion. I'm pleased that we will have plenty of time for these topics today. I will preside over the beginning of the meeting, however I must regretfully leave our meeting shortly after 4 pm to catch a flight on Duke business. My colleague from ECAC, Professor Emily Klein, who is the Vice Chair of Academic Council, will preside over the meeting after I depart. Thank you, Emily.

This is the first of a two-meeting sequence on the DKU Resolution. We will discuss the Resolution today, and we have allotted time to vote on the DKU Resolution at our November meeting.

Faculty input to plans and programs in their formative stages is a critical aspect of faculty governance and of building a community where all of the voices of our members are respected and considered. Today we have an opportunity to provide input into our Strategic Plan while it is still in the formative stage. Engaging today in an in-depth discussion of the Strategic Plan gives us, the faculty, the opportunity to participate in the creation of our vision for the future of Duke. We will devote the majority of our meeting today to this

important discussion, and we are very pleased to have Provost Sally Kornbluth and Vice Provost Susan Lozier at our meeting to contribute our thoughts to the Strategic Plan, which we will share as a roadmap to Duke's future.

Thank you for the positive comments that many of you expressed to me and ECAC regarding the organization of the DKU discussion during our September Council meeting, and the encouragement to follow the same format for our subsequent in-depth discussions. Based upon your input, we will continue with the same format for this meeting.

We will devote the majority of our meeting today to our feedback on the Strategic Plan, just as we devoted 90 minutes to our feedback on the DKU undergraduate degree proposal last month. This means that we will limit the DKU discussion to, at most, 20 to 25 minutes today, and devote the rest of our meeting to the Strategic Plan.

We will run the Q & A for both the DKU Resolution and the Strategic Plan presentation as we did at last month's discussion about DKU. To organize our discussion, when a comment or question is offered by a faculty member, we will give some time for a response by the Provost or in the case of the Strategic Plan discussion, Vice Provost Lozier. Then, other faculty comments that are directly related to that

initial question will be entertained next. After discussion on a question has been completed, I will close that topic and ask for a faculty member to offer their thoughts on another topic related to the proposal at hand. Emily will do the same for the Strategic Plan discussion. Due to the limited time available for the DKU discussion, we will move quickly from topic to topic.

Are there any questions? Okay let's get to the approval of last month's minutes.

### ***APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 15th MINUTES***

*(Minutes approved by voice vote without dissent)*

**Jokerst:** The attendance sheets for Council members are being circulated, so please initial and pass them on. Also, when you ask questions or make comments, please identify yourself for the benefit of everyone in the room. Let's move on to the DKU undergraduate degree resolution.

### ***DKU UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE RESOLUTION***

**Jokerst:** We will now discuss the DKU undergraduate degree resolution. Council members asked that this session be open, rather than in Executive Session, and the Provost in consultation with ECAC agreed that Executive Session was not necessary for today's discussion.

As you know, last month's meeting was devoted to the discussion of the proposed undergraduate degree for Duke-Kunshan University and today we return to this conversation in advance of the vote scheduled at our November 17 meeting. We received an email with comments about the DKU proposal, and, so that we can share and

that you can read those comments, we have placed it on the Academic Council website behind the netID login with the DKU document provided by the Provost.

With your agenda, you saw the proposed resolution (refers to slide) and on our website at the netID protected location, is the background document that is referenced in this resolution. Also for your reference, I would like to show you the resolution that was passed in 2012 by the Academic Council regarding DKU graduate programs (refers to slide). I'll give you a minute to read that and then we'll return to the resolution at hand today.

Okay, let's return to the DKU resolution that we will be discussing today. Before we open the floor for discussion, President Brodhead has asked to say a few words.

**Richard Brodhead (President):** I promised Nan extreme brevity. The fact that you have to leave at 4 pm means that if I speak for half an hour or so, you won't even know how long I went on (laughter). This is the meeting where this faculty will be asked to consider a Strategic Plan. We are at a University that has benefitted from prior Strategic Plans, and now the question is, can we do as good of one this time? You know that the question of a Strategic Plan is not just, how can we do a little more of what we already do? But, what kind of choices can we make, what kind of initiatives can we take or investments could we make such that the university, in time, would end up able to perform its mission at a yet-higher way, and thus enjoy even higher repute? I would say to you what I'm sure you already know, which is, although it doesn't really appear in the Strategic Plan, the Duke Kunshan University undergraduate proposal is a strategic choice for this university. The net results are about

strategic choices, it seems to me. Why would you do such a program? Walking around in one's ordinary life, one might think to do it, but if you thought strategically, you might say to yourself some of the following things. One, it is not controversial that the most rapidly-evolving nation, and thus, geopolitical force in the world, is China. That being so, since China is a part of every issue involving global health, global environment, global economics, global security, global information security, and everything else, you know that a university that can't find a way to engage in China will be a university that is unable to give its students the kind of education that will help them understand the world they need to be actors in. The DKU plan, and thank you, Nan, for showing us the resolution that got the Graduate Program started, that was a test program, or a trial program. Not every feature of it was a success, but it has had at least the following success. It has made Duke significantly better known in China than it ever was before. I can testify to that. It has also enabled us to form deep penetrations and deep connectivities with research partners in China. The fact that the Global Health Research Center was chosen by the World Health Organization as its research hub in East Asia has been an amazing accomplishment for this university. The fact that Jiangsu Province is funding research on air pollution issues by Duke faculty doing work at DKU, these are extraordinary strengthenings to our ability to do the kind of work that is important to us. You might say, what, if anything, does that have to do with doing a four-year undergraduate program there? What I would ask you to remember, and if you want me to speak on this at greater length, I actually do now know a lot about it, in China, there is a model of education that is greatly admired, greatly envied, people send their children

abroad to get the benefit of it, people who have had the benefit of it come home and realize how powerful it is. The Chinese know that the natural product of their own educational system is not altogether the kind of minds, the kind of citizens they want for the future. They look to our liberal arts education as something they don't have, an education that gives a broader, rather than a narrower, training, an education that trains something very different than people who are used to obeying authority or learning how to memorize things and repeat them to faculty members. Our model of education is based on the idea of active roles for students, active inquiry, open questions, faculty, not as the people who know the answer but as the people who frame the question and invite the student to take a role in the answering of that question, groups of people working together to advance together toward better understandings. This is really what we're talking about with the undergraduate program at DKU. Could Duke take the steps that would enable us to become known in China as the most distinguished international university that had brought that powerful model of education to China? It's not Day 2 that you would do this for, it would be Year 20, perhaps, or Year 10 or Year 15. If we became known as the school that had attracted very smart students, not only from China but from around the world, had given them an American-inflected education with Chinese characteristics, that gives them the tie to this university, Duke would be known as something that no other American university will be known as. MIT, you know, advised on the creation of the Indian Institute of Technology, and thus has had a long relation and prestige in India that other universities have not altogether shared. Are there questions to ask about this program? There is nothing but questions to ask. I do not regard anyone as

dishonorable if they ask hard questions about this program. I don't think you would be a friend of this university if you didn't ask such questions. Questions about finances, academic freedom, recruitment, all those and more. But I have to say, I consider it a high compliment to this university, both its faculty and its leadership, that Sally and her team have made it their business to gather such questions and answer them as transparently and fully as they can. When those answers aren't satisfactory, to learn new questions or go back and think harder and bring other answers forward, this has been done in a great variety of university committees, some of which started quite skeptical, but through the process of learning and going forward, came to comfort and came even to a sense of excitement about this program. This has happened in meetings that the Provost has conducted in every school of the university. It has happened in our interaction with the Trustees. This is of the essence, an unexamined DKU is not worth starting. But it does seem to me that when one has entertained every question (yeah, yeah, yeah – just don't start playing the music – laughter), and asked yourself, have you identified every risk and done what you could to mitigate every risk, there still is another question which is, what would be the meaning of missing this opportunity? If you were the university that could do this kind of thing, what would be the meaning for you of electing not to do it? Having this opportunity go away and have all those things turn into negatives for you? I thank this body for being so deliberative, for being willing to venture so deep into this subject in every venue where you have been. That is really important work and the project is the better for everyone's interrogation and everyone's serious interest in it. But, at the end of the day, I do hope you'll give some thought into the idea that this is a strategic

choice. It corresponds to a way we could make a future for Duke that won't happen unless we make this choice. That's what I think will be discussed today and at greater length in November. Thank you.

**Jokerst:** Thank you, President Brodhead. Now Provost Kornbluth will say a few words about the DKU Resolution.

**Sally Kornbluth (Provost):** I'll be quick too. I just want to say a couple things. This is the resolution you'll be considering. As President Brodhead said, I've been traveling from school to school, I've spoken with many of you, either in groups or individually, and I know there are some folks from the Law School here, I saw Jamie Boyle, who had sent some information around. I just want to frame this up; I'm sure it will be a topic for further discussion, which is, probably the most active discussion of this in any of the school was in the Law School, which had to do with the notion of academic freedom in China, human rights in China, et cetera. I just want to make one or two comments about this, and then, of course, this will be part of our discussion. There is a philosophical point here and I've thought about this quite a bit, in part, prompted by a conversation at the Law School and all the other conversations. As Dick was saying, China is going to be a geopolitical force to reckon with, to interact with, for decades to come. To my mind, we can either take our marbles and go home, or we can decide that the way to affect change and the way to have a transformative effect is to be embedded there, to bring a liberal model of education there, and to be able to interact closely and be embedded in the society. There are different ways to approach this, but that is my philosophy on this. Before opening it up to discussion, I do want to make a couple of further comments on this in terms of academic freedom in the

classroom and academic freedom and human rights outside the classroom. In the classroom, and we said this at the last meeting, we have not seen any infringements on academic freedom in the classroom. This was actually highlighted, serendipitously, Ken Rogerson, who is a faculty member in Sanford and is now at DKU teaching, sent a note to Judith Kelly and this was distributed to the Sanford faculty. Ken wants me to make the point in just reading a short excerpt. This is his own opinion, so he's not saying to speak for other people, but I'm just going to read a couple quick excerpts. He said:

"It is true that there are limitations on things in China, but they don't seem to be present at DKU. First, the students are mostly willing to talk about anything [he amplifies that]. Second, the students totally get the contradictions in their system. They understand that China is both Communist and Capitalist, and they understand the tensions. They crave conversation about this [some more amplification]. Third, I was never discouraged from discussing controversial issues. In fact, the opposite was true. Students often came to me to discuss things. Fourth, everything is available at DKU. Nothing is blocked. It seems that China knows this and the students know it. The atmosphere and technology is as open as at Duke. Fifth, while I had to adjust a bit on the reading and writing assignments because of the English language comprehension, they do very well overall. Finally, whether it's true or not, in just seven weeks, the number of students who have told me that this experience is changing their lives is more than my fingers and toes. I do believe that. The conversations are both inspiring and sad. I want them to succeed but the competition is fierce. One last observation. You know I love teaching, and you know I

love students. I've had many. But I've never had a cohort like this class. They want to learn with such a passion that it is hard to keep up with them. Everything I do and say only leads to deeper conversations on politics, society, economics, history, culture, religion, journalism, life, their desire to learn and their ability to put their minds and hearts into learning has been refreshing..."

And he goes on. So, this is one faculty's impression. I will add, also, there was a blog from a Law professor at NYU who commented about academic freedom at NYU versus NYU Shanghai, and this is something we could post, but basically, he said:

"I think it's unlikely that NYU Shanghai students' speech, and by extension, students' at other American universities in China, is chilled by fear of the Communist party. Indeed, I will suggest, if anything, freedom of speech at NYU Shanghai might be greater than at NYU Washington Square or other schools on American soil."

And he goes on to talk about how the classroom dynamics are more affected by peer pressure and when you go to NYU Shanghai, people are coming from all over the world, have different norms, and question each other in ways he hasn't seen in the country. So, with that, I'll open it up to comments and questions. I will note that there are faculty in the audience with much more China experience than I have, personally. I see Melanie Manion, one of our new faculty members this year, who has worked extensively in China. I would invite any folks who have had on-the-ground experience to comment. I would ask others to ask any questions they would like on this, or any other topic that pertains to the resolution and us moving forward with the

undergraduate degree.

**Jokerst:** Questions?

**Larry Zelenak (Law School):** I'll be very brief. I just have a comment. Of course, reactions are welcome, but it's not a question. My current plan is to vote against the resolution and it's because of the academic freedom issue. So much of the discussion about various aspects of DKU have been contingent. I don't see this as a contingent issue. There is nothing I could hear about the guarantees that we are currently getting or about the experience we've had so far about academic freedom that would make me comfortable with having a university in the middle of a regime, the very central tenets of which are antithetical to the very idea of a university. I don't believe we can have a sea of academic freedom in an ocean of repression and for that reason, this is not at all a contingent issue, there is nothing I could hear about guarantees or experiences.

**Kornbluth:** I'm going to make one quick question and I see Melanie (Manion) is raising her hand so it might be worth it for her to say something. There was an interesting comment in here, and this comes to my notion of being embedded and trying to affect change or not. I will say, also, as an aside, that I do acknowledge that the notion, for instance, that was brought up in the Law School, of individual students, off campus doing things, what would be the repercussions. I think we're going to have to have a committee of Duke faculty to clearly delineate in detail what would make us take our marbles and come home. But I think there's a wide range of things that might be. One sentence from this blog that struck me was this:

"The fact that authoritarianism is on the

table as a real option makes much more vivid classroom discussions of democracy and freedom of speech. You have not really discussed Robert Filmer's attack on popular sovereignty until you have discussed it in a city where party-run newspapers regularly denounce multi-party elections."

We have the chance to affect change in that system. I don't know if you want to say anything, Melanie, because you were raising your hand.

**Melanie Manion (Political Science):** I'm new to Duke. Part of this was very exciting to me, DKU, my areas are authoritarianism, a lot of my research is on China, I spent many years in China, including one that I remember very vividly, when I think of this, which is June 4, 1989. The Dean who hired me said, you know, there's a lot of concern about us being engaged with this authoritarian regime. She said, oh, I see your next book is called *Information for Autocrats*. I said, yeah, I do complex research, I do complex things. I do big surveys. We do regression models. But in the end, what I always remember is in June 1989, before I left friends, I mean I've been in China since 1978 and they said whatever opens the door is good, I mean good for them, and whatever closes the door is bad. And I always remembered that. So I think that this isn't the end. In terms of these issues about academic freedom. I was in Hong Kong last year, I was at NYU Shanghai, a big conference on the use of big data and using big data to study Chinese politics. That's a very sensitive question. We had people from all over the world, including Chinese scholars. We had a very lively debate. It was uninterrupted. So you can have these oases of freedoms in China. I'm not naïve. I have been in China for so many crackdowns. This is always going to have to be a work in progress. What we see in China

today is that those oases of academic freedoms have been respected. I guess I think that, we can choose not to get in this game, but I think it's a liberal arts education in China, and it could be transformational. We don't have anything like that in China. I think it's so Duke. It's really an outrageous ambition. I think it's very exciting and I'm really excited to be part of Duke and I really hope this goes forward. I'm not part of Academic Council and I'm new, but I firmly think this is, from everything I know and have experienced, I think this is an amazing opportunity that Duke has created.

**Jokerst:** More questions on this topic?

**Randy Kramer (Nicholas School of the Environment):** I've had the opportunity to visit DKU several times and I spent all of last week there and I just wanted to relay a couple of experiences. While I was there, I attended a poster session of both graduate and undergraduate students in Global Health. They had been asked to prepare posters on some policy or ethical dilemma related to health. There was a wide variety of topics that they chose including some sensitive ones like child slavery, exploitation of sex workers, uncontrolled air pollution in China, and the students were out in the main foyer of the academic building having very lively discussions about those topics. The second thing is that while I was there, I attended a global health research conference with 200 people, most of them were Chinese academics, and during one of the plenary sessions, there was a very animated conversation about differences in government structures, democratic, nondemocratic, and how those structures were playing out in terms of implementation of health policy in China and in Africa. So my own observation is that there is a very free and open exchange of ideas, not only among faculty and students,

but also visitors to the DKU campus.

**James Boyle (Law School):** Dick said that the definition of a friend to the University and to DKU is someone who asks a lot of questions, so I'm the best friend that I can possibly be. Three very quick points. Chair Jokerst kindly allowed me to upload to the Council website, and if you're interested, you can Google it yourselves, documents that I really hope you might look at before you vote. I'm not a member of the Council. First is the 2016 Human Rights Watch report on China, which dictates the fact that we're in an ongoing massive crackdown on human rights, aimed specifically at universities, among other things, and human rights lawyers, my own concern, the regime has locked up literally hundreds of human rights lawyers. It has done so frequently on pretexts. So when you think about Duke taking its marbles and going home, they would be accused of saying naughty things. They will be accused of being sexual predators or they will be accused of being criminals. And what do you do when your faculty member is accused of something, when, just because they're being a human rights person or they've done something outside of the glorious bubble of the Duke campus, are you really going to shut down a four-year university? What would it take for each of us if we were the Provost? How many students? How many faculty? Remember, there is always going to be a pretext. The second thing is that China wants to separate economic freedom and political freedom. It understands in a knowledge economy that it needs critical thinkers. So Dick is right. It needs liberal education but it needs muter liberal education. It needs the freedom to think critical thoughts but not act on those thoughts. If we go there and inspire students and give them the bill of rights and we teach a course on queer theory, we teach

about the treatment of minorities or the disabled or Tibet, that will cause the hammer to drop. Our students are inspired and act as we would want them to, and they act first of all on the campus, and then outside the campus. And then bad things happen to them, will we say, well, we only ever promised you freedom in a bubble? Freedom to be critical without freedom to act on that critique is not liberal arts education. It's mental masturbation. It is freedom in the mind. It is what the knowledge economy needs without politically free citizens. My final analogy, which I stole from my colleague Matt Adler: If we were sitting here deciding to start Duke in Maine, the size of Williams College, 500 students a year, that's a moonshot. Do you know how hard it is to start a liberal arts education? Get all those faculty, get everything going, all the things we'd have to do? And, by the way, Maine is 8,000 miles away, they speak a different language, and it's a repressive authoritarian regime that doesn't obey their own contracts. Minor difficulties, what could go wrong? So I've heard a lot of colleagues say that they're against this, but it's inevitable, so they're going to vote yes. But privately they're thinking no, no, no. It's ran through, it has to happen. Please don't do that. Own your vote. If you're in favor of this, and I'm delighted to hear the people who are, I hope passionately that you're correct, but I cannot understand how you can be, because beyond anecdote, we're talking structure. If you are skeptical, please don't say, well, I was always against it. I vote yes. I sincerely hope that those who are passionately in favor of it, like Dick, who is one of the great defenders of liberal arts education, they are correct. But I cannot see how they can be.

**Jokerst:** We have time for one more question.

**Kornbluth:** Nan, I think, honestly, this is important. We have to give this an extra five minutes or so. I will say this. I am not a human rights lawyer, I'm a molecular biologist. If you want to talk about RNA offline we can do that (laughter). I will say this. This is a fundamentally different perspective that relates to what Melanie said, which is, opening the door is opening the door. If you can't open the door and have everything you could possibly want and you don't want to play, you're right. We're not going to fundamentally change every aspect of the Chinese regime by having a 2,000-student university. But you know, we're going to sure change the lives of those 2,000 who are then going to go on and have ripple effects all over the country as they continue their lives. So it's a different perspective.

**Steffen Bass (Physics):** I've had the pleasure and the pain of being in this process since its inception, I believe, when I was a member of ECAC. I see this in a more pragmatic light. You go into a foreign country and you are guests in that country. So yes, we will have to obey the laws of that country. That will pose, to some extent, restrictions on things that we hold dear like academic freedom. And I believe that the arrangements that have been made are actually very good and very generous. I hear your concerns. I believe you're absolutely right. At some point, something bad is going to happen. It's not a question of if, it's a question of when. But I think the risk is worth taking. The opportunities that this campus gives us, the leverage on the investment we do, is really good. On the more principled side, I am not a lawyer or a historian, I am a nuclear physicist, but I did grow up in Germany. In Germany, there was a very dark place in German history where open thought was all but impossible. These intellectual bubbles that you weren't so

positive about in terms of usefulness were extremely useful in those dark days because they lay the seed to the re-emergence of Germany as the modern country that we know of today. If we can create some of these bubbles, then we have already done a good deed.

**Ruth Day (Psychology and Neuroscience):** Do we have any evidence about what's happened to the students who have been in the programs so far, graduate and undergraduate and so on? What happens in the rest of their lives? Job opportunities, or getting on watch lists, or things that would be difficult to know about. Do we have any evidence, empirical foundation, for thinking about the future of the students who would participate in that?

**Kornbluth:** Remember, it's only been open for two years, and in graduate programs. I'll actually have to defer to Denis here to talk about it because he knows in a more granular way than I do.

**Denis Simon (Executive Vice Chancellor, Duke Kunshan University):** If you take our Master's programs, the Master's students, particularly MMS students have actually done exceptionally well in the job market. After the first six months, about 80+% of them found employment, some with multinational companies, some with Chinese companies. So their employment destinations were all very good. We know among the GLS students, that's the undergraduate population who come for a semester, that a large number of them have actually applied for DKU graduate programs. So they've come back to us again for more of what they got as an undergraduate. Among those who haven't come back to us, a good number have gone overseas for advanced graduate education. No one has suffered any kind of negativity

in terms of having attended our joint venture. In fact, it's been just the opposite. Because of their engagement with us, their English language has improved, their critical thinking skills have improved, their problem solving thinking has improved, and that's all revealed itself in the level of placement after their postgraduate studies.

**Day:** Aside from their job placement, the ones who are Chinese students, for example, fanning out in their society, with the multinational corporations and so on, do we have any information about how they are faring?

**Simon:** Sure. They've all kept in touch. We have an alumni network. There have been about 60 in each class. We have now about 240 graduates, most of whom are ethnic Chinese. Basically, they've covered 20 of the major universities where they were, which means, geographically, they're all over the country, from Sichuan University in the West to Shanghai on the Eastern coast. All of them seem to have gone back and had productive fourth years at their universities. Some of them have stayed in their communities and gotten jobs in local government, working for local government. By far, they're not all in the multinational corporations, that's not the intent. The intent, really, is to give them a balance or a boost as they want to pursue their careers in the future. Right now I'd say about 50% have tried to go into the job market, and 50% have gone on for advanced education.

**Emily Klein (Nicholas School of the Environment / Vice Chair, Academic Council):** We're going to extend the time another ten minutes.

**Carlos Rojas (Asian and Middle Eastern Studies):** Very briefly, this speaks to the point that just came up about teaching

students that will then go back into Chinese society outside of the “island” of DKU. We actually have, not only students who have graduated from DKU, but Duke itself is increasingly reliant on students from mainland China to come here as undergrads and graduate students, some of them stay but then a lot of them go back to China. So if we were really concerned about the ramifications for students who come here and are exposed to liberal values and then go back to China and risk crossing a set of invisible lines, I think we should really consider taking the international students from mainland China, which is actually a fairly sizeable body of the student population. The second point I want to make very briefly is I’ve been hosting a set of small, one or two day workshops these past two years at DKU on a wide array of topics. One of them was on what we call underground literature, literature published under the Mao’s regime that could not be published openly for decades. Another one we call urban fringes, about the sort of urbanization and the social and political and environmental issues that it raises. Both places we had scholars and authors and then the second case we had actual activists from mainland China and from outside, Hong Kong, Taiwan. A woman spoke very openly and there were some issues that were in abstract terms very politically sensitive. But all our visitors, both from mainland China and abroad, seemed to value that space.

**Cam Harvey (Fuqua School of Business):**

One comment and one question. For the MMS, I had a conversation with one of the instructors and let me describe an experiment: two classes, one MMS-Durham and the other MMS-DKU, both about the same size (50 students), both taught in Durham, both taught by the same instructor, both having the same exam. As

Academic Council members know, I expressed skepticism last year that we could attract the same quality of student at DKU as we have in Durham. As a result of the experiment I have described, I no longer have this concern. The question has to do with what Dick said in terms of DKU being a strategic choice. Indeed, we will be talking about many strategic choices in terms of our Strategic Plan. There’s a lot going on. One of the subtler risks here is, do we have the bandwidth to do the undergraduate DKU program? This is going to take a lot of hand-holding, a lot of time, a lot of effort, and we want to avoid the scenario that this effort diminishes the chances of achieving the other very important strategic initiatives that are detailed in the next item of business.

**Kornbluth:** I could not agree with you more. I may have been having these conversations about DKU for the last two years, but that’s not all we’ve been talking about. Although some days it feels like that. Duke in Durham is the important thing. We’re interested in DKU for values that help drive the Duke vision forward. If this is approved, then we have to pull the trigger on a true transition team, there’s going to have to be a pass-off to DKU, Denis has been working very hard at getting the org chart details, but also really thinking about what they’re going to need to make it go there. We will still be deeply involved. I’ve talked about faculty members here helping hiring, et cetera. But we cannot be doing the heavy lifting here for the very reason you raise. We have to provide the quality control and, as I said, we have to maintain ties to the mothership, if you will. But the priority is clearly Duke and that is where the focus on the leadership has to be, going forward. I think in these early days, there was a lot of Duke effort to get liftoff, but the locus of that has got to transition.

**Mike Merson (Vice Provost and Vice President, Office of Global Strategy and Programs / Vice Chancellor, Duke-NUS):**

I think Randy addressed the global health participation and we really had no problems in our educational research programs. I also want to say that we should remember we have ten years of experience in Singapore. This is a country that has similar issues around academic freedom. We have had no problems at all. I know it's a medical school, not a liberal arts college, but that's ten years of experience in a country like Singapore that has gone extremely well. It has taught us as a university how to work well in a setting like Singapore or like China. We're not going into this naïve. In terms of your bandwidth issue, what we've learned in Singapore is that if you can get a small number, I don't know the number, maybe five, Duke faculty. Why is that medical school so good? Why should we be so proud of it, that Duke-NUS has a Duke name on it? Because we had, let's say, five Duke faculty who went out there for three, four, five, six years. That will be more important in my view than anything else. Getting some faculty here to go there and really make the difference. I'll just say one last thing. Yale-NUS, you may know this story, in Singapore, has had similar issues around academic freedom. If you were to talk with them now, they couldn't be happier with the undergraduate college that they've set up in Singapore. I know Singapore is not China, but I just want to tell you that we have experience. Other universities have experiences that have been very positive, even in these challenging settings.

***STRATEGIC PLAN PRESENTATION AND UPDATE***

**Klein:** I now call Provost Kornbluth and Vice Provost for Strategic Planning,

Professor Susan Lozier, who is also a former chair of this Council, to the podium to share the Strategic Plan, which has been updated since our last discussion of the Plan at our October 2015 Academic Council meeting. There have been numerous discussions with faculty at various venues.

**Kornbluth:** Let me mentally switch gears here to our own Strategic Plan. As Emily mentioned, we have had extensive faculty discussion over the last 18 months or so. Susan has been a wonderful leader of this. We've gotten input from all different venues. The draft of the plan that you have in front of you now is very much open for input and comment. Susan and I, along with Noah Pickus, have been to APC, the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees, GPC, we have talked with the other Vice Provosts, obviously, we have been to the University Institute Initiative Directors, and we've had a conversation with ECAC. I'm just going to say, extremely quickly, and then turn it over to Susan, that there are a couple things that have emerged just in this early reading of the plan that I might as well just put out there. People may have more comments on it, but I think it's something we've already taken on board for the next iteration of the plan. One thing is that the core values, the core missions or themes of the university that came out in the last two Strategic Plans, knowledge in the service of society, globalization, interdisciplinarity; there was no intention in this plan not to continue all of those things as bedrock values of this university. I think we view that as the platform on which this plan is built. So we're going to go back and make that a little clearer in the prologue. The other thing you might have noticed is that there is no executive summary. There will be. Part of that may have been making sure that everyone reads the actual plan and not just the executive

summary. There's also still no title. If you wake up in the middle of the night and a title strikes you, please do email us. We're still thinking about that. The other thing I should raise is that a number of people asked, there are particular themes within the "global to local" section of the plan and I want to make clear that those are themes with which we are going to launch, but the mechanism of bringing communities together, collaboratories, et cetera, will be open to other areas of interest and inquiry as we move forward. So we didn't want to preclude people from saying they'd like to participate in that, but they don't work in one of those three areas. That said, I should say that our definition of those areas were meant to be very broad. A good example, we talked about population health, I was talking to Deborah Jenson the other day about this and I said that the Health Humanities Lab would have been a perfect entry into that. So these things are not meant to be defined narrowly in the plan. We hope that people can see themselves and the things they do in the various elements of the plan. If not, as I said, we're very open. We didn't want to make it a kitchen sink. We wanted to have a structure. But I'm hoping that everyone can see how they might participate in at least some subset of the activities described in the plan going forward. I'm going to turn it over to Susan and then we can both answer any questions or hear comments.

**Susan Lozier (Vice Provost, Strategic Planning / Nicholas School of the Environment):** I'm going to keep this very brief since our time has been a little shortened. I do want to acknowledge that this plan is the result of many people's efforts, work, and ideas across the university. Sally mentioned Noah Pickus, but Noah started this process and was involved in this process even before I was,

and he has been the Vice Chair of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee and he has been a great partner working over the past almost two years. I don't think I see any members of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee here, but I see many people who have been involved with the working groups that we had. The working groups were faculty across all schools and also we had students on those as well, and administrators. I do want to credit Sally and say that really, we hope we have invited comments along the way, in addition to being here today, and this plan really reflects broad community input. Another word about how it was pulled together. Some of you may know that the last Strategic Plan, "Making a Difference," that was crafted by asking the schools and institutes that were present at Duke at the time to put together their Strategic Plans. Those Strategic Plans were put together to build the university plan. Sally's idea, though, was really that we wanted to start with the university community, and a faculty-led committee creating a university plan. So you won't see in this plan, here's what we're going to do with the institutes, here's what we're doing for the schools, or any other academic unit. What we're trying to say is, here are our collective aspirations for the university, and we invite the schools and the institutes to see how their visions align with this and how they can help us achieve our collective goals. One last thing, and that has to do with the theme of the community. This plan is really built on the recognition that the strength we have here is this high-density collection of scholars and learners. The high density affords our university something that no other unit has, and that is that we have these interactions and collisions that really can lead to new ways of thinking and new knowledge. The other thing in this world today where we have access to information, ubiquitous

access or instantaneous access to information, is that a university today really serves as a place where students and scholars can put all that information in its context, scientific, legal, technical, ethical. Which means, why we need scholars and learners here who have very different backgrounds. This focus of this plan is very much on research communities, learning communities, and reaching out to our communities outside of Duke. So the four goals that we have, the community theme runs through all that. I will mention one last thing, that the framing document that we talked about last fall had a different set of goals. One of the distinctions of the goals mentioned in this plan from the framing document, is there we have separate goals, talking about building and maintaining a diverse and vibrant community. As the working groups started to work over the past year, we realized that, if we're really interested in new ways of thinking and placing information in context, we're interested in excellence in research and teaching, et cetera, we cannot have diversity as a stand-alone goal. So what we wanted to do with this plan is to fuse the plan with diversity and inclusion, just like we're trying to put our global aspirations and our interdisciplinary aspirations throughout the plan as well. If you notice that one change, it wasn't because we thought it wasn't an important goal, it's because we thought it was important enough to put it through the plan. With that, I have said enough and would like to open it up to questions.

**Klein:** Do you want to say the timeline we are looking at? You're collecting input now?

**Lozier:** Yes, we're collecting input, as Sally mentioned, through those committees and then we will have a final plan that will be presented to the Council at the December meeting. We will ask the Council to endorse

the plan at the January meeting and we will go to the Board of Trustees in February for final approval.

**Lee Baker (Cultural Anthropology):** It was a great Strategic Plan, the commitment to diversity, the way you talk about bringing information into context and the framing of things, I thought was just spectacular. I know it's been a lot of work and it was inspirational and aspirational. So thank you for the time you put into it. My one question is with the undergraduate curriculum. When you ask for feedback, is there an opportunity to co-evolve the Strategic Plan and the undergraduate curriculum? Because the timing is perfect, and there's a lot of alignment with learning communities and working with the schools and bringing the graduate students together. So how does the feedback actually work? If an institute really wants to evolve their thinking, aligning it with the Strategic Plan, but hopefully some reciprocity or integration, I'm not sure what the right words are.

**Kornbluth:** We tag team on these things and we always have slightly different angles on it, which I think is good. We've been having, as you know, a lot of conversations back and forth with Suzanne (Shanahan), with other members of the IDC (Imagining the Duke Curriculum) group. I think the only way we're going to achieve that kind of co-evolution is to keep having dialogues and a good example, as we talked about some of the themes, for instance, as you all are talking about, you're not calling it "Duke 101" anymore, we're calling it something else. But the notion of this common experience in the freshman year, fits very well with the, for instance, deepening the undergraduate piece. Also, some of the initial conversations were focusing on things like race and ethnicity, that is one of

our themes, and I think they would complement each other very well. I think the only way we can continue to co-evolve will be continued conversations. It may well be that Susan and I are going to work on the plan revisions in November. I understand that you all are going through to the beginning of next year. So there may be a final-ish version of the plan before you're done. But that doesn't mean that there won't be continued evolution in implementation and practice, even if it's not detailed exactly in the plan.

**Lozier:** I would say that, too. It's very important that we have aspirations that are aligned. That we're thinking about the same things we want for the students. I think that's clear, that we have been aligned on that. I think when we get to the implementation, it will be very important to work more closely together then. But Suzanne was part of our working group, and we've been in touch with her throughout the process. So we've actually been very much influenced by those ideas as we've been working through the plan.

**Harvey:** I have two questions. The first one is a difficult one to answer. We've had these cross-disciplinary initiatives that I think we're proud of. I guess the question is, do we have evidence that this has actually advanced our scholarship and standing? It's hard to answer because we don't know what would have happened if we didn't do it. So, maybe a good way to look at this is to look at the schools that we aspire to be like, such as Harvard and Stanford. Are they doing the same thing, or is this just a risk?

**Kornbluth:** It's an interesting thing, and Dick can probably comment on this too, but the issue is, what we're seeing a lot of is that there are schools that are now adapting or repeating what we did starting almost a

decade ago. This trend in both education and research in interdisciplinarity is something where, I'd say Duke was ahead of the curve and we're seeing it.

**Harvey:** Schools above us?

**Kornbluth:** Yes. One thing I will say, somewhat anecdotally, is that there are a lot of faculty here today who are attracted by those particular opportunities, who have done very well. There are areas of research where we have been able to make inroads in ways that we wouldn't have necessarily been able to do, going completely head-on in a disciplinary sense. I do want to make one comment though, in general, that riffs off that question. We don't want to conflate interdisciplinarity and a collaborative form of research. They're complementary, but they're not always the same thing. One thing we wanted to introduce more firmly into this plan is that we could have rich disciplinary collaborations that should be open to similar funding mechanisms and interdisciplinarity is only fed by strong disciplines.

**Lozier:** And in fact, the collaborative groups, the vertically integrated groups that we focused on with the interdisciplinary efforts, have given us the idea that we should extend this. It's sort of like we're building on it. This has been a great model. Looking at the success of those programs, we've wanted to extend those learning community opportunities to disciplinary efforts as well. It's motivated that.

**Brodhead:** Am I wasting time by answering your question too? (laughter). Everybody knows that rankings of schools are based on quite conservative units that are evaluated. It's one of the problems that, if you don't innovate, the day is going to come when you're going to pay the price for not having

done it. And yet we don't get the benefit in rankings the first time around. At least, though, it does seem to be amazing how many schools we've had visits from and people where the schools are very separate from each other, where they just say, it's amazing, but we don't know how we would even start that. It's something we've heard. We haven't heard that from Stanford, but we've certainly heard it from other schools. I found it quite striking and I hope you will take some pride. We all know the US News and World Report rankings of universities. Very striking to me was that the Wall Street Journal has come up with a new ranking system using different metrics that doesn't put quite so much weight on SAT scores or number of students rejected. These are numbers. If you select for SAT scores, that can help your rankings, but it can actually hurt you in many other ways, as you know. Theirs is much more based on what people did afterward and different things of that sort. And it was very striking to me that Duke was ranked seventh in that list. That seemed to be a pretty great place to be, until we're first (laughter).

**Steve Nowicki (Dean and Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education / Biology):** Although it might seem mere wordsmithing, I'd also like to suggest that Duke should not aspire to be like Harvard or like Stanford, but rather to be like Duke, just a better Duke. I chose to come to Duke because it wasn't like Harvard or Stanford.

**Lozier:** Are you suggesting that as a title? "Not Harvard?" (laughter)

**Kornbluth:** That's close to what Ed was saying the other day: Stronger, Better, Faster... (laughter). I like kicking it up a notch.

**Craig Henriquez (Biomedical Engineering):** You mentioned that Duke was really at the forefront of interdisciplinarity. There was a mention in the Strategic Plan document about the fact that the increased diverse forms of scholarship have not been incorporated into the tenure and promotion process. I was struck by that because we've been doing it a long time. If anyone has figured this out, it should be us. Is there a structural problem in the tenure process, that this is not being regarded highly?

**Kornbluth:** I think one of the things is that it's stretched even beyond interdisciplinarity, when we're talking about criteria. I'll get back to that in a moment. I think the issue has often been, truthfully, in the letters, when people come up for promotion. You wind up having someone who is very interdisciplinary and they wind up getting letters with no overlap from people who see different pieces of the pictures. It's like the blind men and the elephant. Sometimes it becomes difficult to integrate those. I think we probably have not been explicit enough as we can be, both in having candidates define what their specific contribution to interdisciplinary efforts are, and really what we expect in the evaluation as a university. That said, part of the thinking was not around interdisciplinarity, but also around diverse forms of public scholarship, performance, et cetera. A good example is that we have, let's say, a composer who recently got tenure in the music department. What venues they're performing in, it's not the same to have their piece performed at Carnegie Hall as to have it played at the Hillsborough Kiwanis Club (laughter). That's an extreme example.

**Brodhead:** Which in your opinion is better? (laughter)

**Kornbluth:** It's just not the same. So that's an issue. We don't want to go into a riff on tenure, because I do think a task force is talking about this. The problem has been that it's been a moving target. And what we need is for units to define what they consider excellence in whatever it is they're trying to put forward. The problem is when the criteria change every time a different candidate comes through. I think part of the revision will be to get units to articulate, in their area, what excellence is. Every time we have someone come through, we hear something like, well, this field doesn't publish very much, so their one paper is good. It's great if that's true, but it can't be a constantly moving target. I think that thinking broadly about criteria, thinking about interdisciplinarity, but also thinking about forms of team scholarship, forms of alternative scholarship. We always want to be excellent. But we also want our definition of excellence to be evolving past this whole scholar in the archives, publishing a large book, kind of thing.

**Garnett Kelsoe (Immunology):** So, to that point, and all of the programs that I've heard over the years, sitting in this field, we really talk about scholarship in the context of other goals, interaction, global interaction, interaction with the community. But I don't think we've ever really talked about scholarship, per se.

**Kornbluth:** There is a paragraph in the plan that I'm going to direct you to. It's my favorite paragraph in the whole plan.

**Lozier:** Maybe we need to enhance that because we were trying to say, creation of new knowledge is a main priority of this university. Basic knowledge for its own sake. Discovery.

**Kelsoe:** Many people would say that's the

primary goal of universities.

**Lozier:** Yes, it's the creation, delivery, and translation of knowledge.

**Kelsoe:** Perhaps it could be moved higher in the listing.

**Lozier:** We'd be happy to do that. I will say that, Sally mentioned there isn't an executive summary, but we are going to, with that summary, highlight what we value as a university, what the main aspirations are, and then what the impact is if these goals are realized. So it is important for us to hear what people aren't hearing in the plan that we think is there. So I appreciate that.

**Kornbluth:** It's interesting because there's a paragraph on the real importance of, in the science section, real fundamental curiosity-driven research but what was interesting was when Scott Lindroth, the Vice Provost for the Arts read it, he said that same principle should be suffused throughout the plan, namely fundamental knowledge for knowledge's own sake. I think that is something that we have to expand beyond that context. So I think your point is very well taken.

**Tina Williams (Psychology & Neuroscience):** I haven't read this in as much detail as I should, so I will say that up front. I have scanned it and read parts of it. I was struck by the fact that the graduate school itself and graduate education is not really a central focus. There are little pieces here and there where graduate students are mentioned, but I didn't feel like there was an initiative that was really directed towards graduate students themselves and their own pursuit of knowledge. I'm following up with what Kelsoe said, where I feel like it's connecting them to professional

students or allowing them to be entrepreneurs or something, but we all know that. What we want graduate students to be doing is to become specialists, become incredibly focused individuals on their own pursuit of knowledge, and I don't see that in the document. That would be something that, I feel like our graduate school is underfunded, I feel like our graduate students are sometimes forgotten, when you're on campus. They're kind of between the very exciting undergraduates and a lot of attention to faculty and other programs. So I guess I miss that a little bit in the document.

**Lozier:** I'm sorry you missed that because we think that's a strong pillar of this plan. Past plans have sort of mentioned professional and graduate students in passing. From the very beginning, we wanted to have a strong emphasis on graduate education. I will admit that in the rewrite, so this plan was 54 pages this summer, and upon excellent advice from the gentleman here in the front row [refers to President Brodhead], we condensed it (laughter). In the condensing, we took out all the important parts (laughter). No, but we are calling for a reimagining of graduate education at Duke and we want Duke to take the lead. Because graduate education nationally, there are many issues about how we're educating PhD students today, given the job market. What would we say if we weren't thinking about how graduate students are impacting faculty research, or weren't impacting how they were helping with our teaching responsibilities, what do we need to do for those graduate students themselves? To give them the education they need to put them in a position to make the career path which they want. So I'm saying this about the rewriting in that, what we really are trying to say is, as much as the university has invested in the past 18

months or two, in trying to reimagine the Duke undergraduate curriculum we are calling for an effort to reimagine graduate education at Duke. We weren't able to do it in the time we had here, with everything else in the Strategic Plan, but then we're saying, in the meantime, there are programs that we already have available, that we can open up to graduate and professional students. So that's where you're looking at those things we want to do. In the current plan, the priority is reversed and we need to correct that.

**Williams:** Maybe it's a writing issue, but it seemed like, there are a lot of little things for graduate students, but I didn't see a focus. That was missing for me.

**Kornbluth:** The other thing I think that, as Susan was saying, calling for a task force, calling to look at it seriously, there's going to have to be real engagement by individual units. Because unlike the reimagining of the Arts and Sciences curriculum, where at least they're dealing with a single problem, if you will, or a single advantage, the problem is every department, every program, has somewhat different goals for education. Getting programs to articulate what their goal is, and training students and making sure the curricula are aligned with that, making sure students are given, as you say, what they need to do their individual research, is going to be an extremely heterogeneous problem. We couldn't address that in a granular way, but your point is well taken, to highlight that that is the issue. I think that's fair.

**Harvey:** I have a specific question on the strategic hiring for faculty excellence. You list a number of criteria for them and one of them is true distinction. There are some other criteria and at the end of the sentence, there's an "and/or." I was a little concerned

that this meant that we're potentially going to trade off true distinction for some of these other criteria.

**Kornbluth:** If you remember to email us, we will change that. That's definitely not the intention. I should again say that areas will be determining and making the case for what that is and what they're looking for. The other thing that has come up, and I should say it now because I know it will come up in the implementation, if you look at some schools that have growth room, where they can hire extra faculty, and some schools that can't, there is still turnover in those schools, whether it's for retirement or people leaving. One piece of this plan, throughout the faculty hiring piece, will be central funds that enable units in their regular searches to lure, if you will, the most excellent faculty members to Duke. I can imagine a situation where we triangulate funds so that if we put money into hires that would have occurred anyway, but we're helping them because they got this fabulous candidate, then perhaps that additional money, if you will, can triangulate back to programmatic initiatives in that unit. So hopefully that will give some flexibility and incentive to work together to really get fantastic faculty.

**Lozier:** I want to take a quick moment to acknowledge Lee Willard's efforts in the back. Her experience in pulling together and working on the last plan was really critical in helping us formulate ideas this summer. It was very critical when we were trying to coalesce everything and put words to paper.

**Kornbluth:** And she cancelled her vacation for us!

**Henriquez:** There was a theme in there about investing in the sciences being critical for the future of Duke and a benefit to our

entire university. I looked at the amount of money associated with that, which I think is \$15 million. That doesn't sound like a transformative number to invest in sciences.

**Kornbluth:** Two things about this. One, obviously, these are meant to be supplementary funds to help hiring, it's not stand-alone. But there are two other elements here. One is that we have very philanthropic sources that we may, potentially, be able to go to that are interested in this and can help us elevate that. Also, as we finish this campaign and we start thinking about the next phase, I think science faculty are going to be something that's quite important. The other thing is, and this is true for the numbers throughout the plan, these are immediate, central investments. And when I say immediate, over the next five years or so. They're not meant to be the complete resource envelope, including what we will bring to bear philanthropically, what we'll be partnering with schools on. I agree, we're not going to transform the scientific landscape. That said, and you know this as well as I do, individuals, if strategically chosen, can have this incredible reverberating effect. We recently put \$10 million into the quantitative initiative. We just hired Peter Hoff from the University of Washington, there are other candidates who are probably close to closing on this. These are people who, it's not only their own research, it really has a reverberating effect. We're not going to be MIT in some areas, we just can't. But we can make strategic choices. The other thing is, and this was pointed out to us at the University Institute and Centers dinner by Nita Farahany, who runs Science & Society, a lot of the things we do at Duke will attract people here who are not only interested, let's say, in doing science, but are interested

in implications for science policy, etc. What I'm interested in, is having a strong enough leg of the stool that it can match other areas going on and underpin things like science policy, health policy, reaching out to our medical school to have a true partnership. You're right, you'd probably need \$200-300 million, given the size of start-up packages, et cetera, to completely rejuvenate the sciences.

**Warren Grill (Biomedical Engineering):**

A follow up on that. What's the process by which the budget numbers were arrived? So did you say, we have \$132 million, and so we're going to divide it into these pots? Or was there thinking about, this is how much it's going to cost to achieve the goals that had been set out of the plan? Even \$132 million over five years, to me, seems like a very modest investment. We spent more than that renovating our football stadium. So this is a core academic enterprise over five years, and it sounds pretty modest.

**Lozier:** I'll just say something quickly and then turn this over to Sally. From the beginning, we did not start with saying, this is how much money we have for the plan. So our conversations were, where should Duke be in the next ten years? What should we be doing? Initially, those conversations were unconstrained, which I think is the right way to do it. So I think what Lee (Willard) was saying, the aspirations in there, and what you're saying, they're going to cost some money. I think what Sally is going to tell you is, after we pulled all these recommendations together, it was the initial estimate of what we have available. This is what we can do to get started. But certainly we hope that there's development, et cetera, other funds to come along the way.

**Kornbluth:** I'll add this. If you look at the last two plans, if they had been funded

solely on central resources flowing through the Provost's office, we wouldn't have gotten liftoff on many of the things you see around the university. One audience for the plan, aside from the faculty and the students and staff at Duke is potential donors. We will soon complete a campaign that's now north of \$3.2 billion. Yes, there are athletics and facilities, but a lot of that has gone into programs. So we took the funding envelope that we believe we're going to be able to have for several Provostial funds, if you will. But there is going to be a lot more money that's going to be brought to bear on these goals over time. If you look at some of the programs that have already been mentioned, where we already have some philanthropy flowing to those, but we did not take that into account as we put the very rough budget numbers out.

**Klein:** Thank you, Sally and Susan. This concludes today's meeting. We meet next on November 17 – have a good evening.