



Minutes of the Meeting of the Academic Council  
Thursday, November 17, 2016

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

Welcome, everyone, to the November meeting of the Academic Council, and thank you for attending our meeting. Obviously we've got a pretty full house today. Today we will vote on the proposed resolution to establish an undergraduate degree at Duke Kunshan University, or DKU. We have discussed the DKU undergraduate degree for over three years in the Council, including a full Council meeting this past September to provide feedback to the proposal, a lively discussion at our October meeting, and a vote today. And before we vote, we will open the floor for further discussion.

In the past few years, we have aimed to emphasize the Council's role in faculty governance by engaging in open discussion of major proposals while they are still in their formative stages. This has given us the opportunity to provide feedback to programs that include the DKU undergraduate degree and the Strategic Plan. Provost Kornbluth, we appreciate your willingness to engage the faculty, to hear our feedback, and to incorporate our ideas as plans evolve.

We would now like to take that commitment to open discussion today to the next level. And so, today we start something new. After the vote on the DKU curriculum, ECAC would like to engage you, the faculty, in a conversation on the topic of faculty governance. We hope that this will be the

first of many such conversations on a range of issues. For our meeting today, ECAC member Josh Sosin will facilitate our conversation.

***APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 20<sup>TH</sup> MINUTES***

**Jokerst:** We'll move now to the approval of the October 20<sup>th</sup> minutes.

*(Minutes approved by voice vote without dissent)*

Just a reminder before we move on to our other agenda items, if you ask questions or make comments, please identify yourself for the benefit of everyone in the room.

***DKU UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE RESOLUTION***

**Jokerst:** Today we will vote on the resolution proposing an undergraduate degree at Duke Kunshan University. Let me bring up that resolution for you now. Conversations, as I said previously, regarding Duke Kunshan have been active for over six years, and intensive discussions regarding this undergraduate degree have occurred in Council for over three years. Here is the resolution, which was also posted on the Academic Council website with the agenda for today's meeting and on our website at the netid protected location is the background document referenced in the resolution. This proposal has been shaped through intensive

discussions that have included faculty in a variety of ways. These discussions occurred in the faculty committees that include the University Priorities Committee and the Global Priorities Committee. In addition, the Academic Programs Committee voted on this resolution and unanimously passed this resolution approving the DKU undergraduate degree. All of those documents are referenced behind netid on the Academic Council website. We have also engaged in thoughtful discussions in Academic Council. Last year, we discussed the DKU undergraduate degree and in September we devoted the entire Council meeting to feedback on the degree. Today's meeting is the second meeting of the two meeting voting sequence for the DKU Resolution. At this meeting, we will vote on the resolution. We will have additional time for discussion after the resolution is moved and seconded.

Before we move to a motion, President Brodhead has asked to say just a few words to us.

**Richard Brodhead (President):** The question now is if I should stand on the Nan box or not (laughter). It might not be a good idea for me to tower over you on these, as all occasions (laughter). Thinking about the last couple of weeks and thinking about today, I just thought I would start with a comment. I want to say something about the period of the election and after the election. But it is not about the results of the election. I do not believe it is appropriate for the university to take a side in those elections. Our responsibility is to protect a space for debate and exchange, and I sent out a note to that effect last week. When you look back at the election, I remember that the founders of this country had in mind that, for democracy to work, you would need an educated citizenship and that the point of elections is that they were meant to be seasons of

education in which people learned what was at stake and the meaning of their choices. Maybe that always was a bit idealistic in terms of the reality of this country, but I think that anybody looking back at the very protracted election cycle we had just been through would have to say that as a pedagogical matter, the culture of education during this election was a pretty dismal one. We live in a country with hundreds of exceedingly complicated ideas before us as people entrusted to make those choices. But instead of any elaboration, taking the public into the nature of the choices and the meaning and advantage of different ones, we had a campaign where, largely, the campaign was run on each side making clear how disastrous the other would be, with sort of simplistic negative content chasing out pretty much all over. I keep that in mind, and then I turn to the United States of Duke University. Because this is also election day. This is the second election this November, you might say, two too many. When I think of the educational climate that has preceded the vote today, it just seems to me the contrast is just so totally overwhelming. When we first talked about a program in China, let alone we first talked about an undergraduate degree program in China, there were a lot of points of view, quite diametrically opposed ones, from 50,000-foot altitudes. Either this was the best program in the history of the world, the salvation of international relations, and the future of human rights, or it was the worst thing ever contemplated, a disaster for this university, et cetera. I mean, I exaggerate a little. It seems to me, what I do find impressive and that anyone at this university has a source of pride in is that from the beginning of this discussion to the present, we have taken something very abstract and we've tried to pull it down to tease out what is promising about this, how real is that promise, to tease out what is risky about this, how risky is that risk, to run this process

through every faculty committee that could consider it. As you know, those committees did not start made up of people who were pre-sold on this idea. It was the process of inquiry, the process of learning, the process of people exchanging points of view, asking questions of one another, coming up with better answers to those questions. That's what I think has really taken this idea from what it might have been two or three years past, Nan's a little appalled to hear that this might be the sixth year of our discussing this subject. But that's what took it from what it might have been some years past to where we find it today. I think even a person who might not wish to favor it might understand how this has something to do with trying to connect us with the most rapidly emerging and consequential country in the world, how it has something to do with trying to connect our research possibilities there, how it has something to do with trying to identify Duke with the best features of American higher education, the culture of open questions, open inquiry, close attention of teacher to student, and so on. I think the person most supportive of it would understand by now, very clearly, what some of the questions are that need to be asked about this. The financial questions, I think until we got the commitment from Kunshan that they would subsidize the program up to the extent of \$45 million a year, with Duke's contribution capped at \$5 million, until you knew that, the financial risk was, it seems to me, a total unknown. The subject of academic freedom, one that I know has vexed many people in this Council, what we have to answer that is no certainty on any side, but the experience of the now very large number of faculty members who have taught there and who, in this very room, have told us about their experience opening what might have seemed risky questions to a lively discussion in the middle of an audience of Chinese and other students. Through that process, what I'm

really trying to say is an elaborate tribute to the process of academic decision and participation in decision-making. The process of people trying to use their intellect to understand questions rather than simply bat down someone else's point of view. I think this has brought us a long way in this process. I was in California at the time of the September meeting. But at the October meeting, are you going to hate me if I say this? Not every faculty meeting I have been at in my 40 years of faculty life has been equally enthralled. But I thought that the October one, where you had Jamie Boyle make an amazing case about questions of how, if you had any presence there, might you be licensing oppression in many forms, and then to have Melanie Manion, new to our faculty in Political Science, say that she had worked in China all through the Tiananmen years, and that what her friends told her is, whatever helps to open the door is good for free inquiry in China, and whatever closes the door is bad for it, and all the other discussion that took place at that time. It's kind of an amazing achievement that we have this, it's kind of a cliché, "free and full exchange." But free and full exchange is just, in fact, what we have had. I think everyone of every persuasion ought to look at everyone else and realize this has been done with civility and with an intent to educate others, and with a willingness to be educated oneself. I'll just say one last word about the election. Everyone knows that this election has created a period of unusual uncertainty as regards to the United States and the world. I have had people suggest that the nature of that uncertainty is so large that we should perhaps consider putting off this decision today. I have to say, I can easily understand how someone could suggest that. I only wanted to offer my own thoughts about that subject and I've come to the view that I do not think that's the right way to proceed for three reasons. One, we have prepared and

prepared and prepared. Committees spent all last year working their way through this. We are in a state of readiness we will never be at again to make this decision today. The second one is, if someone thinks that in a month or two months or six months, the current uncertainty will be dispelled (laughter), remember when we heard about known unknowns and unknown unknowns? (laughter). It just seems to me that if you're going to say, uncertainty is such that we need to defer this, you need to understand, you're probably indefinitely deferring it. And everyone knows the fate of things that are indefinitely deferred. The third thing I would say, and I say this quite personally, is this. The fears we have, both of other countries and that they have about us, have to do with resurgences of nationalism in our time. I was in Britain the day of the Brexit vote and I was in this country when you heard people run on campaigns of pulling back to a narrower sense of America's role in the world and interest in the world. And certainly we have heard such things in China. A moment when nations and cultures are beginning to divest in from the idea of the international order, seems to me the time that needs something like the DKU undergraduate program more than ever. That's finally what you would be creating here. Not just a place of research and education, but a place that trains citizens on both sides of the Pacific to enter into each other's thinking, to learn how to share each other's anxieties, each other's hopes, and how to become constructive partners, whatever might be going on day to day in the politics in their country. I think this is a powerful reason to care about this project and even to support it, on the condition that the risks have been identified, as they laboriously have, and I believe mitigated. I do believe in free elections and I think that everyone here will take this as a matter of conscience, and that whatever position we feel, looking back, people can take pride in having used the

powers of deliberation, the powers of community and thoughtfulness in a community, in the way that is intended in the high ideal of the university.

**Jokerst:** Thank you, President Brodhead.

Let's continue. Do I have a motion from a Council member to approve the resolution?

*(Motion approved by voice vote without dissent)*

The floor is now open for discussion.

**Tom Robisheaux (History):** While I'm not a member of the Council, I have a bit more history with the proposal and the development of the curriculum for DKU than most people sitting in this room. I was Chair of the Arts and Sciences Council in the winter of 2012-13 when the first discussions began about courses that would be mounted and taught at DKU and at the same time, we in the Arts and Sciences Council leadership began talking about the curriculum. In fact, we had before us proposals about principles. It went on from there. We formed the Ad Hoc DKU Joint Committee, by the way, terrible name (laughter). But what it gave was reassurance to the faculty of Arts and Sciences that we had those faculty members who had the most experience with course review and development and approval, and with those who are engaged with academic programs in other countries. That is, the Global Education Committee. We had, in other words, the best of our two standing committees that looked at these proposals and reviewed and advised the group, then led by Nora Bynum, of course, in the Provost's office, as discussions went forward. Repeatedly, I remember when Noah (Pickus) came into the picture, he would come to the meetings of the executive committee of the Arts and Sciences Council and float some new ideas. We had sessions of

the Arts and Sciences Council that were dedicated to it. Then a group of us threw the proposal, and Noah, he's here somewhere, to the lions, actually, which is the Curriculum Committee of the Arts and Sciences Council. They have a ferocious reputation. They are skeptical to the core. Rare is the proposal that comes before them that doesn't go through a year or two of really probing, searching criticism, review, revision, free expression of reservations, new iterations, and so on and so forth. It's one of the reasons why we have such a robust curriculum and now a new curriculum proposal before the Arts and Sciences Council. We have had the best people in Arts and Sciences, with all of their eyes on this proposal from the winter of 2012-2013. I want you to know, at almost every single meeting, I or one of my colleagues raised profound questions and I was a very strong critic for a very long time about this, particularly about the political environment in China and its history of human rights abuses and repression and so on and so forth and wondering if this would work or not. Over time, as this curriculum for this new undergraduate program came into view, I realized just how bold and visionary it really is. That's four years of my own engagement with it. So, while I think that any reservations that I'm sure colleagues have about the environment in which a liberal arts education is to be offered in China are very well taken, we should not lose sight of that at all, on the vantage point of the curriculum, I can say it is superbly well thought through, it's adapted to the circumstances of DKU. I've met with many of the colleagues who have taught there. It's been evolving on the ground. The students have been excited about the format. I think it's going to work and I'll just remind you, any curriculum, any program you're going to propose has a ten-year lifespan. In ten years, the faculty at DKU will come back to their curriculum like we always come back to our curriculum every

ten years or so. So we will meet the circumstances and they will have to learn about it. I would just urge colleagues to support this. One, it is a carefully thought through curriculum and program by the best people here at the university who have lots of expertise and experience about liberal arts curriculum development. Second of all, it has had the support of people who are keenly aware of the risks and possibilities that are there. Third of all, I just want to leave you with this one thought. I'm a historian of Europe. I think in hundreds of years, I don't think in terms of two years, one year, or five years or so. The last time a liberal arts curriculum was brought to the new universities in Europe was in the 11<sup>th</sup> century (laughter). So it was a tumultuous time, I want you to know. Expect conflict. That's exactly what happened in the European universities in the 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> centuries over the curriculum, over some bold professors who probably took things too far, some who were prosecuted for heresy, some students who were prosecuted for heresy and treason. Over a thousand years, however, that core curriculum, very simple in the 11<sup>th</sup> century, has been adapted to one university environment after another, spread across Europe, leapt the Atlantic and came to our institutions. We are the stewards of the kind of liberal arts tradition that goes back a millennium. If we can approve this, please don't think about five, ten, even 25 years out. Think in terms of the very long term. This, I think, is really the hope. I don't get to vote, I'm not a representative here, but I would vote for the long term. Because that's what liberal arts education should do. Maybe not now, maybe not in five years, maybe not this student or that faculty member or something, but 50 years out, 100 years out, and I would be proud of this institution that we were behind one of those efforts that lit a flame in China. It may falter, it may be repressed, by the way. I fully expect that. Historians see this

happen all the time. There will be setbacks, I fully expect that too. But it may become a model and an inspiration for other institutions and it is unique in China. I can tell you that. They looked at all the other institutions. This is bold and different. I would love to see my university, which is also my alma mater, by the way, have its name on transplanting a one-thousand-year tradition of liberal, free, critical thinking to a new continent and a new population. That's all I have to say. Vote for it.

**Cam Harvey (Fuqua):** I have a specific question about a type of risk that we haven't considered. It's a fact that soon we will have a new President. If the DKU proposal goes forward today, that President will have to devote a lot of time and enthusiastic energy to make this initiative work. If Dick was the President in the future, I don't have this uncertainty because Dick is an enthusiastic leader of the DKU program. But we don't know what the view is of the future President. So a reasonable question has to do with the views of the candidates on this initiative. Is there any information on that? I'm not sure where we are in the search. Is there a finalist? Is there a short list? It would certainly help if we knew these views so that this uncertainty could be mitigated.

**Brodhead:** Let the offending person speak to your question (laughter). I have decided to serve for 50 more years (laughter/applause). With the enthusiastic leadership that you love so much. Nan is on the search committee, but the members of the search committee are sworn to silence, so she can't say anything. I'm not on the search committee, but I know a thing or two (laughter). What we know is, from the beginning of the serious consideration, candidates have been told about DKU, they have been sent that 40-page question and answer document. They've all read it and

have all been asked questions at the early round of interviews about it, and they've all been given to understand that if they were to be appointed in this job, it would be their job, if it had gone forward with faculty and trustee approval, to raise this and lead it to success. I believe it's fair to say, no candidate has dropped out on the basis of that. But it will not come as a surprise to the new President that such a thing exists and that it will be expected to be part of their job. People on the Board of Trustees ask themselves, might it not be better to wait until the new President starts and see what they think, but actually, the Board is not full of academics, it's full of business people, and they said that's the last thing they would do, would be to defer a difficult decision and put it on the desk of somebody their first day on the job.

**Jokerst:** I'm not saying a word (laughter).

**Steffen Bass (Physics):** I want to take up the issue of bubbles of academic freedom that we had in October, and I'm not going to rehash my own arguments, but I would actually like to ask one colleague of ours, Ken Rogerson, who came back from DKU recently, and has taught students over there and had discussions with students about these very bubbles, to share his experiences.

**Ken Rogerson (Sanford):** Hi, I just got back a couple weeks ago. I taught the first half of the semester over there. The best way I can say this is, I am a free speech guy. I study and research and teach on technology and politics. Let me just say, I'm not the only one in this room who has done this and I want to point out there are a number of people in this room who could speak to this as well, so I appreciate that. I taught a class on internet and politics. Initially, for me, I wondered how it would be taken. This committee that Tom was talking about, when they approved this,

they called me back in the room and said, don't change anything. I said okay. I was concerned about that but I didn't. I went over there and I didn't change anything about it. We talked about the Great Firewall of China as easily as Edward Snowden. They had comments and thoughts about all of the above. I will be honest in the moment and say that, Sally, I heard that you read some of my comments that went to the Sanford faculty at the last meeting. I stand by those comments but I also want you to know as a Council that I recognize what the unknowns and the known unknowns are. I get that. There are still some unknowns out there. But I come back with a calmer feeling that whatever concerns about immediate academic freedom on the ground don't exist. I was encouraged beyond belief to teach what I wanted to teach. There were 62 students there. My class was capped at 15. I ended up with 28 students in the class. They were mostly Chinese. I did have an American or two, and two of the Indians were in my class as well. They were from Shiv Nadar [University]. I will just throw that out as, I think it was a really great thought experiment and the students embraced it and were very willing to criticize their government, criticize the Communist party, criticize the Great Firewall, and criticize the United States. That was really beautiful to me, that all of the above was possible. I wasn't sure, but I am now. At least teaching my one class in whatever bubble I was in worked. Hopefully that's enough.

**Deborah Jensen (Director, Franklin Humanities Institute):** Mike Merson asked the other Institute directors what we wanted to get out of a DKU curriculum. I was talking with Carlos Rojas about the work that he and Ralph Litzinger and Kate Hayles and many other Duke Humanities faculty have been doing, hosting workshops and conferences with networks of Humanities colleagues from

across Asia at DKU. We proposed a Center for Research in Critical Asian Humanities. We brought it to Sally. She asked a lot of great questions. She said that she thought this was another great way to really ensure that faculty were probing and testing liberal arts qualities at DKU in the way as they would at Duke and she's given her provostial support. I think it's a sign of how seriously and earnestly Duke has thought about what education can be at DKU. I haven't seen that kind of investment in any of the NYU global campuses or other universities. I'm excited about it.

**Speaker:** Some of you might know that Medical Physics was one of the pioneering programs that we started as a graduate program at DKU a few years back. So we have a few years of experience working at DKU. I just want to say that it has been a wonderful opportunity for us. I think it is an opportunity that we can expand and embrace even further. Medical Physics is a field that is highly developed in the US, but it really needs a lot of work in terms of expansion. China is advancing very rapidly; it's becoming technologically advanced. We have an opportunity to sort of, from a technological side of things, to be able to see the work that we've developed here. The scholarship that is formed here. The technology that we have brought here would have a lasting impact on the largest, most populous country in the world. If Duke can make their footprint in that direction, that's huge. I'm highly supportive of this. I'm not on the Council, but that's my voice.

**Jim Zhang (Professor, DKU / Nicholas School of the Environment):** I'm one of the beneficiaries of this program, actually. The first day I was recruited at Duke because that played a larger part of my decision to come to Duke among all the institutions. I've been here for three years. I've spent a lot of time at

DKU because the work I do is air quality, environmental pollution, and disease. If you really want to look at the global disease and what is contributing to that, especially focusing on the environment, that's a place you're going to make a larger impact. That's the main reason that, if I want to spend my time, the same amount of time on one issue there, and places like India, in terms of air quality induced disease, that's where you want to spend your effort. If DKU has a plan for me to indeed get a chance to collaborate and include some new people just like me from other prestigious universities and join the Environmental Policy program, for the exact same reason. Also, in terms of my own research, the local government supports collaboration. They know that air quality is very bad in that area. They want to support research in hopes of understanding what the causes of the problems are and what the policy strategies are that can be used to make it better. In terms of academic freedom, I came to the United States in 1989 to do my PhD studies and then I stayed here. My entire career, just like other people, postdoc, assistant professor, administrator as associate dean in the School of Public Health and department chair for years. So I did sort of realize what academic freedom is in Western, United States system, including state universities, private universities, like USC or Duke. At the same time, I also look at the changes since I left China. I still have a very close connection with Peking University and Tsinghua University and other universities through collaborations. I have seen a huge amount of changes that have occurred over the last 30 years, in terms of what you can say, what you can teach in the classrooms, and what you can discuss in meetings. The progress made towards more and more looking like a Western system, I think it's probably not as fast as some of us would like, but I think that if you look at change, it's beyond my comprehension.

300,000 Chinese kids come into the United States for undergraduate and graduate studies each year, I know that 70-80% will return because they have better opportunities in China for work or anything. So those people will carry whatever they learned here. At the same time, Peking and Tsinghua have started to do the tenure system just like we have. The faculty will be reviewed, that kind of thing, all following what we are doing here. I really feel like, yes, maybe there are still some areas that maybe are not as free as here, but look at the change. And also, the difference of what we do at Duke Kunshan, you cannot feel any difference from here in terms of research or teaching. I think we will be able to attract a lot of talents because of this project and work on issues that are going to be so important to the world. I'm not on the Council but I wanted to share my experience.

**William Johnson (Classical Studies):** I'm speaking as a Humanities faculty. I taught the very first semester at DKU and it was an interesting semester. I'll remind you that in the fall of 2014, it was the time of the Hong Kong protests, for example. I got to see, live on the ground, what it was like to be in China at a really touchy point in terms of political crisis. There are two things I wanted to mention. One is to support the very first statement. I think when an historian writes the history of Duke University 100 years, 200 years from now, this vote, if it goes forward, could be the biggest part of the story of our university. The second thing is that I wanted to mention again in somewhat specific terms reacts to the question that was brought up about human rights and what we're doing there and so forth. One of the things we have to be very careful about is not to look at this as a paternalistic enterprise. There's no question, to me, having talked to a lot of people in China, that Chinese universities are looking very closely at DKU, that they're

interested in this as a model, that there are a number of universities that are willing to follow our leadership there. But this is not a situation where we are just sending our resources and our intelligence and our greater wisdom over there. We have a lot to learn, not just to get out of China. As a Humanities faculty, I have the pleasure and privilege of teaching a module on the Athenian democracy and I can tell you, I learned a lot more about democracy discussing it with my Chinese students than I've ever learned talking to anyone in the United States (laughter). Here are these incredibly smart people – we have like the top-picked students from all over this enormous country – very smart students, who would, for instance, say, you know, I don't think democracy is right for China. We're too big. You start thinking through the representational system. You start thinking about the size. It makes me wonder, well, maybe they have something there. Maybe the fact that we're 300 million people is why we're reaching this point of crisis in our own representation. Or I had students say things like, well, you know, freedom of access and information, your government and your wealthy people control all the information too! At the time, I thought, well, sort of, but it's different. And now, I'm not so sure (laughter). So we have things to learn from them. I'm not an un-cosmopolitan person, I have certainly travelled quite extensively in my life, but almost all in Europe and the Mediterranean, including behind the Iron Curtain when I was young. But my half year of my semester abroad at DKU has certainly changed the way I think about all sorts of things that are really incredibly important for thinking about and studying the Humanities.

**Earl Dowell (Pratt School of Engineering):**

I may be a bit of a lonely voice on the subject based on the past comments, but let me point out the following. First of all, let me thank the

Provost and the President for being very clear about the financial implications, both the past, where we've spent \$95 million, apparently, and going forward, when we plan to spend at least for the next several years no more than \$5 million a year. That's still not inconsequential. That's approximately the annual income on a \$100 million endowment. It's smaller than what we've been spending up to this point, but it's not nominal. The other thing, and I'm not sure this has been discussed all that much, but if I understand the goal of this enterprise, the best we can hope is someday we're going to have Williams College or the equivalent at DKU. Williams College is a wonderful school. There are other wonderful liberal arts schools. But that's not what Duke University is. We're a research university. In fact, we tell our undergraduates and their parents, when they come, the reason they should come to Duke and possibly not go to a liberal arts college, is because there's something special about an undergraduate program within the context of a research university. So I'm asking myself the question, why are we getting into that business, when maybe Williams could do DKU better than we could, if that's what we're trying to create? There are all these uncertainties, but for the moment, I'm willing to concede that you have a wonderful curriculum created by some very able faculty. Certainly there's no evidence as of yet that the Chinese are squeezing us with respect to freedom of speech, although they would be very foolish to do so before we're fully committed. One doesn't know what's going to happen. As Tom Robisheaux pointed out, it's going to be up and down. But I come back to the fundamentals. We're going to spend a fair amount of money, not as much as before, but a fair amount, and we're at best going to create something that isn't really what we are, however wonderful it may be. So I'm asking myself the question, why are we doing this?

**Brodhead:** I seem to be absolutely irrepressible today (laughter). I'll just say a couple of things. You gave the figure which is correct, \$5 million a year would correspond to the income from \$100 million endowment. I have been in the business of raising money on behalf of this university over the last several years, and as you know, we have now crossed over the \$3.25 billion goal on our current campaign, a year ahead of time. We are \$200 million past our goal. I heard something last night at a seminar at the Sanford School that I thought connected with that. Daniel Burnham, the great architect of Chicago, said "Make no little plans." Because people don't care enough about little plans. They're not motivated by little plans. And so, little though it is, it will be accomplished. I have to say, I think I know the reasons why people are so generous with Duke. It's because they see it as an aspirational university. I'm with you; if I thought this were going to be an island of undergraduate liberal arts in the middle of nothing, I would say that's not what Duke is. Of course we began with graduate programs, as you will remember. We have begun by creating research centers and it is absolutely part of the curriculum that undergraduates will participate and benefit from the research centers we already have going there in Global Health, the work on air quality, the new center in Environmental Policy. So I don't see the difference on quite the same scale as you do. The last thing I'd say is, building Williams College in Williamstown is not something I would do nowadays. If you could create Williams College with an internationally-connected research institutes next to it, in a country that does not have that level of education, that might be worth a little investment, because it's the model of education that's the powerful thing here. I certainly understand your question and you have the freedom to disagree.

**Kornbluth:** I have one additional comment which is that, if you think of our investment in isolation, it's one thing, but when you think about how many other resources, both financial and intellectual, that we're going to be leveraging with our investment here, I think, in some ways, it's actually a deal. Because we would be in China, we would have many faculty working in China, regardless of whether we were doing DKU. Now we have a beautiful campus, we have an investment from our partners, and I think we can leverage those things to really have a big impact in a way that we wouldn't be able to do with just \$5 million a year on our own.

**Dowell:** The Provost and I have had communications on this before. There is substantial activity with China now, without DKU, mostly at the graduate level, mostly on research. At the moment I have three people from China, a faculty member on sabbatical and two PhD students. And I'm sure I'm not the only one. I asked for a census to find out how many more of these there are, but there is a very substantial research interaction with China now, as well as other countries. DKU, I don't think it's going to impact that much one way or the other. It's not going to hurt, but I don't see it as making it twice as big.

**Kornbluth:** Not to reenact our many conversations (laughter), but I will say this. Earl, you may have Chinese students working with you, but your work is not particularly enriched by a Chinese context. There are many faculty here who work on things that have a dimension in China. It's not just the students interacting, it's the entrée into Chinese society. It's the interactions with what's going on on the ground in China. It's not just the fabulous students. It's not just the faculty we might attract. So we can continue to email for a few weeks on this (laughter), but I think that's where my view lies on this.

**Jokerst:** Let me ask a question. Is there a comment related to this comment? We're going to keep the topic consistent. Who has a comment related to this comment?

**Billy Pizer (Sanford School of Public Policy):** On this topic of research, I thought I would just tell a quick story about myself. Four years ago, I had no research in China. I do environmental policy, largely in the United States. Jeff Vincent asked me to be on the Research Subcommittee of the China Program Committee, or whatever, to think about research in China, and we came up with the idea, not surprisingly, that environment would be a good idea. I didn't have a lot of ambitions for myself but it certainly made sense. A couple of trips to China to try to set up our environment program, and I found a lot of academics in China who were interested in the same topics I was working on in the United States who were interested in collaborating. I don't know how much that extends to other areas, but I would just suggest that for a lot of people who might not have thought about working in China, there is a great opportunity to apply your work, as Sally and Dick were saying, to another context. I would invite you to think about that.

**Jokerst:** Any other comments on that topic?

**Lisa Keister (Sociology):** I have been doing research in China since the late 80s, I'll date myself that way, but one of the biggest challenges, I do work on organizations and company performance and such. One of the biggest challenges of doing research in China is finding a home base. I haven't mentioned this before because this comes up in side conversations but this is a critical thing for those of us doing research there, to have a place where we can not just engage with the students, but also call 'home' when we're over there trying to collect data or do

interviews or otherwise do the research that we're already doing. I'm on the Council and I'm going to vote for this and I hope that everyone else will too, if for no other reason than to give us a home base.

**Jokerst:** Okay, we're going to move to another topic.

**Alex Rosenberg (Philosophy):** The more I think about the academic freedom issues connected with DKU, the more I think it's the right thing for us to do. Not only do we have an opportunity to establish an institution that expresses the values to which we're committed in a country that may or may not need the kind of exemplar that we could produce, but for ourselves and for the importance of faculty governance of this university to have an institution like that about which our faculty is concerned and committed and which provides a test, in a way, for faculty governance at Duke, because in the future we will continue to have to monitor the status of this institution in China. The faculty as a whole can provide the most important constituency for an administration that needs to push back against a chilling environment or otherwise take steps to ensure and protect the kind of values for which we stand in China. These are all opportunities that we would forgo if we didn't have presence there.

**Jokerst:** Other comments on this topic?

**Carlos Rojas (Asian and Middle Eastern Studies):** My comment refers back to both Earl's and Alex's points. We're not creating a Williams College that would be independent of Duke as a research institution. We're creating something that would be an extension of Duke as a research institution. It would be fundamentally integrated with our objectives here. In terms of intellectual freedom, I think that's absolutely correct. If

DKU goes forward or it doesn't go forward, we still have lots of faculty on campus there doing research in China or confronting these issues of intellectual freedom. We have lots of students who are coming from China, lots of our own students are going to China to study. I think having an institutional base that will help to buttress those research and pedagogical ventures, that can only help. Sometime last year or two years ago, I think John French cited the justification that Duke faculty doing research in China need DKU in order for their research. That's not technically true. I do research on China, I have lots of contacts, I could go to China any time I want, I have many affiliations. But having DKU as a base that allows me to network and liaison and sort of bring people together definitely helps to further the work that I'm already doing. In terms of our students, I think that having DKU as a presence there is also very beneficial.

**Prasad Kasibhatla (Nicholas School of the Environment):** I have a clarification question, I guess. I understand that it's a joint venture, the word 'joint' is specified, and I guess that means Duke, Wuhan, and Kunshan, that's what the 'joint' refers to. I understand that there's this cooperative education agreement that governs things. I guess my question is, at a smaller level, individual programs, individual courses, individual research projects, do our other partners have any kind of say in terms of modifying it, vetoing, or anything at all?

**Kornbluth:** No.

**Brodhead:** We've said from the first, they will put up the land, they will put up the buildings, they would put up the bulk of the money, we will put up the criteria for admission, we will put up the criteria for faculty hiring, and we will put up the criteria for the curriculum. Our gift is the academic

side.

**Kornbluth:** We're pretty clear, they cannot veto our academic decisions.

**Pat Wolf (Biomedical Engineering):** Just a short point. There's a \$750,000 budget on campus for Kunshan. So as well as the \$5 million, there's another \$750,000. Sorry I threw that in there. I also have this concern: what happens when the faculty are hired in China that would be under the influence of the Chinese government? Their families, their jobs, and are there protections in place so that faculty governance in China doesn't change everything that we've created? The faculty over there are going to be hired, they're going to be on the ground in China, living there, and they'll be under the influence of the Chinese government. Will we still be able to maintain control? Will we still have faculty governance roles? Will the administration that's hired over there execute our will? I just have those questions and that's all going to happen very quickly as we hire the faculty over there.

**Zhang:** Let me try to answer that. I'm the chair of the DKU Faculty Council. The faculty governance will try to follow what the Duke model is. So we're in the process of revising the policy and that sort of thing. But there are no places where we say, the government will tell us and we're going to do whatever they say, except for the mandatory retirement age. That's the area we have to follow. We don't know what the answer is there. But also, look at all the other places like Peking University and Tsinghua University. They started last year just exactly trying to do what the US academic institutions are doing. They don't have a tenure system. They have sort of a tenure system, but they don't do it. Now they're converting. Even their full professors have to go back and say whether they are equivalent to an associate professor, tenure

level, based on the global calibration scale. So I don't think we're going to go backwards, we're going forwards and we hope other universities are going to follow the faculty governance model instead of the administrative, authoritative type of old system.

**Fang-Fang Yin (Director, Medical Physics Program, DKU):** I'm the Director of Medical Physics Graduate Program at DKU so I have a lot to say about this. I have invested substantial efforts during the last four years into DKU when DKU started and helped to establish the Medical Physics graduate program at DKU. There are a couple questions you asked that I can answer about how the program freedom is. Nobody asked me to propose the MP Program at DKU. I proposed it to the DKU office and they started to review it and they said that it's good. Everything was done here. The way we formulated the curriculum, the staff level, the teaching schedule, admission, everything has followed exactly the same as what I did at Duke. So that is the one. For the program design and operation, such as how we teach it, how we do everything academically, they (DKU) really don't intervene – but try to assist. What they're looking at is how much the program could contribute the society and profession as well as the impact to the Kunshan. So this is something I want to echo the professor of Physics. By doing business at DKU we are not just investing for the next few years, we are investing for the Duke brand around world and for the next 50 years. This is how I and you will see it later. I'll just give you one example in Medical Physics. Before we moved there, the Medical Physics education was very weak in China. Now, after two years of our program running there, I think the whole country knows this Medical Physics education. Some top institutions wanted and planned to mimic similar programs to what we're trying to do.

So I think we already play the roles. Also the local government and professionals felt that we may be able to help their hospitals to do better in terms of imaging, radiation therapy for cancers and others such as education and training. So I think we started seeing the impact our work had generated in the community. In terms of faculty, all the faculty members were basically recruited here, but were offered by DKU. Denis (Simon) would be the person to write the offer letters. Faculty was recruited the same way as we have done here at Duke. I recruited the same faculty quality that I recruited for here. Also, the process of hiring faculty and adjunct faculty follows the same process of that which would be done here at Duke and those faculty will be endorsed by the executive body of Duke medical physics graduate program.

**Kornbluth:** Haiyan (Gao) spent quite a bit of time putting together the principles of Academic Council faculty governance operations, I know Josh (Socular), you were involved in it as well, and William (Johnson). What was interesting is, chairing the board of DKU, the board, even though Duke has the controlling votes, it has folks from Kunshan government and from Wuhan, it's been interesting. We've educated them about what true faculty governance means, but we've never gotten this pushback of, oh, we don't want that there. Honestly, we talk a lot, and we don't have to go through it in this meeting, about lines in the sand. This is another one. We're setting up a faculty governance process that we stand by as Duke University and that's how we want to operate DKU. They may argue with us, but that's one of the bedrock principles in establishing that university.

**Jokerst:** Any more questions on this topic?  
New topic?

**Garnett Kelsoe (Immunology):** I would first like to congratulate Professor Dowell as being the only negative voice, and yet he's held this discussion up for almost four years and that's a remarkable feat (laughter). Essentially, we're in the situation of a group of investors that would like to establish and pay for, partially, an evolutionary biology institute at Bob Jones University. You guys can look this up later (laughter). We're welcomed, people like us, and even people say, gosh, you know, it would be great to learn about this theory of evolution that lasts longer than seven days, and we want you, but in fact, we have no leverage whatsoever after we build the institution, we can withdraw, we can say we don't like it, we can complain, but the only leverage that we have is to leave. And at some point, it gets so expensive to leave, that it becomes a harder and harder decision to make. I personally don't know whether this is going to be a wise investment and be a great thing in the future of Duke, or it's not going to be. I just have no idea. I think we need to understand and admit that we really, honestly, regardless of what contracts we have with the government, should the government change its mind, it will. And we have no leverage whatsoever, except to leave.

**Kornbluth:** There's physically leaving, and there's taking our name off the enterprise. That's the first thing. The second thing is, they're investing in this because they want a top-flight university there. They don't know how to run a university. Our leverage is the intelligence, the know-how, et cetera. So you're right, we can't look in a crystal ball and know. There is an element of risk and we're making a bet. We have to look at what the possible huge benefits are. I know what you're saying, but I do think that it's a matter of maintaining our values and principles and being true to them, and trying to do something important.

**Kelsoe:** May I respond to that? I just returned from Berlin. I did a post doc in Germany with a very distinguished immunologist who bounced around from Germany to Harvard and he's back in Germany again. He's from a distinguished family. His father, Boris Rajewsky, ran the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute from 1937 until 1945. Boris and the entire family were White Russians. They lost, so they immigrated to Germany. A distinguished group. Of course, during that time, great institutions of learning in Germany lost brilliant scientists, simply by the whim of the government. There was nothing that the universities could do. They could abhor it. Many of them roundly fought against it, as did Boris Rajewsky, who later became director of the University of Frankfurt. But the point is, we don't have much power. We have hopes. We can look for the best, but we don't have a lot of power.

**Charles Becker (Economics):** I have a fair amount of experience in working with universities in countries that are not entirely democratic. I just came back from Moscow and their economics school. My observation is that the governments don't tend to interfere enormously. That's not a goal. I think this is a very minor work concern, in that what they want is access to technology and access to figure out how we do it so that they can figure out eventually how to do it even better. The impact of our ideas on their society is really minor. You just don't tend to see that. This is not a concern. As an economist, I'll vote for this reluctantly. Because my real reluctance is that we have not really thought about the opportunity cost. Economists like to use that word. We didn't go and explore and say, what were the best possible alternatives? President Brodhead's last comment about not withdrawing from the world is probably what sways me right now, but we could have been in Mexico instead. We don't have an unlimited number

of these things to do. Moving into China comes at a cost. I think there are lessons for the future in making our decisions from this process.

**Brodhead:** If you pardon me again. I not only tolerate, I relish the thoughtfulness of this discussion. After all, everything that you do means you no longer have the ability to make that investment in something else. At the same time, Duke has a medical school in Singapore that has grown very considerable values, including ones we anticipated in advance and ones we absolutely failed to anticipate—for instance, its value as a site of teaching experimentation. That’s where the flipped classroom was pioneered and then brought back to our own medical school and elsewhere. I would say, and I understand there are arguments to be made in different ways, if Duke were to successfully establish a presence in China, to me that would be quite different from establishing a presence in Mexico or some other country, simply because of the place that China is fated to have in the next generation and thus the consequential nature of whether the republics on both sides can be educated to understand each other and move forward.

For me, that’s always been one of the profound hopes of this enterprise. I would just say something else to everybody. When we speak of “the Chinese” and “the Chinese repressiveness” and things of that sort, when I go to China, what I always find surprising is the number of people with fantastic Western educations who don’t think that differently from most people I know. I got an honorary degree from Tsinghua, you may know, my second year at Duke. When I went there, the President of Beijing University insisted as a matter of parity that I had to meet with him. But at the last minute, I got a call saying, you won’t meet with the President, you’re going to meet with the Party Secretary of Beijing

University. I thought, whoa nelly, I don’t meet with Party Secretaries, and the Party Secretary is not the President. Only then did I learn that the Party Secretary is a higher official than the President. When I met this person, full of distrust, and in retrospect, I can say prejudice, he was a person who had three degrees from Stanford and had worked in the United States for eight or nine years after his education. There are lots of people in China hoping for a freer future for China. Just as a person in China can be sitting there saying [about the United States], they’re all a nation of nationalists, they’re all a nation defined by their hostility to the rest of the world—well, some are and some aren’t. It seems to me one of the things we need to do is to try to figure out what bridges can a university specifically build that could be a benefit to us as educators and to everybody as citizens of the world.

**Craig Henriquez (Biomedical Engineering / Former Chair, Academic Council):** As someone who was here at the very beginning of this discussion seven years ago, at that time I sort of raised the point that I will get enthusiastic if I felt that there was a group of faculty that were enthusiastic about DKU. Over that seven years, I think that what we’ve done is we’ve actually engendered enthusiasm, not actually in the places I thought it would be. This was actually a venture that was going to be from the Business School. That’s really where it started. Where the enthusiasm has come is from outside the Business School. It came from places in the Humanities and the School of the Environment and Global Health. So that is very encouraging because that took time. I think that’s really what makes this an interesting opportunity. That said, I also have some concerns and those concerns are also related to something that Mike Merson said last time, which was, the reason why Singapore was successful was that faculty

embedded themselves in Singapore. There was a group of faculty from Duke who left Duke and literally took up shop there. That's where they made their homes, that's where they raised their families. They did it for a significant period of time. What I haven't heard, although it may be true, but beyond the administration, because I know there are faculty who have left here and gone there, how many faculty are moving from Duke to DKU to spend a significant portion of their lives there, to bring the values of Duke, the knowledge of Duke? Because I think, in the end, that is the most important thing that we're bringing to DKU. The idea of creating a university is interesting, and the possibilities for novel innovation in education, but really, in trying to bring Duke over there, faculty have to go over there. I'm curious to know how many faculty are going to pick up shop and move and live in Kunshan and actually impart those values to DKU?

**Kornbluth:** Just one comment on this, and I can't answer the question of how many faculty, but I will say this. When you talk about Duke-NUS, and I think what Mike Merson was talking about was people like Pat Casey, for instance. Or now Tom Coffman. They are administrators. In other words, Pat went over there as the Executive Vice Dean. Tom Coffman has gone over there as Dean. Pat Casey is the Haiyan Gao. You know what I'm saying?

**Henriquez:** There were others, Tony VanDongen, who is a collaborator of mine.

**Kornbluth:** Well, Tony went quite a bit later. Not to speak for Tony and his motivations, he was offered a robust research program and resources. And we have some of that at our disposal too. I will say, what we have seen is the people like Jim Zhang. Or we just hired Junjie Zhang for the environment program. People who will spend significant time at

DKU who have ties to Duke but it's because of the DKU dimension that they really want to be here. Not to put too fine a point on it, but if I were a faculty member thinking of going, I might wait to see how the vote went first (laughter). I think that we will have pillars there and founding fathers and mothers, just as we saw at Duke-NUS. Part of it will be people who have a hand and a role in wanting to shape the programs going forward. Although we have a great curriculum, there are a lot of pieces to fill in. We have interesting research programs, there are a lot of pieces to fill in. So I think it's too early to say that that's not going to happen. I'm very optimistic that it actually will.

**Jim Cox (Law):** I don't know whether to make this as a resolution, or just ask for clarification from Sally. But before I do that, I just want to say, in my long history at Duke, I've never seen a thorough and balanced report come out of the Provost's office on something as controversial as this and I really want to compliment you and the administration that stood behind you. This really was a great step forward. There is a lot of uncertainty there. The sort of "kum ba ya" here today, I appreciate that, and I don't question the genuineness of the whole thing. At the same time, we had a lot of uncertainties going into this in the last discussion. I don't think we've addressed many of those. Those uncertainties went through the ceiling on November 8<sup>th</sup>, at least for me, looking at the world orders, the financial markets, but also the dynamics in politics and the financial markets as well. Going forward with those uncertainties, what I'd like to hear, without a resolution, is clarification of page 43 of that wonderful report you prepared. On page 43, you state that after launch, there will be an external review. I looked through the document for clues, like all good lawyers do, for what

“launch” means. I know what “after” means, and I couldn’t figure out what “launch” meant. But then I speculated, and surmised that this would be later than I think would be appropriate. So what I was going to propose is that, a lot of us would sleep better who care deeply about Duke, if we thought that we would do something like this, and we would have a review. You get to work with ECAC, the people you report to, the people who report to you, and what that means. And we do that not later than, and I chose this wisely, like I try to do a lot of things in my life, 2019-2020. I chose that because that is the third year of the first term of the new President, which would provide him or her with two years of a culturalization of what Duke is all about, what our missions are, and to survey the landscape then, for what’s happening at Duke Durham, as well as what’s happening in Kunshan. So it would be really nice to think that we could have some thoughtful review discussing what that might be, what the input would be. It doesn’t have to be an external review. But it might be somewhere before we have a full-blown external review. You can think about a lot of questions that came up leading up to today. You can also think about any questions after that point, and report back. How do you feel about that? Because I’m perfectly prepared to put that in a resolution, but I don’t like to be confrontational if I don’t have to be.

**Kornbluth:** A couple comments. One is that it depends on what it is you’re reviewing. If you’re actually talking about what I was referring to as a review of the academic programs, the undergraduate programs, 2019-2020 is too soon, particularly as, at the very best, we’re going to launch in 2018.

**Brodhead:** It may well be 2019.

**Kornbluth:** It may well be 2019. So if you’re talking about reviewing the programs and

having an external review the way we do with Master’s programs here, or departments here, I think you need to give it a few years. That’s the first thing. But let me just say, in terms of reviewing the progress we say we’re making, i.e. we’re going to start hiring faculty, we have to think about recruiting students, we have to think about fleshing out the programs, I think it is very important that we keep an incredibly close tab on that. So, if you or the faculty want that formalized in some way, I’m all for it. Honestly, we’ve been talking about this with our partners in Kunshan, they call it KPIs, I would call it milestones. Duke-NUS has been very serious about those kind of milestones before they ever had a student walk in the door. I don’t have any problem with that. I don’t think you can review an educational program before you have a year or two of operation.

**Cox:** I think you put your finger on exactly what I was asking for. Just like your report makes and you made in your oral presentation, trajectory becomes important in trying to figure out where you’re going. That’s good management. To the extent that we have a stewardship function here for some governance function like that, I think being informed of the trajectory would be a good idea. If you’re willing to do that, I think everybody here would celebrate that. It could be a five-minute presentation, a ten-minute presentation, but just keep us in the loop so we know what’s happening and what’s the trajectory.

**Kornbluth:** Absolutely.

**Cox:** I think it also lays the foundation for the new President to be able to be engaged in the program, and if we have this understanding with the trustees, it doesn’t create any political problems, should there be anything that occurs in the interim. I’m trying to be discrete there, but at the same time I think

you understand the message I'm saying.

**Kornbluth:** Absolutely. And I'll say this. As positive as we're feeling like this is a great venture, none of us want to delude ourselves. If things are going south, we want to know it so we can make corrections, et cetera. So I'm all for that kind of continuing to sort of hold our feet to the fire, and we will, in terms of making sure things are moving forward in the way that we put forward to you. I think that's the right thing to do. I don't have any problem with that at all.

**Cox:** Thank you.

**Erika Weinthal (Nicholas School of the Environment):** I'll just address your point too, just in relation to the environment program. Those are the issues that we took into account in designing the program to have a number of accountability checks along the way. In doing that, we created a management committee that I sit on, Billy Pizer sits on, the director of DKU, but also staff from the Nicholas School and DKU, so that we constantly check in. Also, all the programs have to be certified by SACS. So there are a lot of different ways that we are staying on top of the progress moving forward. I would also hope, with the liberal arts curriculum, because there is a huge environment component, that we'll also find ways to have to interact with the undergrad program in the area of environment. Also, again, to build in different milestones and oversight mechanisms to ensure the quality of the program at Duke Kunshan as well as at Duke.

**Josh Sosin (Classical Studies / Member of ECAC):** I'll admit that the very first time I saw any details on this I was skeptical, and that skepticism remained over a period of years, owing to my sitting on a number of different committees that saw different aspects of this

over time, such that I was able to see it evolve. One result of that is I now feel as confident as I think a person can be about the virtues of this. I wanted to cycle back to one thing that a number of concerns in a number of areas shared in common, and that was how one's comfort in thinking about short term considerations diminishes when you think about medium term and long term considerations. It goes without saying that, at some point, and over a long time, careful attention has to be given to what the fail scenario looks like. What the varieties of withdrawal look like and how we control that to the best possible advantage. We really have to do that about everything, including things that we build here. But I wanted to call attention to two medium and longer term considerations that aren't concerns or risks but opportunities and things that we would do well to be thinking about and talking about and preparing for now. One of them has come up in a number of ways, concerning governance and oversight and how we're going to manage all of this. This all brings with it a really significant burden on voluntary faculty service. There are a lot of people who are going to undertake this willingly and there has been talk of remuneration for some of those tasks, and this is great. I just wanted to observe that it's pretty rare that this room is this full. We have a hard time recruiting people to do the work at our own local institution and it is a certainty that we will syphon off some of them, and maybe even some of the best talent to serve this other enterprise. This support here comes with the added responsibility of stepping up in local service obligations here at home as well as looking abroad to this venture. The other thing I wanted to mention, and I'll try to be brief, because I see Nan looking at me, is that we've spoken in a number of ways about what each party is bringing to the table. In some ways, the relationship is asymmetrical. But I think we,

bringing the experience with building and stewarding a curriculum like this, our partners, bringing cash (laughter) and a number of other virtues as well. But all relationships change over time and we want that relationship to change over time. So one of the things that I think we have to be very thoughtful about how we're going to manage, is getting to a place where the answer isn't just, well, we have the veto vote. Because as Tom began today by observing curricula change, and even if the basic governance and oversight structures remain fairly stable, it's all those little details on the ground with how courses are taught and scheduled and people working with each other where the possibility of real beauty or real mess exists. So I think it would be a real opportunity for us to think about how to manage these really tricky things because the disaster scenarios, we have to do anyway. But these are new and challenging in ways that might actually be productive for us back at home.

**Jokerst:** Thank you. This has been a productive discussion. I was looking at my timer here and we are going to move on to a vote in a couple of minutes. So Sally has asked to give some very brief comments.

**Kornbluth:** What Dick said and what others have said, regardless of how this turns out, I really have to appreciate the great conversation we have had on this, both here, and honestly, over the last two years. I think, for me, I learned a lot about faculty governance jumping into this topic at the deep end, and I've come to really believe that it's the right thing for Duke to do, but I also realize that, however the vote goes, even if it's favorable, it is not unanimous. If there are people here who are still against it, what I hope is that, ten years or twenty years down the line, people who were in favor of it will feel really proud that they made that vote and be engaged, and the people who were against

it may have mellowed their views. Or they may think, well I still don't think it's a great idea, but it hasn't been a disaster. What I'm really hoping is, you'll look down the line and think that this was really the right thing for Duke to have done. I really just want to thank everyone again for being willing to engage in this conversation over many months. So thank you.

**Jokerst:** To reflect back on that, you've been very transparent, you've shared a great deal of information with us, and you fed back our comments into the proposal. So that has honored us.

#### ***VOTE ON THE PROPOSED DKU UNDERGRADUATE RESOLUTION***

**Jokerst:** So, we're going to move on. Elected Council members, you should have received a ballot as you entered the room. If you do not have one of the yellow ballots, please come down and see Sandra and she will give you a ballot after checking your name off of the elected Council roster.

I now ask that you cast your vote by checking the box of your choice on your ballot. After voting, please pass your ballots to the end of the row and our colleagues Josh Socolar, from Physics, and Cam Harvey, from the Fuqua School, will collect and tabulate the votes. I will announce the result by 5:00.

Council members, has everyone voted?

This has been a very good discussion that has taken a number of years, but I think we should be proud of Duke and the fact that we have been able to engage in this faculty governance process with the administration. We won't be having our faculty governance conversation today, we enacted it. Before we get the vote result, I would like to offer some thoughts about our community and our

relationships to one another against the backdrop of the changes in our nation.

As Chair of our Council, one of my primary aims has been to engage you fully in discussions that impact our collective Duke future. To accomplish this, my aim has always been to introduce topics and then get out of the way so that we hear your opinions and so we can listen to one another.

The events of the past months, though, compel me to speak to you today of the importance of our commitment to each other, and to community at Duke. As the tone and content of our national discourse has changed over the past months, and our country is seemingly deeply divided, it is reassuring to me that we are able to find meaning and purpose in our work and in our relationships with colleagues, students, staff, the administration, and the trustees. These past weeks have driven a need for us to emphasize and underscore our core values: to respect myriad points of view and to value the contributions of every person on this campus.

As we move forward with what may be challenging days of change and uncertainty, we would be wise to deepen the foundation of our shared collegiality and community so that we will be able to personally and, as a community, find ways to thrive. I encourage you to be there for each other, in ways little and large, as we traverse this path together.

As Desmond Tutu said, “Do your little bit of good where you are; it’s those little bits of good put together that overwhelm the world.”

And now, we will not have our faculty governance discussion (laughter). So hang loose, and we will get the results of the vote in a few minutes.

## ***RESULTS OF THE VOTE ON THE DKU UNDERGRADUATE RESOLUTION***

**Jokerst:** We have the results of the vote. The results of the DKU vote are: Yes: 57, No: 18. The resolution has passed (applause).

Thank you – this concludes today’s meeting. We meet next on December 1st – I hope you have a wonderful Thanksgiving holiday.