

Minutes of the Meeting of the Academic Council

Thursday, October 22, 2015

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

Welcome, everyone, to today's meeting. We've got a really full schedule, so we're going to get started. I'd like to go ahead and call our meeting to order.

As part of our announcements, I'd like to address a communication that came to me earlier today via email from one of our Council members. As a result of that email exchange, Vice President of Administration Kyle Cavanaugh is going to address the Council on the topic of dependent verification and open enrollment. Those of you with dependents may have already heard about the dependent verification matter, and so Kyle would like to come and tell us a little more about that.

Kyle Cavanaugh (Vice President of Administration): I'm thrilled to be here to talk about anything other than parking (laughter). Hopefully, all of you have received this. 36,000 of these went out about two weeks ago. This is kind of a preliminary discussion about the next couple of years. Our healthcare plans are really going to be a year to year decision. You used to be able to take a look at these over a five year or longer time period, but with the Affordable Care Act and the complexities of negotiating that space, it really will be a year to year decision. This has been a very tough summer behind the

scenes. We were looking at costs somewhere in the 10-14% range in terms of our premium. So, the summer was spent in very aggressive negotiations with our PBM, or our Pharmacy Benefit Manager. That space has gotten very aggressive and we were very successful during the summer. If you took a look at your open enrollment materials, you'll see that the result is not what we anticipated which was we would be in 10-12% range increases. But premiums are being held to a 2-4% increase. That's rather phenomenal, if you're watching what's happening around the nation and if you're watching what's happening here in the state. So, that's all good news in terms of all four plans will remain intact. We do have to make some modest, and I know the word modest is always in the eye of the beholder, in terms of what's happening with healthcare, but all of the copays, for example, both in primary care and in generic medications, will be held exactly the same. Our vision plan premiums will stay flat. Our dental plan premiums, except for one plan that will go up just a little bit, but all the others will be flat. So, our outlook for 2016 is looking really good. That's the positive news. The other is we have been very far behind in terms of validating who is actually on our plan. We hire people and we don't validate who is actually on there other than the point of hire. The majority of our

peers have been way ahead of us in this regard. We've been quite behind in this. So we needed to go through a number of verification processes for a variety of reasons. Most of those are tied to the ACA. Starting this January, we have to report, all employers in the United States do, to the federal government, everyone we have on our plan. Not just our employees but also their dependents. So that data goes up on one side of the ledger. On the other side of the ledger, the federal government is taking a look to see, is there anyone on there that actually has a role in one of the exchanges and possibly taken advantage of a subsidy. If any of that has happened, there will be a circle back to the employer and penalize them one-to-one on an individual basis, and if it happens to hit a certain threshold, we're into very large numbers. So every employer in the United States is going through this process and is prepared, as we are, to start this reporting mechanism come this January. The other is, doing a dependent verification has always been a good fiduciary thing to do. One of the things that has really been a game changer in this space is, if an employer decides to keep their plan, which we have chosen to do as opposed to getting in the pay game, which is to close our plans down and push everyone into the exchange, the employer now is not allowed to have any lifetime limits. So that means if you offer someone coverage, and they're on your plan, you are financially exposed with no topic on there. So any individual that's on there that shouldn't be on there, you've got issues. There's a reporting requirement as well as fiduciary exposure. So, a couple different things. One is, human nature being what it is, we track open enrollment very closely every year. I know this applies to nobody in this room, but what

we watch is, in the first hour that open enrollment is open this coming Monday, we'll see a little blip. We'll see a little enrollment in there. And then it goes dead silent until the last 48 hours (laughter). In the last 48 hours going literally until midnight of when open enrollment closes, it just kind of spikes out. Very human behavior. So when you're doing a dependent authorization, you want to have a deadline. Now, that deadline is November 6 with the enrollment coming off at the end of the year. We have not communicated this broadly, but I'm telling this to you as my colleagues and friends, that's not exactly what's going to happen. We will not take any single person off until we are absolutely confident that there's been an individual communication contact with that person to ensure that that's what should happen. So this will roll into 2016. But just like open enrollment, if you don't communicate the deadlines, people's behavior tends to kind of cascade out. We're running actually, in that process, slightly ahead of schedule. So we have, of the 64,000 covered lives that we have in the plan, about 36,000 individual employees in the plan. Only about half of them have dependents, dependents being a spouse, partner, or child. About half of that number is in there. We're at a little over 50% response rate so we're a little bit ahead of that schedule. The more important number is that we have had several dozen people, and that's running a little bit ahead of schedule too, who have said, well, now that you've asked me to look at this, this person doesn't meet the eligibility requirements. We've had every scenario that you might imagine. We've had grandchildren, friends, neighbors (laughter) and the issue here is, there are real cost implications associated with doing this. So that's why this process is

underway. I think we're in good shape regarding the plans for 2016, and I hope this helps in terms of an explanation.

Jokerst: Thank you, Kyle. Any questions for Kyle? Alright, thank you. If you have dependents that you're supporting, be sure to read those documents because you are going to need some documentation associated with that verification. For example, I needed to get the birth certificates for my two kids and it took me a while to get a hold of those. So that was the expression of the concern associated with dependent verification. Some people may need a little bit more time to get their documentation together.

Before we move on to our other agenda items, I'd like to congratulate, on behalf of the faculty, Paul Modrich, James B. Duke Professor in Biochemistry and Howard Hughes Medical Institute investigator, who will share this year's Nobel Prize in Chemistry for his work over four decades on how mistakes in DNA code are repaired. His work identified and characterized the enzymes that carry out DNA mismatch repair, work with direct implications for how some classes of tumors and neurodegenerative diseases arise and are treated. Let's congratulate Paul and his colleagues on this award (applause). It's great news for Duke and the Triangle since there are two Chemistry awardees in the Triangle this year.

Our second announcement is on a somber note, as we remember the first female Dean of the Trinity College of Arts and Sciences and James B. Duke Professor Emerita Ernestine Friedl, who passed away on October 12 at the age of 95. She was an internationally renowned anthropologist who served as Dean of Trinity College of Arts and Sciences from 1980 to 1985, and launched important

initiatives that included hiring senior women and black faculty; improving advising and teaching; and enabling more students to study abroad. She leaves behind many colleagues who will miss her inspiration, creativity, and support, and we offer our condolences to her family and friends. The memorial service for Ernestine will be held at 3 pm on Friday Oct. 23 in Baldwin Auditorium, with a reception following in the Friedl Building, which is named in her honor.

APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 17th MINUTES

Jokerst: Our first order of business is to approve the minutes from the September 17th meeting which, as usual, were posted with today's agenda. Are there any corrections or edits to the minutes?

(Minutes approved by voice without dissent)

Before we turn to our agenda items, a couple of reminders: the attendance sheets are being circulated, so please initial and return these to Sandra at the end of our meeting. And as you ask questions or make comments today, please identify yourself and your school or department.

APPENDIX Y REVISION AND VOTE

Jokerst: Next, we'd like to go to the Appendix Y revision and vote on that revision. [Refers to slide]. This is our proposed addition to Appendix Y which we saw at our last meeting. Those of you who were here last month know that our colleague Pat Wolf raised a question about some of the language associated with the revision. Note that this is formalizing what has already been the

practice for when a unit or department wants to change its name. That document was posted again with your agenda, and is shown on this slide, with my added underlining to point out the approval stages. ECAC discussed the questions raised following our September 17th meeting and the consensus was that the wording proposed is consistent with the bulk of the Faculty Handbook – all 292 pages of it. Frankly, I was very surprised it was that long. One of my ECAC colleagues I think said it best: “If we tried to address all of the various ambiguities in the Faculty Handbook that could arise at some point or time, we could spend the entire academic year trying to sort through those.” So, ECAC feels that the wording is fine as proposed. Is there any further discussion, or may I have a motion to approve?

(Appendix Y revisions approved by voice without dissent)

PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL MASTER’S DEGREE IN ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY AT DUKE KUNSHAN UNIVERSITY

Jokerst: Next, we’d like to talk about the proposed International Master’s Degree in Environmental Policy at Duke Kunshan University. Professors Erika Weinthal, from the Nicholas School, and Billy Pizer, from Sanford, are here to present a proposal for an International Master’s Degree in Environmental Policy at Duke Kunshan University. The proposal has been evaluated and approved by the various school and university faculty governance bodies before coming to you today. We will vote on this at our November meeting. Today is for presentation and for discussion.

First, Provost Kornbluth will say a few words about Master’s Degrees and

then we will welcome Professors Weinthal and Pizer to the podium to present the degree proposal, after which they will take questions from the Council.

Sally Kornbluth (Provost): I just wanted to say a few brief words and Nan did indicate that this really has been thoroughly vetted with all the faculty governance committees. The two things I just wanted to make clear are: I didn’t want this discussion to get caught up in two other discussions going on. One has to do with Master’s degrees in general and one has to do with DKU. Just to bring people up to speed, as far as Master’s degrees are concerned, I think you’re all familiar with the fact that Paula McClain and her Graduate School Dean colleagues presented a document concerning issues with Master’s degrees at Duke, many of which have to do with services and programs on campus that affect the vitality of Master’s programs, how they’re affecting PhD programs, et cetera. So I wanted to say, first of all, this particular program obviously is at DKU. So things like how it strains CAPS is not really part of this discussion. The other thing that I did want to say, though, and also I should add that it dovetails nicely with the Environmental Research program that’s going on at DKU, that is really one of the things that we’re seeing a great deal of initial success. In terms of DKU, at the last Council meeting I spoke about the undergraduate degree and the approvals process and we had the Ad Hoc Committee. Let me back up, speaking about committees. I convened a Master’s Degree Committee to start looking at implementation of that report that Paula put forward. They will soon be meeting to start that work. As far as DKU is concerned, we have a large number of discussions set up with governance

bodies and schools and again, I don't want to sort of conflate the discussion on the undergraduate degree with this particular Master's. That's really just to set the stage for Erika and Billy about an individual program that will be offered at DKU and the director of that program will also head the Environmental Research piece at DKU.

Erika Weinthal (Nicholas School of the Environment): Good afternoon. I'm going to start off by introducing the International Master's in Environmental Policy program for DKU. I also want to underscore, building on what Provost Kornbluth said, this is part of Phase I. So it is part of the initial endeavor to build a number of Master's programs at DKU that include the Master of Management Studies, Global Health, and Medical Physics. We will be the fourth Master's program. The Environment at DKU: When we think about the environment at DKU, we're really building upon what we do here at Duke, which is to do research and education that is collaborative, interdisciplinary, and global. It has two components at DKU. The first is a research center, a research program that has already been approved by the DKU advisory board and so that is already moving forward. But the motivation behind that is to create a platform for carrying out independent research in China and to have an impact on environmental policy-making in the world and in China. We are soon hoping to hire the director of that program towards the beginning of next year. The second part, which is what I'll be talking about today, and same with Billy, is the signature International Master's in Environmental Policy, which is part of the larger undertaking at DKU to build an environment program. What we'll talk

about a little bit more in detail afterwards is that this is a distinctive, unique program that doesn't exist at Duke. We are not replicating what we do in the Nicholas School or the Sanford School. We have set out to design a program that is fine-tuned for China and environment at DKU. We are hoping to begin this program in fall 2017. In the process leading up to this, we had the opportunity to learn from a lot of the other programs that have been in existence and one of the things that we've learned is that you need to build your reputation, take some time, and get to know the landscape. Over this year we've set out to do a lot of momentum-building exercises. We've been holding a number of conferences. We've had two already this fall, one on China-US climate change action and cooperation, and another on water and energy. We will hold one in the spring on tropical conservation. We are also considering a conference on food policy. There are other centers that are being created at DKU, including one on ozone. The motivation for an Environmental Master's Program in China: I hope this is obvious (laughter). When you look at the news in China, you usually see gray skies, smog, even though last week I had blue skies the entire week. It's a high priority issue in China. It's in the news all the time. It has been elevated in government circles. That's the first motivation. But also, Environment is a signature program at Duke. We are known for our Environmental programs here and if we're going to be at DKU, we should be doing environment. This is a way to expand our educational offerings, our research, and have an impact in the world of policy and practice. Also, there is a unique market opportunity in China. When you look at environmental programs in China, most are focused on

the environmental sciences and engineering. They are really weak in the environmental social sciences. So we've identified a really large gap in the production of knowledge in an area that we see a potential to fill. So there's essentially a growing market for such programs. Other motivations that we can talk about more later are about the ability to connect teaching and research. But another motivation is job placement. This is both for Duke students and for students who would come out of the IMEP program. What we're seeing here in the Nicholas School is that we're seeing students finding jobs in markets that we haven't seen in the past. Students are going into the private sector, they're working in consulting, and they're not just working with NGOs and government. So the environmental field is growing in China and there's a huge opportunity for producing a new cadre of environmental leaders that will have an impact across the entire policy realm in China. The last slide I'm going to talk about before I turn it over to Billy is the process that has gotten us here today. This has been a process that has been ongoing. We've had the opportunity to learn from all the other programs. We began initial discussions when discussions began with DKU in 2009 and really took off in 2013 when we commissioned a scoping report. We really wanted to learn what the landscape looked like in China at the time. And then we worked out the research proposals but more importantly, we convened a number of meetings with faculty at Duke. We went to China to meet with colleagues there to learn about their programs, we brought in outside faculty to talk to us and asked them, what would an ideal program look like for the Chinese landscape? With that, we convened a drafting committee, a faculty from both

the Nicholas School and from Sanford to work on a curriculum that is unique. It doesn't exist here at Duke so we're not taking a Duke program and transplanting it to China. We had a large number of meetings with our faculty, with both deans who are both here today, from the Nicholas School and Sanford School. And then we had meetings with our faculty councils, executive committees, we had votes in both schools. So both schools have actually voted positively on this program. And then we went through the University Committees. In short, this has been a very thoroughly-vetted process. There was also a marketing study done last summer just to look at the market landscape.

Billy Pizer (Sanford School of Public Policy):

Erika has been talking about the process and motivation for the program and I'm going to spend a few minutes talking about the program itself.

Obviously there's a limit to what I can do in five minutes. You have the proposals circulated, and of course we'll be available to answer your questions. Two things I'd just like to start with that I think are very useful to build on what Erika was saying. First of all, this is a really unique program. It's not only unique to Duke, it's actually unique in the United States or the World. Right now, if you wanted to study Environmental Policy, you could go to a Policy School and focus on environment, or you could go to an Environment School and focus on policy but you wouldn't be getting exactly the right thing. What we've done is try to take the best of both the MPP program at Sanford and the MEM program at Nicholas and combine them into a two year program at DKU. So I think it's very exciting and it's really quite novel. The second thing I would emphasize is that the process that Erika

showed you a minute ago, we learned a lot going through this process. What you see in front of you today is not what we started with a year and a half ago. It really benefitted a lot from the input from faculty at Sanford, from Nicholas, and elsewhere and just to highlight one thing: one of the key features of the program is the exchange of students. One of the signature features of the program is that in the fall of the second year, students at DKU will have the option to come to Duke for a semester and take more electives they wouldn't be able to do at DKU. At the same time, that opens up an opportunity for Duke students to go to DKU and take classes there and have a Chinese experience. When we talked to the faculties at Nicholas and Sanford, it really opened our eyes to some of the logistical challenges of doing that. I think the final proposal has a lot more detail about how that rotation would work and I think we'll make it a lot more successful when it actually begins to take place. Other things that you see here are just the issues that came up in our marketing studies and our conversations with people about things that would make the program particularly valuable. A two year program is very unique in China; most of them are three years. The focus on internships and professional studies is also unique. And the other thing that Erika mentioned is just the integration of research and education is something that people talk about and is something that I think we do quite well. Going on to mechanics, the way the program is designed is, we need to get to about 45 students per year, so 90 students total over two years on campus, in order to make everything work. What we planned on in the budget and the planning is a ramp up over three years: starting at 15, going to 30, and then attracting 45 students in the third year of

the program. This is a guess. We think we can do this. One of the things we did in the marketing study was to do some research about how many students were interested and how many we would actually have to attract in order to make this work. What we found was that, of the students at the top universities who expressed an interest in the program, we would need to get 7-8% of those students in order to fill the program, which we think is quite achievable. I will also mention that this is just if we wanted to fill them entirely with Chinese students. There are a lot of other sources from outside of China, including those highlighted here [refers to slide]. The expectation is that a third of the students will be outside of China. So we do think this is quite achievable. One of the things we did is some analysis of what we would do and what we could do with a budget if we did not hit these numbers. I can go into that during the Q&A if people are interested. What does the actual program look like? We could talk a lot more about this if folks have questions. As I mentioned, it's a bit of a blend of the MEM program and the MPP program. The signature Master's program at Sanford and the signature Master's program at Nicholas. This matrix here tells you in a very comprehensive way what the students are taking as well as what the faculty are teaching [refers to slide]. So these first three positions are the faculty that would be hired to teach primarily at DKU. The second three are faculty members who would be affiliated with the research center but would be able to teach maybe one class per year. Then there are a number of other sources of faculty and teaching that we would utilize in order to make the program work. I'll just highlight that the plan is to have two visiting faculty from Duke each semester

at DKU. In terms of the classes, it starts with something that looks a lot like an MPP with a focus on economics, policy analysis and statistics the first semester. In the spring there's a policy practicum, there are political policies classes, environmental sciences, and they have an elective each semester. The second year, they're at Duke, they're taking electives at Duke as well as their Master's project capstone and then then come back in the spring semester to DKU to take law, government, and finish their MP as well as do some other electives. This is not necessarily the exact way it will work, but this is just trying to give you an idea of how we could actually meet the teaching obligations with the faculty that we're planning to hire. For those of you interested in numbers, this is the budget in summary form [refers to slide]. You can see the enrollment and tuition assumptions at the top as well as the large categories of expenses at the bottom. Obviously the largest category of expenses is compensation for the faculty but the other operating expenses include things like seminars and other charges for the students, supplies, things like that. You can see the net tuition actually does not cover the net expenses until we get to the full enrollment in the last year here. So we're running a deficit for the first four years and then in the fourth year of the program itself we finally begin to break even. The total at the bottom there shows exactly how much we're expecting to be the contribution margin to make the program balance over the first five years. Just to highlight that that is a subsidy that would be split between the Kunshan and the Duke Provosts. These costs are not born by either of the schools. Just to talk for a minute about the benefits to Duke. This is something that we thought quite a bit about. Something I wouldn't have

actually thought about when we started this process but it became really clear to me going to China and talking to people that perhaps the biggest advantage is actually access to students. When you're in China and you actually get to know the Chinese system and you get to know the faculty of the schools, it's actually a huge opportunity for us to recruit the best students to Duke for our own Master's programs and for our PhD programs. So one of the things I'm very excited about is our ability to potentially access really good students in China for our Duke programs. As I've listed up here, this sort of program fits with the global mission of both the Nicholas School and Sanford School. It provides a lot of opportunities for Duke students. We've already mentioned the exchange of students to Duke. We've also mentioned the fact that the career opportunities for students who want to work in China will be enhanced by having career services in China. We talked about the job placement. Alumni ties, that's not about neckties. What we're thinking about there is that we have all these alumni in China working on environmental issues. This is an opportunity to bring them together to work with us on this program and become better functioning alumni. So I think we're quite excited about that. There are obviously other things for research and collaboration. One of the things that came up in ECAC was the idea that if you're a Duke faculty and you want to go to China and collaborate with a Chinese collaborator, everybody can meet at DKU and teach for a semester and do that sort of collaboration. So with that, I'm going to stop and we can take some questions.

Cam Harvey (Fuqua School of Business): First, I'd like to congratulate

you for all the work; it's a huge amount of work. The program looks really interesting. It definitely fulfills the service mission for Duke and the teaching mission. My question has to do with the research mission. What I'm concerned about is this program is very expensive in terms of the forecasted costs. Part of the proposal has to do with a cluster hire of three DKU faculty. I'm just wondering: is this going to advance Duke University's research mission to have DKU faculty that are not necessarily in the same caliber that we would have at Duke University doing research? From the Business School perspective, I can't imagine having faculty housed there that would advance our research mission. So if you could talk to that, that would help me a lot.

Pizer: I'll give you a couple reactions. First of all, the kinds of faculty we'll be able to hire there is something that I'm actually quite optimistic about. Right now we're in the process, as Erika mentioned, of trying to hire the director. And the candidates we have are really incredible candidates.

Harvey: Would they be tenurable at Duke?

Pizer: They would be tenurable at Duke. The three candidates would have been tenurable at Duke. So I'm optimistic we'll find really interesting people who want to work in China and for different reasons have a reason to be there. I would also say, and I highlighted it very quickly in the last slide, I think the opportunity of having this program in China and having a vehicle for Duke faculty to go to China not just to do research but because they want to do some teaching, provides a pedestal for them to do a lot of research. So speaking from my personal perspective,

I'm excited to have some faculty there both as potential collaborators but also the DKU program itself to be a foothold to go to China and use that as a stepping stone to do a lot more collaboration. The trips that Erika and I have taken over the past two years have really suggested a lot of opportunities, at least for me.

Weinthal: And it's also, as far as the benefits for research, every time we go over and we have a conference, or we went over and had Duke Day, and Larry Carin's office organized it very well, opportunities are being made to partner with colleagues in China to submit grant proposals. So the research side is really taking off, at least in generating revenue that will be shared. Sometimes going to Duke, sometimes going to DKU, but we're really focused on hiring a director that is tenurable at Duke because we see that as essentially the most important position. If we get someone of that caliber, it's going to attract other people of the same caliber who want to come and work with this person.

Anne Yoder (Biology / ECAC): I just want to expand on that a little bit. Erika, you've heard this from me many times. I have collaborators at the Beijing Institute of Genomics who are very excited about this program specifically because they have teaching limitations imposed upon them, and to be able to go to a center like this and have those constraints released offers them an opportunity to interact with me, and I'm sure I'm not unique in having these kinds of connections. Every time I go to Beijing and work with that group, a paper emerges and our research moves forward. So I can imagine that I am one of many faculty members at Duke who would have similar opportunities.

Sara Beale (Law School): You noted that there was going to be a fairly significant subvention until eventually it's hoped that it will start to break even and you noted that neither of the two schools that are proposing are on the plug financially at all. You noted that there are a lot of benefits to the faculty in research programs and the missions of each of those two schools but we're all going to pay for it. So can we understand: what is the justification from the Provost's point of view of not having this be an initiative of the two schools which will fund and will benefit from, as opposed to it being a university initiative? I guess part of that is a question to the Provost: what have we done with the other programs? The Medical Physics and so forth. Maybe it's precedent and it's all central-administration-funded. That's my question.

Pizer: Sally may want to weigh in with her own answer. I would say that a lot of faculty benefits are not exclusive to the Nicholas School and Sanford. I know that Environmental Policy may not appeal to a large chunk of the room, but there's nothing exclusive about those tools. The other thing I'll mention is that there are a lot of upsides for the two schools, certainly their faculty are interested in this topic, but the other thing is that there's a big upside for DKU. So the money that the program will eventually make goes back to DKU. So in a sense, DKU is taking the risk. The DKU buffer between Duke and Kunshan is taking the financial risk but they also have the financial upside once it starts making money. And in the long run, it is expected to actually be net positive revenue.

Kornbluth: I think part of it is that an investment in any of these programs,

when there is an enthusiastic cohort at Duke that's going to be involved and gain benefit from it, is essential investment in something that can be drawn from across the university. I said this a little bit at the last meeting when I was talking about DKU in general. No program we do benefits every single group of faculty. There just has to be sufficient enthusiasm, involvement, and interest in some subset of faculty from these schools that are interested that it's justifiable on par with any other program that we're going to invest in. Admittedly, these are all somewhat experiments. I have to say, we did intentionally do market research. That was part of what we put the brakes on. We can never guarantee, but it seems to me that this is a pretty good bet. Plus, it synergizes so well with one of the strongest research programs we're seeing there and something that I could really see succeeding.

Beale: We're building on that.

Kornbluth: Exactly. The other thing I have to say about attracting top faculty. The question about how to get a group of faculty to go and stay in DKU and teach. I do think that that synergy between research and the teaching mission there is part of the key to getting the very best faculty that are going to participate in both dimensions of that in the environment program. I think that that can be a model as we go forward, even as we're thinking about some aspects of the undergraduate degree program.

Weinthal: I just want to add one quick thing. The other benefits that we didn't really talk about are to the executive education programs both at Sanford and Nicholas. They are growing and China is a huge opportunity and over the last month

we've had several delegations coming through from the Ministry of Environmental Protection who have noticed Duke now. We're on the map. They want to come and meet our faculty and see our schools. So it's opening new opportunities here at Duke for both schools.

Julie Edell (Fuqua School of Business): I noted, and you didn't really mention that it was going to be a Duke degree rather than a joint degree or a Duke-DKU degree. I'm interested in the thinking behind why it's going to be a Duke degree and that we will only have some Duke faculty, some DKU faculty, what's the thinking there?

Kornbluth: Let me just clarify something. All the Master's programs that are now at DKU are Duke degrees. So there's no such degree granting entity as Duke Kunshan University and so that is what's behind this. I will say also that because of that, we're even more heavily vested in this absolutely being a Duke quality program. Because these graduates will come out with a Master's degree from Duke. They will have done it at DKU, but that's sort of the force we're putting behind this. It's also part of the rationale for the investment. In order to have the Duke quality program, you really do have to have a certain level of investment.

Lee Baker (Dean of Academic Affairs / Associate Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education): I saw in the market research comparison to other schools that a lot of the other schools didn't have tuition. Is the tuition here going to be similar to the Graduate School at Duke or other programs and then the so-called competitors at other Universities in China?

Pizer: The tuition at DKU for the non-Chinese students will be similar to what the other Master's degree programs at DKU are charging. The budget is actually budgeted a little bit low so you could add something to that or we could generate more revenue on that. Even with the tuition, there's also a lot of financial aid. That's one side of it. The other side is that for the Chinese students, the tuition is set by the Chinese government. So that's kind of fixed. It is actually, for Chinese students, it is competitive. One of the things I was talking about with some students of Fudan University when I was there, we started talking about how much it costs. They said, oh, this is comparable to what I would see. So I think the tuition is competitive, I guess is the way I would describe it, with other programs.

Warren Grill (Biomedical Engineering): I was wondering if you could describe how your projections of enrollment, both initially and changes in enrollment over time, compare to the projections of the other Master's programs? And then what the reality of those programs has been in comparison to their projections? So we can kind of apply the same correction factor.

Kornbluth: I really want to jump in here (laughter). Let me just say one thing about this. That is why I said I can't make any guarantees here, but this is why I came in and we started talking about this, I said whoa, let's do a market research here. Because there was not a thorough market research done on each one of the other programs. We hope that these estimates are grounded in as much as we could find out in China. Here, I don't know exactly how those estimates were made, but this was an attempt to get an accurate estimate. But fair enough. The original

estimates were way more optimistic than what we've seen in the other programs. So there has to be a contingency plan as Billy referred to that if we don't hit those numbers, there's some kind of downsizing of the program.

Pizer: Just to elaborate: One thing that we have done and we can go through this if people want, but we did go through an exercise where we tried to figure out what happens if it takes longer. Could we scale back resources? We did an exercise where, if it took four years instead of three years, we'd lose about a million dollars in revenue over the five year period. Could we scale back some of the hiring and whatnot in order to break even? It is possible to do that. That would be a choice that people would have to make as they saw the numbers coming in, exactly how they would do that. The point was to demonstrate that there would be ways we could save money if the enrollment numbers were not hitting our targets. Just to go to the actual idea about the enrollment numbers, I think this program benefits from a number of things that the other programs did not have. Namely, DKU has been there for a couple of years already. So when you go and talk to people at other universities, they've heard of DKU now. So I think that helps. Also, Duke is really well known for environment. There are a lot of Chinese students who are coming to Duke now so I think that's a huge benefit for us. We've been doing all these events that are hopefully building support. Finally I'll just say, we've already had several students who want to know if they can apply now. We've had to tell them no, actually, you can't apply because it doesn't start for two years. So to me, there are a lot of positive signs that we can get 15 students for the first year and then build on that.

Weinthal: I just held an event at Tsinghua last week where there were 40 students in a room coming to hear about the program. So we were tested a lot more in marketing and recruitment and taking the time to do that before we start up, which I think differs from the other programs too.

Kornbluth: That's what I was going to say also. The recruitment piece is way different. Also, there's now a much more integrated recruitment effort at DKU to really make these programs visible. So it will be interesting to see if we see a pick up in the other programs as well now that there's a focus on recruitment.

Jokerst: Thank you very much for your comments. Remember, we will be able to have more discussion and vote at our next meeting.

STRATEGIC PLANNING UPDATE AND THEMES

Jokerst: I now call back to the podium Provost Kornbluth, and joining her is Professor Susan Lozier, chair of Duke's Strategic Planning Steering Committee, and a former chair of this Council, as well. They're going to discuss the work of the past year of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee on Phase 1 of the new Strategic Plan, and the path forward in Phase 2.

Kornbluth: Thanks, Nan. You've all seen the document. I'm going to back up and tell you a little bit about the Strategic Plan and where we are in the document but I want to make two qualifiers up front to this discussion. For those of you who heard this before, participated in these

discussions, you might have seen that the document, usually when we put a document through APC and UPC, we modify it as we go along so the product you see by the time you get here is different. That has not been the case here because this document is a framework document for the discussion. All of the things are going to be put into the final strategic plan. We weren't reworking the framework document that sets up the discussion because that seems like a lot of work for not where we want to go. The other thing is that the specific examples, and we can discuss all this, that you've seen in this framework are just that, examples. There are things that came up at discussions that are not necessarily the things that are going to be finally in the plan. We're going to have a lot more discussion. So, with that, I'm going to give you just a little bit of a preamble, and then Susan will jump in. Susan, as Nan said, has been chairing the strategic planning effort. Noah Pickus has been vice chairing it. Susan will talk about the steering committee. Suffice it to say, we've had a lot of dinners and lunches with faculty over the last year, as when I first became Provost and I came and talked about having open discussion. We had open sign up on the web for these dinners and lunches. All of them were full. We got a great interest in the faculty from across the whole university. So it's been a really interesting process. The thing that surprised me, though, that we've talked about a lot and I've said in other venues, is that I'm really expecting when we had this random assortment of faculty, that we would hear something different at each one of these dinners. But actually, we got the same message over and over and over again. And that was as follows. First of all, Duke, in the last decade, has introduced so many new programs. We

have institutes that grew up, we have centers that have grown up, we have programs that have grown up. We have initiatives: DukeEngage, DukeImmerse, and Duke Focus. So there was a strong feeling that maybe what this plan needs is not to come up with another whole slew of programs when we have a lot of programs that need to be sustained. That's not to say that we're not going to do anything new. But the focus was on how we build communities of students, of faculty, the collaborative communities, to really take advantage of all these things that were put in place. So after all of these conversations, we decided to focus this plan on, we don't know what the title is going to be yet, but sort of a community of scholars. I actually wanted to call it "Kicking it up a notch," (laughter) because that's actually what I think we're talking about. Deepening our faculty excellence, we have an excellent faculty. What kind of tools can we put in the hands of the faculty to make their research and teaching better? How do we continue to build an excellent faculty? How do we deepen the intellectual life of our undergraduates and our graduate students? How do we offer opportunities to graduate students to take advantage of all these programs? Diversity: how do we make a really diverse community? We are going to be taking a lot of advantage of the work that went before us on the [Academic Council] Diversity Task Force. And then a continued interest in the globalization but adding to that a sort of problem-based perspective which engages the local environment as well as the global environment. So I think it's not as jazzy as doing this big program and that big program in some ways. But after talking to lots of faculty, it seems like this is what Duke needs now. We need to make the investments to really capitalize

on what we've started and really make sure that we can elevate all the work that's being done here. So I'm going to turn it over to Susan to go into a little bit more depth. These are the goals into which we are going to build the Strategic Plan going forward. Susan will talk a little bit about them and then we just want to open up for discussion and thoughts on these broader areas of interest.

Susan Lozier (Nicholas School of the Environment / Chair, Strategic Planning Steering Committee): Before I start going through some of the overall goals, I just want to recognize the committee members that served on this steering committee. Sally already mentioned that Noah Pickus assisted me in the leadership committee. To give you an idea of the breadth of the committee members that we have, I just want to read them briefly. Gary Bennett from Psychology and Neuroscience and the Institute of Global Health was on the committee. Chuck Campbell from the Divinity School, Charlie Clotfelter from Sanford, Laurent Dubois from Romance Studies and History, Alex Hartemink from Computer Science, Digital Science and Biology, Adriane Lentz-Smith from History, African and African American Studies, Marilyn Oermann from the School of Nursing, Svati Shah from the School of Medicine, Kristine Stiles from Art, Art History and Digital Studies, Peter Ubel from Fuqua, Jeff Vincent from the Nicholas School, Jennifer West from Pratt and Jonathan Weiner from Law. Sally and Keith Whitfield were ex officio. Before I step through the goals, I just wanted to add one thing. Sally talked about a general consensus that emerged over these discussions we had over the past year about really trying to catalyze the communities across the university to

really enhance our research, teaching and service missions. Another consensus that really emerged is that, while we have had a really strong couple decades in building a foundation of interdisciplinarity, globalization, and service in the society, all of which touch on our teaching, service and research missions, people really felt that Duke could reach new levels of distinction by really further connecting the research, service, and teaching missions. So as I walk through these goals, I won't walk through them, maybe I'll run through them because everyone had this document to read. I hope you see that the themes of community and connectivity are running through these.

Kornbluth: One more thing I want to add: one thing that also came out a little bit was, what's the secret sauce at Duke? There are excellent faculty at many of our peer institutions. The extreme collaborative nature, the collegiality, and also the nimbleness and fluidity in being able to form these different communities to attack problems of common interest came out as something we want to continue to enhance and preserve at Duke.

Lozier: The first goal is bolstering the intellectual communities of students. As Sally mentioned, we heard over and over again for the undergraduates is that we have had a number of innovative programs but what we're really interested in doing is looking at those programs and saying, what has worked with those programs? The programs I'm talking about now are really the programs that provide a real intellectual engagement for students outside of the classroom experience. So not all of you, but many of you, especially in Arts and Sciences, know that right now there is a

committee that's looking at the curriculum. That is a two to three year review process. Our committee is not looking at those curricular changes. But we have been in communication with that committee. What we're really interested in is talking about what are those experiences outside of the classroom? When students come here, how are they intellectually engaged? What environment are we providing for them to be engaged? The graduate students, though, expressed to us that we have perhaps under-innovated on the programs that have been available to them. The past plan did mention graduate students, but it somewhat mentioned them in passing. So we're really interested in them and a strong desire has been expressed from faculty from all schools to really reimagine or rethink what graduate education can look like. So that is going to be a big piece of this plan. The other thing is that, in addition to undergraduate and graduate students, we're also really interested in having professional students be part of these communities as well. There's been a lot of innovation out in the professional schools for their educational programs, both curricular and co-curricular. We want to know what that innovation has been, what has worked best, and then we really want to make sure that we have that available to all the professional and graduate students who come here to Duke.

Kornbluth: I'm going to jump in with just a couple examples here. For instance, we've heard from graduate students that they would like to participate in innovation and entrepreneurship. Something that could enhance their education, what they're doing that will put tools in their hands for after their

graduation. In terms of undergraduates, we've heard, even outside the curriculum that folks want to have a way to take intellectual adventure without a lot of risks. So there's been a faculty committee looking at a potential Spring Break program where students would take a single course, pass/fail, or even ungraded, where they would take a deep dive into a single subject. Offer students an intellectual endeavor outside of the classroom that will broaden them and deepen them and offer, frankly, some of the things that keep coming up everywhere. Offering alternatives to social scenes that some of the students don't really want to partake in. Offer them intellectual alternatives that will enable them to really participate fully in the Duke community.

Lozier: We're referring to these as learning communities. This leads to the second goal because in order to really be successful in these learning communities, these learning communities have to have available to them perspectives from different histories, different backgrounds, et cetera. That means that, as a university community, we really need to recognize that diversity is a key tenet for ideas and creativity. Many of us who have been here for a number of years know that we've made remarkable strides in diversifying our undergraduate population and in pockets of some of the professional students and graduate students as well. The diversification of our faculty has not kept pace. I know this Council has been addressing this and under the leadership of Nan and Trina, there is the Diversity Task Force. So the goals of that Task Force will be some of the goals that we're putting in here. But we're not just talking solely about faculty diversity. We're really talking about well, we have all these

students now, and they're a diverse group, how do we make this community here a welcoming and inclusive community? So the theme of community and connectivity extends to goal three. The origin of goal three is really two parts. Throughout the nine months that we talked to faculty, there was really tremendous enthusiasm for thinking about our engagement with our local community; whether local is Durham or the Piedmont or the Southeast. Thinking about that engagement not so much from a community service point of view but really from our research then being applied to and partnering with local communities to address issues and concerns in the 21st century that Duke research can best address. So there was a lot of enthusiasm there thinking about our local engagement in terms of our research program as well. The second piece of that is that our global programs to date have been primarily place-based. We have a China initiative, an Africa initiative, and a Brazil initiative. Recognizing the 21st century that communities across the globe have similar challenges, whether it is climate change, migration, demographics, inequality, what we want to do is supplement the place-based approach with an issue-based approach. These two sentiments sort of merged into what we're calling having Duke research address issues that scale or cross borders or boundaries. I want to explain a little bit about the history in there because, at least right now, we're still having an issue with describing exactly what that means: issues that scale. That has been the motivation behind it.

Kornbluth: A good example is, we're talking about tropical conservation where, it's an issue that is present in

many parts of the globe. It isn't really localized to one place. Really trying to think about how our faculty are interested in issues and how we join different places to address critical problems. Climate change is another area, obviously. Things that came up where, frankly, having DKU as a platform will be helpful.

Lozier: The fourth goal is to foster and support the excellence of Duke faculty as leaders of the university's intellectual communities. As faculty, we have the responsibility and the privilege of providing leadership for all of these communities in research and teaching and service missions that we've been talking about. This goal really talks about well, in order to provide that leadership, we need to make sure the faculty has the support and resources necessary to do that. Just a few more things before we throw it open for discussion. Sally mentioned, and Nan said this is the first phase so what our goal now is to say, what can we best do to achieve each of these four goals? What do we have in place? What do we need to expand on? Are there new programs or new ideas that would help us achieve these? We're going back out to the community. This is one part of that. We're talking to people and so our goal then is, by the end of the year, we will have attached to each of these goals what we're actually going to be doing and make some priorities.

Kornbluth: Exactly. So these buckets or goals will obviously be filled in with specific programs that are going to come out over the years. People will have the opportunity, there will be working groups to develop some of the examples we've given, but also there's plenty of opportunity for additional examples.

Obviously, ultimately we're going to have to make strategic choices in terms of which are expanded upon within each of the goals. Again, there will be plenty of discussion before we get to land on the final areas. The other thing I should say is, some of the things we're talking about, this plan is not going to be delivered until the end of the academic year or the beginning of the next year. So I don't want people to feel that we're completely on hold until then. Some of these interesting ideas that are coming up in these discussions, we're starting to implement already. They will have a place in the plan but also you will see a sort of run up to the plan with some of the things that we'll be discussing. With that, we can just hear reactions or things people are thinking about in terms of the emphasis on community in these particular areas that we're discussing and what you think we need to consider as we go into actually constructing the plan in earnest.

Jokerst: (Silence) You shocked them! (laughter)

Lozier: This is a friendlier audience than Hillary Clinton's (laughter).

Tina Williams (Psychology and Neuroscience): I applaud you for considering graduate students because I think you're absolutely right, the previous Strategic Plan only mentioned them in passing and that's a group that has been wanting more in many ways. I'm curious about what thoughts have come out of the faculty in terms of building graduate communities, both across the professional schools, across hopefully some major disciplinary? I know we could use some more kinds of things that help them get jobs. I'm just wondering what else we are talking about. Different kinds of housing?

Are we putting them together? Because they live all over the place just like regular people do. It's a different kind of community. I'm kind of curious about what initial thoughts you had so that we can help.

Kornbluth: I'll make a comment and then I'll pass it to Susan. We haven't really been talking about co-housing or anything like that. But part of it is, we've heard from a lot of the graduate students that they have a desire to participate. For instance, we have some graduate participation in things like Bass Connections. There are other programs that involve graduate students and sort of vertically-integrated research teams that I think they are really interested in taking a greater part in. Again, it's some of the things that are outside of the research arena. Part of it is to build alternative career opportunities, as you say. The civic engagement pieces, as I said, innovation and entrepreneurship. Obviously, their main focus is still going to be their research. But they want to have opportunities to explore other dimensions because most of them are not going into careers in academia.

Lozier: It's not a surprise that one of the motivations behind this has to do with the job market. I will say that our conversations were not just with faculty but the graduate students' input was loud and clear. They want us to look seriously at the graduate education that we're offering here. I do think it is sort of expanding some of the programs, looking at what are the best ones to expand and make them available to graduate students. We've also talked about making joint degrees easier for students. We've talked about affordability issues as well, internship possibilities, making those

more available. We've also talked about expanding the alumni network for graduate and professional students to take advantage of. So these all are sort of floating out there. It isn't particularly curricular things we're talking about because these students are all over in different schools and programs. What we're talking about is, when students come here, what can every graduate student expect that they can take advantage of when they come to Duke?

Alex Rosenberg (Philosophy): I was glad to hear at the beginning of the conversation that there is an important link between enhancing the intellectual life of undergraduates and the curriculum. I want to emphasize that some data suggests that our current curriculum is very low on the priority list of students as reasons of why they come to Duke. It's essential to improving the intellectual life of our undergraduate student experience that this curriculum become a much more important reason for the kind of students that we want to come to Duke. I want to encourage you and the Arts and Sciences Committee to work together particularly on this.

Lozier: Thank you. Suzanne Shanahan is leading that committee and we have been talking to her. I would say, for all students, we want to say that the intellectual environment we have here, of which the curriculum is one component, we want that to be the reason that they come to Duke.

Rosenberg: That's right. You can lead a horse to water but the horse has got to want to come to this water.

Kornbluth: I do think that part of the discussions we've been having with

Suzanne, and there are probably folks here who are on the committee who could comment more, is to sort of get away from the check box mentality of a curriculum where they have to do one from column A, two from column B, and really think about what an intellectually coherent education is for the students. We're not in lock step in terms of timing. But what I'm hoping is that things that are emerging from the curriculum committee will inform the plan and vice versa so that our efforts to build intellectual activities beyond the scholarship students. I went to a dinner last night with the A.B. Duke students, this is just a small slice of our students. We want to have these kind of activities available to much broader groups of students. In our discussion last night, this starts getting them reflecting on what they're doing in their curriculum in the classroom. When they start drawing the connections and they have the opportunities to have these conversations in depth outside of the classroom. So that's kind of where we're going. We'll see how it coordinates going forward.

Lozier: I'll just make one more quick note. When we're talking about outside the classroom, it just reminds me of a quote from the French composer Claude Debussy who said that music is what happens between the notes. So we really need to make sure that our intellectual environment is not just about that classroom and what's happening in the classroom space. We're really trying to have this intellectual environment imbued in what we do.

Josh Sosin (Classical Studies and the Library / ECAC): I like this document a lot. This is my third occasion to read it. So let me thank you for not changing it each

time. I really like the idea of a single word standing for the whole thing: community. You can call them buckets or bins or goals or containers or whatever, but so long as the thinking you do within each one of them comes back to that mantra of community, how does this conduce to community? That's a really nice, elegant, simple, organizing thread. I aim this comment at the previous. On the one hand, there is the goal to provide the kind of intellectual stimulation that you want students to shape on their own time here. But then there's also the fact that you want to have sufficient force to displace some of the other, less attractive reasons that they may have in mind when they come here. So I just wanted to suggest that certainly in the first goal, and in the others as well, we might do well as we're focusing on the intellectual and academic side, which is great, and that should be at the top of the list, bear in mind also the social and cultural components, which I take to underlie the comment a minute ago.

Lozier: We have heard this, in fact Nan brought it up before, and Josh, we've heard it from you, maybe this is the third time (laughter). I will say, and I'll say the answer I gave to you last time, what we're trying to do here is to not say, here is the environment we don't want. We're trying to say, this is the environment we want. We're trying to focus on this intellectual environment and what we can provide to students. We do understand that there are the whole social engagements, which we want students to have a social life here as well. We are engaging Larry Moneta; we are having a conversation and a dinner about this broader theme. Keeping in mind, this is an academic plan. So we feel very comfortable saying, this is the intellectual environment that we want

students to be exposed to and we're hoping that this environment then draws them into this world and the other world takes a smaller piece of the pie.

Kornbluth: I also think another piece of it is, a lot of the students' social lives, the culture, we can't really remove those from the top down. It's sort of like, mom and dad aren't really telling the kids what to do. But, I will say that I think it's our role to encourage the positive activities to flourish. For instance, there's this new thing called Duke Conversations which was started by students. It is faculty dinners in faculty homes discussing substantive issues with groups of students. Students have been signing up for this and a very large number of students have signed up for this. It suggests that there's really a hunger for these kinds of things and I think for us to support this not only what we would want to do through Larry Moneta, through Alex Hartemink and the scholarship office, but really supporting the efforts of students in helping them to do the kinds of things that offer attractive alternatives is really important.

Lozier: I'll just say one other thing on that topic and neither one of us mentioned it before but it's something we've talked about a lot. When people talk about the students and trying to get them involved in this intellectual experience, they talk a lot about having more student-faculty interactions. But what we're hoping to do with this plan is also say, we want undergraduate-professional-graduate students as well. There's faculty involved in these learning communities because the professional and graduate students can really serve as mentors and advisors. Many of us have had this happen already in our labs and programs we're running.

We really want to make those experiences, those interactions more common. So we're giving those students role models that at many times are closer in their age and they can understand what they're doing. So it's not just the program themselves but the community of the program they interact with.

Rob Mitchell (English): I wanted to add to Alex's point and say that I think it would be good to have some sort of mechanism for assessing whether or not these undergraduate community-building activities are working. One mechanism might be to see if there's a change in the reasons that students stayed or why they come here. Hopefully you would see after three or four years that they're coming here for different reasons than they are now and I think that's a good way of checking if these are working. The other comment is that I'm serving as director of Graduate Studies and I will say that when I hear about more community-building activities for graduate students, it makes me a little nervous because, at least in my discipline, at some point, usually around the second or third year, our students become very monastic. But, they also, themselves having come from undergraduate institutions where they want to get everything accredited, will leap at any opportunity to have something more on their CVs. Both because they think it may help them get a job and second because often it is a way of sort of avoiding that monastic endeavor. So it's a tricky thing at the graduate level because I think the graduate programs have their own sense of what's working. It's not that I don't want there to be any programs, but I do feel like I spend a lot of time talking with students about which programs will actually help and which things are probably not going to help.

Lozier: I agree. We talk about rethinking graduate education. That is not without some tensions there. Graduate education is very different if we're talking about Humanities or Sciences or Engineering or Medicine. So we do understand that there are some nuances there. What is it that we want to make available? I will say what we want to make available, not require. Also, what would best meet those graduate students' needs? I do think this takes some careful thought and that's what we're going to be doing over the next month. I'm happy for input from any of the directors of Graduate Studies or anybody in thinking about this. We have, in some ways, been doing a lot of innovations on the undergraduate side and we need to figure out what has worked. I think we're not starting from scratch with graduate programs. The Graduate School has some programs so we have some information. I do think there is more hard work that needs to be done.

Kornbluth: Two comments. One, on your undergraduate comment. I think there's another piece which is how we attract students upfront and how we engineer pieces of the admissions process so it's not only a backend assessment of whether things have changed because of the programs, but it's also who the students are that we take. So that's one thing. The other graduate piece is that I think this can be done in a thoughtful way but it has to be tailored program to program. I'll just give a really quick example. In Medicine, there's this thing called Scholars of Molecular Medicine where students can, these are Basic Science students who are really making their living doing bench work. They can go outside for not a huge amount of time,

just episodic, where they visit patients in the clinic with the diseases they're doing basic research on. They do some case studies with clinicians. They discuss some literature. In the end, I've had three different students in my lab who have gone through this and while I was worried at first about it taking away from bench time, it enhanced their enthusiasm and their focus on their work so much because they were able to put it in context. I realize it's different in every field, but my point is, if we think about things that will enhance the way students think about their graduate work and potentially give them other career opportunities, it's got to be that we set the framework and individual programs can work within that. We will be collecting at least examples that we might be able to resource as part of the plan.

Harvey: A question of goal four: excellence of faculty. It says: "Duke could: Determine how high quality research, teaching, service, and community involvement can be rewarded in faculty appointments, promotion and salary." The question is: does this mean that our criteria for tenure are on the table and in particular of the weight that we put on the research component?

Kornbluth: I think that our tenure process is sort of continually evolving. I'll give you two examples. One is, we now see packages coming through where there's a much bigger piece of public scholarship, which, a decade ago, people would not have recognized as something that goes into the tenurability. We're seeing interdisciplinarity where now you have to go out to this much broader catchment of letters because when you ask any individual discipline-based faculty to comment, they only see a

narrow slice. So when we say things are on the table, it's not that you're going to see dramatic shifts. I think we just need to take into account trends in what we see in our faculty and what we see in higher education in general for what we and folks in the field consider true excellence. So it just leaves that open to discussion and in individual fields again, we're trying to get departments to articulate what they consider excellence in their faculty and what criteria we should be judging on. It's not homogeneous and we may have been treating it in a monolithic manner because the academy was moving forward in a very traditional way. But we're doing so many different kinds of experiments here that I think we have to reward people if they're doing an excellent job in those kinds of categories of experimentation.

Jokerst: Thank you Susan, thank you to the committee, and thank you Provost Kornbluth. If you have further comments, please feel free to email Susan or to send them to Academic Council.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO OFFICE OF LICENSING AND VENTURES

Jokerst: I'm going to stand here and you'll see why the box is very important (laughter). One last topic on our agenda. This is the proposed changes to Duke's Office of Licensing & Ventures. With your agenda you saw the document posted for our last item. This regards the proposed changes to the Office of Licensing & Ventures and Duke's policy on inventions, patents, and technology transfer. Provost Kornbluth has been very busy. She will appear before us again today for this topic and she will be joined by Vice Provost for Research, Larry Carin to answer any questions that you might have.

Kornbluth: I'm going to leave most of this to Larry and I just want to make it short (laughter). Just a few comments about this. If there's anything I heard a lot of complaints about, I mean, I've heard plenty of complaints, but the thing I heard a lot of complaints about when I became Provost was a machinery for ensuring that discoveries that are made by faculty can actually make it to the marketplace. This is part of our core value on knowledge in the service of society, is to really help faculty do that. To translate: part of the issue is that we have this Office of Licensing and Ventures, which for those of you who haven't been involved in it, it is involved in all our intellectual property, it's involved in patenting, et cetera. Part of the problem was philosophical. Which is, to my mind, and I think the National Academy has also supported this in a recent report, the role of an Office of Licensing and Ventures in the context of a university is not as a profit center. It would be wonderful if we make money on some of our discoveries. We would all be thrilled about it. But the real role is to translate discoveries out there to the world. So a big part of what Larry is going to tell you about is actually not just pragmatic nuts and bolts of how the office is going to operate. But that will indeed change. But it is really a philosophical reorientation of how we think about the Office of Licensing and Ventures in the Duke context. And, it actually comes at an opportune time because we're actually now searching for a new director of the Office of Licensing and Ventures. So we're looking for a director who shares this sort of philosophical orientation of really being in service to the faculty and moving their discoveries forward. So Larry, very graciously, took this on when he was first

hired, actually originally in collaboration with Rob Califf, who is now at the FDA and then subsequently with Scott Gibson from Medicine. It's been a tight partnership with Medicine to really work with a group of faculty to figure out what this enterprise should look like at Duke and I think they've done an extremely thorough job and Larry will tell you about it.

Larry Carin (Vice Provost, Research):

As Sally said, this has been basically a year-long process. We've been going at this pretty much since I started in July last year. So I'm just going to give an overview of the changes that we've made through this process and the most important thing, as Sally said, is our core values. So there is a document that describes how Duke does IP, and we have revised that document. So I'm just going to summarize the revisions. The first thing, which is in some sense the most important thing, is the overarching goal. So we added to the top of the entire document that quote there [refers to slide: "guided by the long view, including promotion of invention disclosures, prompt reviews of new disclosures, wide transition of Duke IP to the marketplace as measured by licensing transactions, faculty satisfaction, and revenue generation."] The key of that quote, the mission of the office is to translate inventions from our faculty to the marketplace and to try to seek faculty satisfaction and lastly revenue generation. So this is explicitly saying that while revenue generation is important, we would like to get as much as we can, it is not the core mission of the office. So this is actually a fundamental change and it kind of underscores all of the subsequent changes that we made. So the substantive changes: we put explicit timelines on OLV. So previously there

were really no timelines and you could send stuff to them and you may or may not ever hear, actually. So these bullets really summarize it. Three months after an invention is disclosed, the inventor will hear something. There are details about what they'll hear. But they will hear from the office. Six months after a provisional patent has been disclosed, the inventor will be told by OLV whether the university is going to pursue a patent. If not, that will be assigned back to the inventor. Thirdly, no negotiation between OLV and an outside company will go for longer than six months. So if a negotiation hits six months, that matter will be brought to a new OLV board, which is the third bullet. So that's a new body which would be composed of five faculty, three from the School of Medicine and two from the campus. That board will review all issues that might come up, including disputes between OLV and others. The hope would be that we would not have a whole lot of those. Then the board will ensure that the policies are followed. The fourth bullet addresses a point that I heard over and over again from the faculty. I want people to recognize that there was a key point that almost everybody wanted to see changed and it has been changed. That is the following. Previously, whenever technology was assigned back to the inventor, it said that the university got 10% of the inventor's share. Then it said, unless there's some negotiation, et cetera. So it was 10%, but maybe not 10%. And it was not uniformly high. Most importantly, the faculty that I talked to felt that if the university said they weren't interested in the technology and then the inventor makes something of it, it's kind of hard for the university to come back and ask for something. So there are some arguments on both sides. Nevertheless we listened to the faculty.

So, if technology is assigned back to the inventor, the inventor will own 100% of that invention and whatever comes of that will go to the inventor. So that's a fundamental change. Then all other aspects of our distribution policy are unchanged. Nobody had any problems with how Duke handled distribution if Duke chose to create the patent. There was really no issue there. So now we have introduced a moral hazard, because there might be some incentive to put forward stuff that Duke might be inclined to decline. So we added the language which hopefully won't really come up, if technology is assigned back to the inventor, it's the inventor's responsibility to demonstrate to the OLV board that what they subsequently commercialize was indeed the same thing that was presented in the first place. So hopefully that would never come up, but it's been added. The second bullet here, we went through the entire document and revised it and that included adding discussion about I&E which did not exist. The document had not been updated since 1995. So I&E did not exist so we added some language that I&E will be the center of education in the context of innovation and entrepreneurship. Finally, we've gone through a process where we have really re-stoked the office and redirected the office and we're going to have a new director. So we're now in the process of doing a national search. The hope is that within six months we will have a new director. Any questions?

Grill: First, Larry, terrific work on this. If you could go back to your timeline, this has been a persistent challenge for the office as well as for the inventors and I'm wondering if you could put a little more teeth on this. If OLV does not meet the timeline, then the IP is automatically

assigned back to the inventors. Otherwise the intent could be a little bit of waffling, we're not sure, and it can really keep people's feet to the fire that way.

Carin: I understand what you're saying and you're not the first person to say it. There was never any timeline of any sort previously. There was never an OLV board. So what I hope is that we don't have that problem. I'm determined, as one of the representatives of the Provost, to assure that that does not ever happen. So I would rather not have a document that had the assumption that the office would not function in the document. I want the office to function. And so I'm the Provost's representative and Scott Gibson is the Chancellor's representative. So it's a seven-person board. Us two administrators and then five faculty. What we're going to do every quarter or whatever, we haven't decided. But when we meet, we're going to ask the director to show us the data on when was it submitted and when did you get back to them. We're going to ask that every time we meet and there better not be any of that where you're going. So the document was not reevaluated since 1995. Let's give it a chance, the new document, before we add that line, which I hope we don't have to have. But I understand your point and I understand your frustration and that has driven everything, those types of frustrations have driven everything that we've done here.

Harvey: Did you look at the most innovative universities? Stanford and MIT? And can you tell me if our policy significantly differs from those innovative universities?

Carin: First of all, we did. And secondly, Jeff Glass in the Pratt School led a

committee, and I think Warren was on it, of several of our most innovative faculty who looked at this in great detail. That drove our revisions to a large extent. So we were very much guided by best practices. To answer your question, I think we are aligned with best practices.

Jokerst: We have time for one more question if anyone has one. Alright, thank you very much, Larry. Thank you everyone for coming. The meeting is adjourned.