

Minutes of the Meeting of the Academic Council
Thursday, November 29, 2018

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

Alright, everyone, I've been accused of wearing a UNC tie. I decided I needed to join in the lament that is necessary if you went to UNC three times, regarding what happened in the game last night.
[laughter]

DISCUSSION BY PRESIDENT VINCE PRICE OF THE PROPOSED LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT PROJECT

Taylor: Welcome, everyone. I hope you had a nice Thanksgiving. A special welcome to Jack Bovender, the Chair of Duke's Board of Trustees. We're going to hear from him later today, and we have a slight revision to the agenda. We're going to address the light rail issue, or President Price is. One thing, just in framing that, ECAC, since I've been Chair, we've been talking about this project with both Vince and with Tallman [Trask, Executive Vice Provost]. Committees with faculty have been talking about this for 15 years in different versions. So, it's been a long discussion. Yesterday, ECAC spent 45 minutes with Tallman talking about nothing but this. So there have been some faculty voices involved. I just wanted you all to know that.

Vince Price (President): Good afternoon. You may have heard or seen information recently in the newspapers

or on the Internet about Duke and the proposed Durham-Orange light rail transit project. I'm not going to go through the very long history of that project, as we have a limited amount of time here today, but Don asked me if I would talk to you just a bit, to give you a high-level update of where things stand at this point in time, and what is still an ongoing discussion about concerns that Duke has raised consistently and clearly since 1998. So, what are those concerns? First, as you may know, the proposed route runs down the middle of Erwin Road. That presents quite a number of serious problems, starting with ambulance access to our emergency department, noise and vibration problems for the Eye Center and other facilities along that route, security precautions for our vaccine research building, and protecting the single line that supplies all the electricity to Duke Health and to our campus. The at-grade crossing at the intersection of Erwin Road and 751, which is already one of the busiest intersections in the region. First, our concerns have to do with that route and the impact of that route. Second, the proposed construction schedule would close off Trent Drive for, potentially, weeks at a time over a period of years. That would have a major impact on the ability of our patients and staff to get to Duke. And it could be, frankly, disastrous for public health and the Health System

and the University's finances. Third, we object, as do many others, to the plan that was announced just last month, to close Blackwell Street in downtown Durham. This would cut off access to American Tobacco Campus, to DPAC and a large part of downtown in which Duke has invested, along with others, hundreds of millions of dollars to rejuvenate this area for the benefit of the community. The city, the county, and GoTriangle, have asked that Duke voluntarily contribute about 100 acres of land and rights of way to this project. The value of that land may be in the neighborhood of \$20 million. We've been asked to relocate our bus maintenance facility on Buchanan Boulevard across from the Smith Warehouse, incurring costs of about \$10 million. And we've also been asked to make an unspecified cash contribution to help close what is projected to be about a \$100 million gap in private fundraising between the project cost and the expected funding from federal, state, and local governments. So where are we now? I will tell you that I personally spent a number of hours talking with representatives of the city, and county officials about this project, and my senior team, principally Tallman, along with Gene Washington [Chancellor for Health Affairs, Duke University / President and CEO, DUHS] and Mike Schoenfeld [Vice President, Public Affairs and Government Relations] and Stelfanie Williams [Vice President, Durham Affairs], and before her Phail Wynn [Former Vice President, Durham Affairs], and many others have devoted considerably more time to this project. Those meetings continue. I have asked Tallman to take the lead in working with GoTriangle to address these very serious issues that we have raised to see if we can come up with some kind of a mutually-agreeable solution. I want to be very

clear, as have my predecessors, and as I've stated to the mayor and to the chair of the county commissioners: Duke is vitally interested in a transit solution that will help our region and we want to be partners with the public and with the private sectors to produce a comprehensive transit solution. So, if the issues that have been raised and consistently identified over the last 20 years, if those issues can actually be resolved to our mutual satisfaction, we will be an enthusiastic advocate for the light rail project. With that, I will open the floor to questions or comments.

Steffen Bass (Physics): Is there a viable alternative that you can put forward to remedy the proposed problems to the route?

Price: We have, over the years, proposed what we believe are viable alternatives. GoTriangle has chosen this route, not at our recommendation or suggestion, but at their recommendation. As I said, in part to avoid the kinds of issues that I've described.

Sarah Deutsch (History): Are our alternative route suggestions available for us to see?

Price: At this juncture, we're primarily focused on addressing these concerns with the current route. I can defer to Tallman and others for the history and events that led to this point. Over the years, there has been a back and forth of alternatives, either proposed by us or by GoTriangle that have iterated to this point. I would hesitate to throw out these things and relive those 20 years.

Sina Farsiu (Biomedical Engineering): Is there any concern about these long-

term, very expensive projects that often, in other states and other cases, have lasted much longer and much higher costs have been associated to them, and they have become too big to fail? Would our investment in the project increase if there are overbudgeting issues?

Price: Well, rather than get into those broader issues in this forum, I would just encourage all of you to learn as much as you can about the proposed project and its cost. It has grown over time, already, before its arrival at this point over those 20 years. Other people have raised similar concerns. These are concerns that are not uncommon in public works projects. But I'd rather not go into those concerns at this juncture.

Volker Blum (Mechanical Engineering): What about the benefits to Duke? The system as it looks could serve a lot of our locations: Downtown, East Campus, West Campus, and UNC.

Price: There are likely benefits to Duke. This is why we advocate a transit solution to the region. I think there are differing views about the scale of those benefits as weighed against the costs of the project, generally and specifically with reference to Duke. But no doubt, there is a need for improved transit in this region. There would be benefits of having an improved transit system.

Harvey Cohen (Clinical Sciences): You mentioned some of the potential problems around Erwin Road and Trent Drive. I thought what I saw in the paper recently that they're talking about the Erwin Road part being elevated. Is that correct? Because one of the big issues is the huge amount of foot and other traffic back and forth across Erwin Road to the

VA, the hospital, et cetera. It seems like this is going to be a potential problem.

Price: So, there is a proposal, not just along Erwin Road, but on various stretches of this rail project to elevate the rail, oftentimes to reduce surface level traffic and pedestrian issues. Of course, elevating a rail introduces other kinds of challenges: pylons in the middle of the roadway, et cetera. But yes, there is a stretch along Erwin Road that is proposed to be elevated. Again, I would just encourage all of you to learn as much as you can about this project. It has a significant history behind it. But just understand, we would not be raising these issues if they were not very serious concerns, not just for Duke and Duke Health, but for the entire region. We are the only level one trauma center in Durham and as a matter of public safety, we feel it's our obligation to raise these concerns.

NON-APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 15 MEETING MINUTES

Taylor: I forgot to say that we are not approving the minutes from the last meeting, because it was only two weeks ago and because of Thanksgiving, the transcription isn't ready. So in January we will do the very exciting thing of approving two sets of minutes. Something to look forward to and bring you back.
[laughter]

IMPROVING CLIMATE & BUILDING COMMUNITY: FOLLOW-UP PLAN TO THE 2018 INTERNAL SURVEY

Taylor: Next, we're going to hear from Abbas Benmamoun, Duke's Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement. He's going to talk with us about the next steps

following Duke's internal assessment on climate and culture for faculty, staff and graduate students that he's going to be leading with Ann Brown, Vice Dean for Faculty in the School of Medicine.

Abbas Benmamoun (Vice Provost, Faculty Advancement): Good afternoon, everyone. I just want to brief you very quickly, I know that we are short on time here and I was told to keep it brief. So to brief you on the survey that we did, and more importantly, on the next steps, and things that we are doing and will be doing and invite your feedback. So as you know, we did the survey last summer. There were two questions. One question was: in the last five years, have you experienced harassment or made to feel uncomfortable here at Duke? And who was the responsible party? And the second question was: what action did you take? People were given a menu of options: going to various places here at Duke, talking to a partner, talking to a colleague, friend, and things like that. So those were the two questions on the survey. They were given to every faculty here at Duke on the University side, School of Medicine and School of Nursing. Faculty, graduate students, staff in academic units, and post docs. Participation rate was around 38%. We'll have an opportunity to talk about those results later with the academic units. Just a quick summary here. So when you look at the results, the most common types experienced, and this is not unusual, you will see the same things if you look at reports from other universities, National Academies reports, recent study, you'll find that gender, sexual orientation, and in this case, age discrimination or harassment or people made to feel uncomfortable were the most common types of incidents that made people feel

harassed. Faculty, all of us here, faculty were most commonly indicated as the responsible party across entities. This is talking about staff and students. So we have a lot of work to do as faculty here. The other thing that is also worrying, that should be worrying to all of us, is that there is a high level of inaction by those who were offended. In other words, many of them did not avail themselves of the resources available here at Duke and avenues available here at Duke. Most people talked with colleagues or with friends, partners, family members. But they did not pursue various avenues to address the concern with the chair, or the dean, or with OIE or other places here on campus. So this is something that we need to look at. So I'm going to talk here about the university side. This is a team effort with my office, the Office for Faculty Advancement, Ann Brown's office in the School of Medicine, and Brigit Carter's [Associate Dean for Diversity and Inclusion] office in the School of Nursing. We will be partnering with all the relevant entities here at Duke: OIE, HR, deans' offices, various places, Student Affairs, and all the others. On our side of the action here, on the University side, Sherilynn Black [Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement] here in my office will be working with us as a member of the team and we are in the process of finalizing the appointment of a faculty member who will join our office to partner with us and lead this effort with us. The dynamics we will be looking at are three: we are looking at dynamics involving faculty: faculty-student, faculty-staff, and faculty-faculty, faculty-faculty chairs and things like that. Student dynamics as well: student-staff, student-faculty, and staff dynamics as well. This is why we are going to partner with HR on this to address the staff side of the issues

that have been uncovered. The other partners that will be working with us are Ada Gregory [Student Ombuds] and Tom Metzloff [Faculty Ombuds]. We already have a working relationship with them. Ada has done a lot of work in particular in bystander training, which will be an important component of the work that we will be doing with academic units here with faculty, staff, and students. We have a representative, of course, from the Office of Institutional Equity. They have hired a new Title IX Coordinator, who should be in place very soon. So we'll be partnering with them and we'll be partnering with other offices here. We will be asking schools for faculty representatives, liaisons with our office so that it is a partnership. We are in the process of launching a search for a project manager who will coordinate this effort for us, because this is going to be a long-term effort. It has to be a long-term effort because a significant part of it is a culture change and those things take time. But we have to keep at it. It's very important that we do that. So some of the next steps, and here, we would really welcome your input, are ideas, and there is a lot of intellectual power here at Duke. So we invite your input in these things. We'll be doing some meetings with deans, directors, chairs, program leaders. We will look at the survey results and will work with them on the next steps at the leadership level. We will also be doing listening sessions, focus groups with faculty, students and staff. It will follow like a tenure review model. We'll have group meetings but also will be open to meeting with individuals as well, for people who would probably feel more comfortable talking with one of us or a group of us from our team. So we'll make those opportunities available. It will be a lot of work, but we want every voice to be

heard on this. We'll be doing some workshops for key department, program, and school leaders to raise awareness and education about the issues that we have uncovered, problem solving, how to solve those problems, both in terms of policy, guidelines, resources, structures that we need to put in place, practices on how to treat each other and how to treat the people who work with us and depend on us, particularly students, and resources that we need to put in place, both at the university level, school level, and department level. We'll be doing some workshops, and some of you have been to some of our workshops, where we have used scenarios, real stories, real cases, so people know that this is real. So that people don't think that this doesn't happen here, or that Duke is different from other places. We are doing workshops for faculty, staff, and students. Again, it could be awareness, problem solving, and resources. We will also be looking at policies, bylaws, things like that. Those are important things. Practices within units, standards, professional standards, and things like that, and resources that are available within the units. And we will be developing a toolkit for units to address harassment, discrimination, and basically to promote respectful climates within our programs. As I said, these are our ideas, we welcome your input on them. There is plenty you can add here. And if anybody wants to help or participate, we will welcome that as well. I just want to share something with you that is very important. We are going to do a lot of things to follow up on the survey, but as many of you know, we have already been doing some of these programs and workshops. Some of you have come to some of them that our office has been doing, that Ann Brown's office has been

doing, and the School of Nursing has been doing. Just to give you a brief idea, and you can consult on the website for the details. All those programs are on our website. We have a series that we launched in August, a brand new series here for academic leaders at Duke. We call it Leading an Academic Unit at Duke. That has workshops, and one workshop we did recently was on how to deal with problems in your units. We will be doing another workshop in the spring using case studies and scenarios. We are partnered with OIE, we are partnered with HR, with others who have expertise in this area. We have developed some best practices. The workshop during the retreat for Trinity in August was specifically on these issues. So we are available to come to units and do this because we know how to do this. We keep improving how we do it and we welcome your input on that. We also launched a new series for faculty called Faculty Advancement and Success Series. Part of this is going to be how to prepare yourself for promotion and tenure, navigating opportunities here at Duke, avail yourself of Duke's opportunities, but also how to address issues of climate and things like that. We are getting more traction on our communication with units. For example, the next workshop, we have a large number of faculty who have registered for it, but we welcome more people to come to these workshops. We ask some faculty to lead these workshops because we really want this to be a peer-to-peer discussion. So if you are interested, let us know. Last spring, we did workshops for directors for undergraduate studies and directors for graduate studies on climate issues. On how to support students, how to help students with difficult problems, how to advise faculty on those things. We are going to do the same thing this year.

We already scheduled workshops in the spring for directors for undergraduate studies and directors for graduate studies in partnership with Gary Bennett's [Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education] office, Arlie Petters [Dean of Academic Affairs, Trinity College], and also with the Graduate School. We did workshops for search committees, best practices for search committees. Part of those workshops that we have done, some of the content included also how to create a welcoming environment for candidates when they come here to Duke and how we can promote a welcoming environment for our faculty when they join us. School of Medicine is doing similar things. Actually, we are collaborating with them on many of their activities. And Ann Brown is in the process of putting together a task force to respond to the surveys. And Brigit Carter in the School of Nursing is doing a similar thing. Some of the activities that we will be doing will be collaborative, will be working together on them. Some of them will be more tailored to specific academic units, to programs, for example. If you work in a lab, focused training for those faculty, for those students, for those staff, for others. So there are things we can do collaboratively and there are things that are more targeted. So, if you have any questions, as I said, we are in the planning stage here. We welcome ideas and your input. You can send them to me, to Sherilynn, if you're in the School of Medicine, Ann Brown and her office, and if it's School of Nursing, Brigit Carter. I'm happy to take your questions.

Roxanne Springer (Physics): I appreciate that climate change takes a long time and it's going to be a slow process, but I want us all to recognize that in the meantime, people are hurting and

suffering, and we are losing students and faculty because of the situation they're in. One thing that I think is missing here is consequences. I know I see things more black and white than some other people, but let's recall that if I were the coach of a sports team, and members of that sports team who are privileged to play the game - it's a privilege, not a right - and if they violate my policies, drinking, bad behavior, breaking things, you bench somebody, and the rest of the team behaves perfectly well for the rest of the semester. Then a new crop of students come in and you have to do it again. Where does that kind of philosophy - are you willing to engage in that kind of philosophy, and if so, what are your plans for implementing it?

Benmamoun: Absolutely. And part of this is that our work with the academic units, with the schools and departments and centers, is about raising awareness, looking at the resources, and the policies and guidelines in place, and what needs to be put in place. But also, accountability. Remember at the last Academic Council meeting, Ann Brown talked about what they do in the School of Medicine, what accountability measures they have in place there. Those are options that we can consider. But there may be others, and we welcome suggestions on that. If we put some mechanisms in place. I'm not talking here about going up to OIE and things that violate some federal or state law and therefore it will require an investigation before you get to that point of putting in place some accountability actions. But other things, for example, how we hold each other accountable. There are various things that we can explore in terms of privileges within the units, in terms of pay, even employment action, depending on the severity of the act. So we will be

discussing these things, talking about them, seeing what our peers are doing. You're absolutely right, Roxanne. This cannot work if they don't have teeth, if they don't have some accountability, to back up the education and incentives to improve the climate within the units. I agree with you. That will be part of the discussion.

Taylor: And that's going to come to us, right? So we're going to get a chance to speak to that. To be very practical about what the consequences look like.

Benmamoun: Right.

Jennifer West (Biomedical

Engineering): I think we need to hurry with this. I'm an associate dean in Pratt. I deal with graduate education. We currently have a female student who is considering dropping out over a sexual harassment issue. This was reported through Conduct@Duke. There have been no consequences. This student feels like the institution is letting her down. So we can talk about it for years to come, but we've got students at risk today. We've got faculty choosing to leave today. This needs to hurry.

Benmamoun: Definitely. When I say it's a long-term thing, I didn't mean to say we need to take our time to deal with them. What I meant is that we need to stay with this. Because whatever we put in place, it has to be sustained over the long term. It's just because of the turnover in students, undergraduate students change every four years, graduate students change, we bring in junior faculty every year, so these are efforts that need to be sustained. They have to be part of the ecosystem that we have here at Duke. There is no question that when issues

come to our attention, we need to adequately address them. As I told you, as you saw, for example, from the results, and you'll see more of that in detail, is that a lot of people – and you see the same thing in the recent excellent National Academies Study, which I urge everybody to look at, because it has some excellent recommendations, with solid research behind it. That's one issue, when people do not follow up, do not complain, or if they follow up, there are issues. Part of it is the power asymmetries, people worried about their careers, and all those things. That we have confidence in the system. So these are things that we need to address, no question. Absolutely.

Taylor: And ECAC, we've told Abbas and everyone, we're prepared to expedite it. I don't know what it looks like, but we're serious about this.

Benmamoun: Absolutely. And I can tell you, we are very serious about this. This is very important. It is both on the human level, individual level, it should be unacceptable to all of us. For anybody to feel harassed or demeaned in any way. Or their career threatened in any way. The other thing is what I saw in the National Academies Report. It is not good for the institution, for research, when you drive people away, you drive talent away. It's not good for us. It's not good for the country. This is an urgent matter for us to address. We are all partners in this. As you saw, faculty really have a responsibility in this. All of us have a responsibility. In this room and across campus, we all have a responsibility to participate, call people out, call each other out when people misbehave. So I agree with you on that.

Nan Jokerst (Electrical and Computer Engineering): Abbas, thank you for all of the effort that you're taking on in this area because we all know this is tremendously important. I want to talk a little bit about the definition of harassment at Duke. Don knows about this because I've sent both of you a little study. In the Diversity Task Force of the Academic Council in 2015, one of the recommendations was to look at Duke's definition of harassment. And our definition is at a level such that – and I quote our harassment policy: “interferes significantly with an individual's work or education, or adversely affects an individual's living conditions.” Many of our peers have an additional clause that indicates, “or, creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive educational environment.” So the hostile environment standard is not one that Duke uses right now, and in the 2015 Diversity Task Force report, we recommended that Duke reflect upon our policy and really step up to lead and step up to the policy that our peers have. So my understanding at that time was that Duke would be looking at this policy, but we still haven't changed it. So you had said that you would be looking at unit-level policies, but I think it's really important for Duke to look at our basic definition of harassment. Could you comment on that?

Benmamoun: Certainly. Thank you, Nan, for that, and for your work on this. Because I know you went and looked at peer institutions and the document that you sent me, as soon as I got it, I shared it with Howie [Kallem, Title IX Coordinator]. Howie can address the question of what they are doing at their end to revise the policy, because I think that they are working on that. Howie, would you like to weigh in?

Howie Kallem (Assistant Vice President, Office for Institutional Equity / Title IX Coordinator): I'm the current Title IX Coordinator in the Office for Institutional Equity, as was mentioned before. They hired my replacement already. I'm retiring at the end of December. I can't wait. [laughter] But, to answer your question, and Abbas did share with me that paper. Two things: first, the way that the courts have applied, and other schools have applied their definitions, when it says, "sexual harassment is conduct that unreasonably interferes with academic or work experience or creates an intimidating or hostile work environment or academic environment," they are really two sides of the same coin. A hostile environment is created by conduct that unreasonably interferes with academic or work experience. That is, in fact, the definition of a hostile environment. We use the definition, we don't use the term "hostile environment." We recognize that that can cause some confusion. So over the last couple of years, there was a task force that consisted of faculty, staff, and students from across the university and across the health system. We took apart the current discrimination and harassment policies that Duke has and started all over again and came up with a consolidated policy that addresses both discrimination and harassment of all sorts, not just sexual harassment, but based on gender, disability, race, national origin, sexual orientation, and all that, and came up with a consolidated policy that does include the term "hostile environment" to make it clear that that's what we're after when we are looking at conduct that might be serious enough to be a policy violation. That review, that draft, was shopped around to a number of stakeholders across the university and

the health system. We were able to incorporate all the comments and concerns that were received, including meeting with ECAC. The policy is in limbo, as far as I know, for now. The work was completed on it, as I said, several months ago, so it really does represent a fundamental change in a number of the ways we approach these issues, including the definition. So we are anxious to see that new policy move forward. I understand that one of the holdups may be that it hasn't yet come before Academic Council, and we are very eager to discuss it with the Council and answer any questions you might have.

Benmamoun: What we'll do is we'll look at what Howie has been doing. We'll look at also the documents that he sent us, the language that our peers have. We have also the Project IX consultants who will give us a report about our policy and our structures. So all these things will be taken into account and we will share with ECAC and others and invite input. We need to move quickly on this and we will.

Taylor: We have been talking about this, but as Abbas said, there was a consultant who looked broadly at Duke's policies and there was a lengthy report and it's being digested. So spring is going to be a busy time for us here.

Benmamoun: And just quickly to add, last year somebody brought to my attention concern about the language about time limitations when people can report and things like that. We worked with OIE on changing that language and that has been changed as far as I know.

Jokerst: I appreciate it because, I can assure you, that the definition difference, we lag our peers and people know we lag

our peers, and for example, I've been harassed but I didn't let it interfere with my work. But there was certainly a hostile environment. So the words matter, and I encourage Duke to really do the right thing with this definition of harassment.

Benmamoun: We'll take a look at it. Definitely. Our task force will look at it and get input also from the Project IX people.

Cohen: I don't understand this. Where is the policy? I heard there is a policy that has been revised, language has been changed, and it's in limbo. So where is limbo? And how do we get out of it?

Taylor: We have a policy, but there has been an outside consultant that has delivered a set of recommendations to the President and the Provost.

Sally Kornbluth (Provost): We have not received Project IX's report, just for clarity's sake.

Cohen: Limbo's not in your office?
[laughter]

Kornbluth: Basically, there was a draft of the policy. One of the big concerns I had, and I know that some folks in ECAC had, was, sort of as the policy draws to a conclusion, it talks about where things should be reported, et cetera, and lays things out. At least to my mind, it's still very confusing. Part of the thing in rolling out a policy, I want it to be very clear where somebody should go, and there should be a single point of contact. The Project IX people were looking at this in some detail and so hopefully it will be an interval in which we'll get a report, we can edit, we can share with the authors of it, we can put it into shape that takes that

into account. What we don't want is multiple, muddied iterations. Jennifer just said a complaint went to Conduct@Duke. I don't even know what that is.

West: For students, that's given as the one site we're supposed to report everything to.

Kornbluth: So I think that I would like some crispness around this for the faculty, but also for staff and students and also we need obviously sort of feedback, follow-up metrics. In other words, something has been received, here's where it is in the process, here's when you can expect an output, et cetera. I know that's not strictly what Nan is referring to in terms of defining harassment, but honestly, I don't want to have a document rolled out without the teeth and structure attached to it that we all agree on. So hopefully we're going to get good, solid external recommendations. We can have a final discussion of this, and then it will certainly come to Academic Council for discussion. As for this particular case, I'm going to follow up with you, Jennifer, offline.

West: I think it actually ties in to Nan's issue, because the dean from Student Affairs who met with these students basically said it was a hostile environment.

Kornbluth: I get it. Can I just say one other thing? With students and faculty, I think part of the issue we've had with our processes is just what you said. It doesn't rise to a certain level. We need to have a clear process. You go to a single portal, there's going to be some kind of triage, and if it doesn't rise to a legal definition of harassment or violation of law, there still

needs to be a process with potential consequences. That was part of the conversation we had with Ann Brown last time about Professionalism Council or whatever you want to call it. I think we have to continue to have that conversation on the campus side, figure out what it's going to look like. Now, in this case, it would be presumably the faculty member who harassed the student who would be brought to whatever this council was. It may not be illegal, but it may certainly be not what we want here in terms of the environment and the culture.

Taylor: We need to move on. This is super important and we're not going to fix it in five more minutes and we're going to be talking about this a lot in the spring. I will say, if I had to summarize ECAC's last twelve months and the discussion of this, is that we need more clarity in defining what legal harassment is and consequences and lots more clarity in what we do when something doesn't rise to being illegal but it's not what we want to be, ourselves. So we have to deal with both of those.

GRADUATE STUDENTS ADDRESS THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL REGARDING WHAT CONSTITUTES A LIVING WAGE AT DUKE FOR PHD STUDENTS

Taylor: Gosh, you guys have had quite an introduction to what faculty meetings are. [speaking to graduate students] [laughter] So we're going to start a conversation that is going to continue into the spring semester and really, we're going to talk about the future of PhD education at Duke, which is us reproducing ourselves. So this is super important stuff. Today we're going to hear from some of our PhD students and

we're going to focus on stipends. The issue is huge. There are so many issues. The first thing I want to say is to thank Paula McClain, Dean of the Graduate School. Her Board of the Graduate School is here today and because of the hurricane, the date was moved to today, so it was put opposite of this, so she's pulled away from that. So thank you, Paula, for coming here. I realize that we crowded your already very busy day. Paula has been pounding the pavement raising money for PhD education, and that's a super important thing. They've been having some success and we're glad for that. So thank you. We're also, in the spring semester, going to hear from Ed Balleisen and Susan Lozier, who for the last year have been working with a committee of faculty looking very broadly at PhD education at Duke. There is a report that was presented to the Academic Programs Committee I believe in about the middle of November, and the process will be able to flow back to the Provost and the Vice Provosts will be involved and to Paula, who is also a Vice Provost of course, and then we are planning in January at the Academic Council meeting a deep dive of PhD education at Duke that includes finances but includes many other things as well. Today what we're going to do is hear from Travis Dauwalter, he's the President of GPSC. Travis is a PhD candidate in Public Policy. We're also going to hear from Casey Williams. Casey is a PhD candidate in Literature. Travis is going to give us a GPSC big picture perspective. Casey is part of a group that tried to organize a graduate student union last year. As you guys know, that effort was defeated. I've gotten to know Travis and Casey and Claire [Ravenscroft, Duke Graduate Students Union] and others and had an opportunity to spend some time

talking with them, not just about PhD education, but we've looked at the financial statements of Duke together and done exciting things like that. In your agenda, you've got several items and there's a lot of information. We're going to produce more questions than answers today, I promise. So that may be a theme for today's meeting, it looks like. We've got a list from the Graduate School of the types of resources provided in addition to the stipend. We've got a breakdown of PhD students by how many have nine-month versus twelve-month stipends. And then GPSC passed a resolution that called for Duke to go to an increased guaranteed stipend for PhD students and Casey and his colleagues have also proposed a similar proposal that actually has even some more requests for support in the form of moving fees and things of that nature. So ECAC was asked to endorse these proposals and we declined to do so. We have not endorsed either of these proposals. That's because we actually don't think we can only talk about PhD stipends. We need a Big Duke conversation about many other factors that fit into PhD education at Duke. I've told the students – and I've enjoyed meeting them – that I was going to treat them like colleagues and try to be straightforward with them and I've told them this so I'm going to tell you what I've told them. If I put my University Priorities Committee Chair hat on, there is just about no way I can imagine a scenario under which we're going to increase PhD stipends just by central flows of money and have nothing else change about PhD education at Duke. Every single easy decision has been made. There is nothing but hard tradeoffs left. So this is the start of a discussion of hard tradeoffs. But ECAC really felt like we wanted to hear

from some of our students to start the conversation.

Travis Dauwalter (President, Duke Graduate and Professional Student Council): Good afternoon. Thanks a lot for putting us on the agenda. It is nice seeing how the sausage gets made. [laughter] I am going to yield most of my time, but I wanted to make three points. The first one is that the cost of living in Durham is going up. I think we all know this. In the resolution that you saw that is in your materials, one figure that we found was that, over the past five years, the cost of living in Durham has increased 23%. The stipends that PhD students are receiving is increasing at an 8% rate. The second point I wanted to make is that I'm a father. I have a wife and two kids. I chose to come back to school after spending some time in the private sector. And the general consensus amongst folks who are kind of not just themselves in coming to Duke to pursue a PhD is that the stipend is generally not enough. I had to get permission from my wife to share some of these figures with you. But the stipend that I receive is approximately \$2,400 a month, give or take. Dean McClain and the Graduate School are gracious enough to give us a \$550 a month childcare subsidy to offset some of our childcare costs, and then we spend \$910 for that childcare and we spend \$870 to pay for health insurance. My health insurance is covered, but the rest of my family costs me \$870 to pay for the rest of their health insurance. So at the end, and I had to do this on a calculator, there is about \$1,170 left over that we can spend to live. We're in a condition where, having come from the private sector and amassing a bit of savings, we can do this, and it was a choice that we made, and it's a burden that we're willing to take on. But

I wonder, and this is kind of just putting it out into the universe, but I wonder if every other student can say the same who has a family? The last thing I wanted to share with you, my third point, is that we, at GPSC, started up last year something called the Community Pantry. It's this really fabulous program where we stock a pantry. It's almost like a food bank. Students can come in and they can grab food stuffs if they find themselves to be food insecure. We started the program off last year with \$2,000 as a pilot, just to stock some shelves and see if anyone was interested. We put a line item budget at the end of last year for \$10,000, which allowed us to keep a stocked pantry for walk-ins, but also create ten bags per week that people could sign up for online through a Qualtrics survey, and we would shut down the survey once we got our tenth application. We would open the application on Sunday morning and we would close it down by Sunday afternoon. So I went to Dean McClain and I said, we think this is a bigger issue. We let it run through Wednesday and we had 40 applications. Dean McClain and the Graduate School were gracious enough, again, to fund us for the remaining 30-bag budget deficit that we have, so we're now supplying 40 bags per week for students who are finding themselves food insecure at Duke University. We are oversubscribed, normally shutting down the subscription on Monday morning. So I think, for me, as I'm thinking about this issue, I totally agree with what Don was saying. It's bigger than just a stipend conversation. We can throw money at it, and maybe that solves all the problems. But there are these very deep nuances to each individual student. Are they a family? Are they part of a family? Do they have children? Are they an international student? Which PhD program are they in?

Because that can dictate precisely what stipend is available to them. And so, with that, I'll yield the rest of my time. I just wanted to share those things with all of you. I think afterwards we have left some time for questions.

Taylor: Let's hold questions for the end. This is also Claire Ravenscroft, who is a PhD candidate in English.

Casey Williams (Duke Graduate Students Union): Thank you, Travis. I want to thank the Academic Council for inviting us to present today. I first just want to reiterate the point that Travis made, that the cost of living in Durham has increased significantly over the last few years. Some PhD students are struggling to make ends meet on the current stipend amount. That's evidenced by the existence of a food pantry. It is especially difficult to get by for students in their later years, when they're paying continuation fees after their sixth year, which comes out to \$3,700 per semester, which often requires students to take extra jobs in order to complete their degree. Ultimately, this ends up hurting the quality of their research and lengthening their time to degree. For example, we have one PhD student in the audience who, after paying continuation fees, takes home about \$14,000, which isn't enough to cover their expenses. Also, insufficient stipend amounts or stipends that don't match cost of living end up discriminating against students who come from less affluent families. It also discriminates against international students who are sometimes restricted from the kinds of work they can do while pursuing their PhD. This is a problem that we haven't just identified. It's also a problem that GPSC has identified, and it's a problem that the Reimagining Doctoral

Education Committee has identified in their focus groups of PhD students and faculty. A livable stipend does three things. It ensures that all PhD students are able to make ends meet while they're here. It produces higher quality research on faster timetables. And it promotes diversity. We, at the Duke Graduate Students Union, have come up with a proposal that involves first, guaranteeing a base stipend of \$31,800 per year, paid out over twelve months beginning in August. The \$31,800 number is the Graduate School's recommended stipend for twelve months, which it publishes on its website for 2019-2020. We're also asking for the elimination of continuation fees, which present an unnecessary financial burden on PhD students after their sixth year. We're asking for the provision of a \$1,000 relocation stipend for incoming PhD students, which is something that some companies do to recruit diverse talent and something that some other universities have started to do as well. In effect, what we're asking for is the extension of the twelve-month stipend schedule to all PhD students, paid at the rate the Graduate School recommends, which, for 2019-2020 is \$31,800. This would affect, we think, 504 PhD students. Some of them are in the Sciences, but the majority are in the Humanities and Social Sciences, where students don't always have the kinds of funding backstops, like the ability to switch labs, that some students in the Sciences have. It's not our place to say how the university should fund this makeover of the funding structure. But one thing that we do think is important to stress is that this shouldn't put additional pressure on departments to make difficult choices about cutting costs. For instance, we don't think departments should have to choose between fully funding their

students and accepting a full cohort of PhD students. We're simply asking the university to make a commitment to funding all of its PhD students for twelve months at the rate that it recommends. We're also asking, again, for the end of continuation fees, and the provision of a relocation stipend. Some peer institutions do something similar to this already. Yale and Emory, for instance, provide guaranteed twelve-month funding for their PhD students at a rate at or above \$31,000 a year. Some departments at Stanford provide a twelve-month stipend of \$42,000 per year. I want to be clear that these aren't scientific comparisons. We haven't, for instance, done the cost of living differences between the cities. This is just to give you a sense of where peer institutions are. Really, the point we're making here is that some PhD students struggle to get by on the current stipend amount. We think the university can address this problem once and for all by changing the funding structure in the ways that we proposed. The Graduate School has done a lot of work in the last few years, a lot of really excellent work, especially around funding. And in general, Duke is an excellent place to do PhD research. But there is widespread agreement, both from us, from GPSC, and also from faculty on the Reimagining Doctoral Education Committee, that a sub-\$31,000 stipend is not sufficient for PhD students to live decently, produce high quality research, and finish on time. I think the big concern here is really that we risk undermining a commitment we all share to making sure that the graduate student body is as diverse as possible. Thank you.

Taylor: Questions?

Speaker: What about work and study?

Williams: So, this would be, again, an extension of the twelve-month funding cycle to all PhD students, which means that students who are currently on a nine-month schedule would be expected to work for twelve months in order to earn that.

Speaker: There is another program. I know that many people, grad students, some of them are looking for temporary jobs. People who can do something for jobs and looking to work part time and it's very hard to find people here at Duke. Why not have some board which can, for example, to provide information about people who might be looking for some kind of job to help them study?

Taylor: Are you saying you have grant money and you wish you had more PhD students that you could pay?

Speaker: Yeah, some. Well, not me. [laughter] Actually we have already hired some people. But in general, I am talking about, if there is another program – we actually have a hard time finding such people. It's very hard to find those people to work. Perhaps there are some people who would like to work.

Williams: I'm not sure I totally understand the question.

Taylor: I'll give an example. I agree with you. For example, if you have an NIH grant, you need a certain type of skill. When you start peeking into this, it's so super complicated. It differs. The reality is going to have to be understood down at the department level. I think, really, what ECAC wants most is the faculty have all got to engage this down at our own department level and work this out. I think it was Casey who said that there are

differences across PhD programs. You can't just sort all PhD students into all funding streams and vice versa.

Farsiu: In the document that DGSU has given, there is a certain student who is receiving, after tax, \$1,100. So that doesn't match any of the numbers for the nine or twelve months that is provided. Can you please explain how this student ended up with \$1,100?

Williams: It might be that in that case, that's after paying continuation fees, which are assessed on students after their sixth year.

Farsiu: So, this is after taxes and continuation fees?

Student: Hi, that's me. It's actually \$14,000 before taxes and it's because as a seventh year, I had to apply for outside funding. So I got a competitive grant for \$20,000 to cover my yearly expenses and after continuation fees and healthcare, which we have to cover after six years, I was left with \$8,000 to live on for the year after paying all that. So I'm teaching a class in the spring, which will give me an additional \$6,000, so that's going to give me \$14,000 for the year.

Bass: I think what's needed here for the faculty is a better understanding of how different divisions – Arts and Sciences, the different departments – actually fund grad students. I'm in the Natural Sciences, where pretty much every faculty is almost like a small business owner. We have to constantly apply for grants, but we pay all our grad students for twelve months per year and I believe those are the ones you're not talking about. Because we follow the recommendations. So for us it's sort of hard to understand where this

hardship comes from. But I know this is systemic to the way I guess, for example, the Humanities grad students are compensated. It may be educational for this body in order for us to form an opinion to actually learn about that. Because I have no clue how the grad student funding works in the Humanities, for example.

Claire Ravenscroft (Duke Graduate Students Union): To your point, I think that's definitely correct. In our minds, part of the reason that the funding structure at Duke needs improvement is because these discrepancies fall along disciplinary lines, which seems entirely arbitrary. And, of course, for students who are in the Humanities or Social Sciences, it feels incredibly unfair. I think that what we're asking for is for the Graduate School budget to be increased. Most of the way that Humanities students are funded is not through individual faculty members but comes through their department.

Bass: Just to follow up: but you're aware that most of the money that the Sciences use to pay grad students is not Duke money.

Ravenscroft: Right. Yeah.

Bass: So it would be incredibly difficult to put the onus on Duke to bring up the funding because we are only able to do that since we're getting those outside funds.

Ravenscroft: I definitely hear you and obviously there are always budgetary constraints. We know that money doesn't grow on trees and it doesn't come from nowhere. But I think at Duke, there is a history of, where there doesn't seem to be

money, if there's enough of a priority behind these programs, then the money is found. A good example would be the way that Duke has invested in undergraduate financial aid over the past ten years. In ways that, I'm sure ten years ago, seemed quite unthinkable.

Bass: Still \$1 billion too little.

Ravenscroft: Yeah. Maybe still insufficient in some people's opinions. But my point is that this is a similar kind of moral imperative, where, if Duke actually believes in having a diverse graduate student population in the way that it has put money behind developing a diverse undergraduate student population, then the money can be found somewhere. We're just interested in starting that conversation to find out where it can come from.

Dauwalter: The only thing I think is important to stress is that our experience with how the sausage is made existed since 3:30 today. So there's no way we can tell you how to find this money. Just that, right now, I have a \$300,000 budget and I'm having to allocate \$27,000 to buy groceries for students. So we're just trying to, more than anything, put a finger or a spotlight on the problem, and then hopefully all of you brilliant people will figure out how to fix it. [laughter]

Sara Beale (Law School): The last bullet point says that these increases shouldn't come at the expense of the individual departments, but several of the comments have stressed that the funding availability in different departments is very different. It isn't clear to me why departments should be able to bring in a larger number of students that they literally "can't afford." So I assume that that's part of the

discussion. I assume maybe that's part of the question of whether departments get authorized by the Graduate School to bring in students that they "can't afford," and one could imagine that the solution is that full funding has to be in place before you bring them in. That would limit the number in some departments, but it's not clear to me that that's the wrong tradeoff. I just want to make sure that we're all assuming that's part of what's on the table.

Taylor: In short version, that's why ECAC didn't just say yes to the proposal. We have to have that conversation. And there's got to be the local level conversation and then we've got to decide a big-picture, federal Duke, how to put it all together.

Mark Anthony Neal (African and African American Studies / member of ECAC): I do want to thank the three of you for taking the time to have this conversation with us. I think for many of my colleagues, it is educational. But something that you brought up, I don't want to gloss over and that is the diversity piece in the classrooms. As a first-generation graduate student, first generation college student graduate, I know what the challenges were in terms of going to graduate school without even having a family backstop. If I didn't have a wife who was working a full time professional job, I would not have been able to complete graduate school. When you talk about questions of diversity, just look at the diversity of the classes of graduate students who are coming in. I know that Duke has lost graduate students in English and Social Sciences departments because they simply got more attractive deals from other institutions. Simply because they weren't

going to be able to afford to live in Durham and be a graduate student. So diversity is a big part of this. Also, again, any students who are first generation students, who are also going to graduate school, that is a significant challenge when they don't have the level of support to be able to be successful.

Ravenscroft: I want to thank you so much, Dr. Neal, for those comments. That resonates strongly with my experience here at Duke. But also, as a kind of illustrative example of precisely the problem that you're identifying. This past year, in English, my home department, we admitted nine students and had nine prospective students here in February looking at our department. Four of them decided to come to Duke, which is about half the size of the cohort that we're used to in my department. And the students who decided not to come here were students of color from working class backgrounds, who saw that they would be making \$31,000 their first two years and after that, saw their funding situation as incredibly precarious and couldn't afford to make the decision to come here so they went to other institutions. So we are, in immediate terms, losing students, and it's precisely the kinds of students that I think everyone in this room is invested in bringing to Duke.

Taylor: I want to thank you three as well. I want to reiterate on behalf of the Council when I told you that I wanted to treat you as colleagues, which means engage in straightforward discussion. So that's what we're going to keep doing. Much more to come on this. Thank you. [applause]

REMARKS FROM DUKE'S CHAIR OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES, JACK BOVENDER

Taylor: Now we have the pleasure to hear from the Chair of the Board of Trustees at Duke University, Jack Bovender. Jack is from King, North Carolina, which is up near Winston-Salem. He is a double-Dukie. He has an undergrad and a Master's of Health Administration degree. I got to know Jack when I had the privilege and the honor of serving on the Presidential Search Committee that selected Vince. I think it was the best group experience that was a professional group experience that I've ever had. Because it was a very difficult challenge and lots of super different people: faculty, students, trustees, but we were kind of driven together by the weightiness of the decision. And the thing that stands out to me about Jack was that he usually spoke last, and he almost always tried to let the student members of the committee speak first. It's the main thing that stands out to me when I think about Jack. So, thank you so much for coming.

Jack Bovender (Chair, Duke Board of Trustees): Thank you for that. I appreciate it. You may notice I'm not exactly the tallest person in the room [laughter] and I remember Nan used to have a stool. So I'm going to do this. I may be cutting off the top of my head, but that's your benefit, actually. [laughter] Last time I was here, I think a lot of you were here, but we probably have some new people. It was to talk about the search process. We were just beginning to put that together. We didn't even have names for people in that but as Don said, this turned out to be a wonderful experience, with obviously a very wonderful outcome for all of us. I'm very

proud of what the committee did. I would like to, with your permission, go back to that process, because it's going to lead into what Don wanted me to talk about mainly here today, which is, what does this new governance that the trustees are engaged in look like? And why are we doing what we're doing? And why now? I will tie that together with the search committee to some degree, but also talk about how this is a brand new experiment and I hope the laboratory is set up right to do this, because I think it can bring great benefits to Duke and to all of you and to our students if we do this right. Just to recap the search, we had seven trustees on this search committee. We had five faculty members. Ellen Davis [Divinity School] was my Vice Chair and she did a wonderful job. She was part of the smaller traveling squad, along with Valerie Ashby [Dean, Trinity College of Arts and Sciences] that went around the country. We talked to about 30 different people. The usual suspects. Some of it just to get information. We went to New England about twice. We went to New York a couple times. We went to Chicago and had some people from the Midwest come and talk to us. We went to the west coast to talk to that usual group of suspects out on the west coast. Not all of these people we talked to were candidates for the job, but we got advice along the way as well as some nominees. We talked to about 20-25 who were possible candidates. The whole committee would meet once a month to go over what the travelling squad had done. So we rolled all of this down to seven candidates that we interviewed over a three-and-a-half-day period in New York. That was a lot of work in a very short period of time. We boiled that down to three people who we brought to Durham, out away from the campus as much as we could, but with visits to the

campus. Out of that whole process, on a Sunday night, the Sunday before Thanksgiving, I called Vince that evening and said, do you still want this job? [laughter] He immediately said yes, he did. The trustees approved this in December of 2016 and he spent the winter months, into the summer, coming to Duke once a month to get his feet on the ground. So, with that as a background, on July 1, we got a new President. On July 1, we got a new Chair of the Board of Trustees. On July 1 we got two new Vice Chairs of the Board of Trustees. So a lot of newbies in this process. The trustees, around that same time, decided that what we should do is to take another look at our whole governance structure. We do this about every ten years. Usually, it's come out the same way. But as we did the surveys and interviews with trustees, some themes came out and you've got paper in front of you, so I'm not going to read these things to you. But essentially, it was that the trustees wanted to spend less time on the so-called fiduciary kinds of things, the committees that do the ticking and tying, if you will, and more time on strategic issues, important strategic issues that fit with the new President coming in, and developing a new strategic framework over time. I'll give you the way the trustees have met in the past. We would come in on Thursday night, then early Friday morning, we would have a plenary session, an executive session of the trustees, and when that plenary session was over, the rest of the morning would be dedicated to one group of committees. Every trustee served on two committees. The afternoon was consumed with more committee work in a plenary session and then Saturday was a plenary session of the trustees along with an executive session at the end of the process. So we had to

find time, before we got really focused on strategic issues, so I would refer you to this diagram that's in the package that you got. So essentially, we had ten committees and we had to figure out ways to consolidate these committees to free up a block of time to be able to do the strategic focus that we talked about. So you will see, I'll give you an example. We used to have Business and Finance, Facilities and Environment and Human Resources. We combined that into one Resources Committee. Now, that's a workload. But the trustees asked for this, so they can't complain as far as I'm concerned. This whole process, as I will show you, takes a lot more work and a lot more preparation on trustees' part before they come to the meetings. That freed a whole block of time to do it. And the way we decided to do it was we would start with a plenary session on Friday morning as we usually do. It's not starting at 8:30 anymore, it's starting at 7:30 for reasons that kind of become apparent as we go through this. Then the strategic task forces meet, and I'll deal with those in a minute and talk to you about the formation of those. Then we have a luncheon in which Vince and his senior leadership, his cabinet, meet with the trustees and opportunities for the trustees to ask questions of different members of the President's Cabinet or any particular presentation that needs to be made. Then, in the afternoon, each trustee is assigned to a fiduciary committee, the typical things that have to deal with business and finance and other kinds of things like that. Those are laid out here: external engagement, graduate and professional education and research, audit and compliance, resources, undergraduate education, and then the executive committee meets on those months that the trustees are not meeting.

We created a governance committee. We did have a subcommittee of the executive committee on trusteeship, but it had a very limited role in identifying possible trustees. This is a much more fulsome committee, which really focuses on ongoing governance issues, including the way committee chairs are decided upon and ultimately, when it's time for me to ride off into the sunset, if you will, how the new Chair of the Board of Trustees is selected and the process by which that is done. So the whole idea behind this was strategic thinking, time to do that, to do work like that, but also to be more transparent inside the board, instead of things kind of happening in the executive committee without a full understanding of what may be going on. But also, to give more chances for leadership to other members of the Board of Trustees on a rotating basis. The other thing was to develop a way of being more transparent to the university as a whole. That means students, faculty, in particular. Now, one of the interesting things too about all this is, as you know, the committees, for a long time, trustee committees have had faculty and student representation. That's been a very important concept. I'm going to come back and stress that in a different way in a few minutes. But it also was important that these four strategic task forces that came out of Vince's work on a strategic framework would also have faculty and students involved with this. So that's how we came up, through Vince's strategic framework, with these four areas for strategic focus. The concept behind this is, these are not permanent task forces. They've got a time limit of about two years. This is one of those concepts in which you pressed the time to make sure that there is a deliverable product from each of these task forces within this two-year period, that these

things don't just hang on and people argue and debate about them and nothing gets done. The work product that comes out of this will inform not only the trustees but the administration about the direction that we need to be going in, relative to this. I'll give you a chance to ask questions about that in a minute. But I want you to also take a look at this, because this feeds into this broad experiment we're trying with the trustees. I'm the lead independent director at Bank of America and as I said when I went on that board, the only thing I know about banking is how to borrow money, but anyway, I'm the lead independent director. Brian Moynihan, the CEO, asked me if I would cohost with him a university trustee forum, which we did in Boston in early November. We started out that night with what he described as a fireside chat. The first question he asked, he said, I understand that you guys at Duke are doing something about governance, changing your governance model, would you talk about that? I hope you have looked at the people who were there. A pretty prestigious group of schools. So I went through in some detail what I've just gone through with you. Laurene Sperling, our Vice Chair, was also at the meeting, and she elaborated on some of the structures about the strategic task forces. She chaired the ad hoc committee that worked on the governance for the year that worked on this. It was very interesting. We were going to cover a lot more things in this fireside chat, but what became very interesting about this is, all of these people focused on this change in governance, and why we were doing it. One of the things that really surprised me, and you guys may know this, is that our model of having students and faculty involved in trustee committees, if it's not unique, at least in this group, it was not

common. In fact, we got some, to me, unusual and I might even say appalling kinds of questions. [laughter] Like, how do you make sure in these committees that the faculty and students are not disruptive to the process? [laughter] How do you guarantee the confidentiality of the material that's being covered? It's just a very unusual group of questions that were asked about this. So I think I want to make the point to you, which you may already know, that the involvement of faculty and students in governance in this university, if not unique, as I said, at least is not common across the country, at least in most prestigious schools in this country. Lots of questions relative to, okay, you've got a big athletic program. Why don't you have an athletic committee here? My point is, the way you govern that effectively is to make sure you've got the right athletic director and the right faculty, and the right administration involved in that process and the right oversight of the process, so you don't end up – excuse me, Don – looking like UNC. [laughter] So lots of questions and in the private time after the presentation and the fireside chat, a lot of one-on-one discussions about this. So I'm sure these Chairs and Vice Chairs of these universities are going to take these examples back and what they do with it, I have no idea. But it was a very educational process for me, I should say. I'll stop there before we cover anything else and see if there are any questions. You had a couple other things you wanted me to cover and we could do that after the question period.

Taylor: We're also going to have a reception after.

Bovender: I realize I'm the only thing keeping you from the reception and alcohol and I apologize. [laughter]

Luke Bretherton (Divinity School): Can you say a little bit about how the strategic task forces do or don't relate to the priorities set out by the strategic plan? Is that deliberate, is that just a separate process?

Bovender: The strategic framework, it was the recommendation of Vince. And Vince, you may want to talk about this, it was his recommendation to the trustees that the first four task forces be based upon some points he called out in the strategic framework.

Price: As I was coming on board, the finishing touches were being put on the academic strategic plan. And Duke Health has its own plan, Advancing Health Together. What's described here as a framework sits above and around those, and we worked very hard to make sure that it's consistent with the priorities that were advanced in those plans. The reason these four areas were selected had to do with the ability within a two-year run to articulate a reasonable set of charges to the committees. And I will say, these committees are operating on a very high strategic level. The intention here is to draw from these committees as an expert source of long-term strategic planning device, not the drop-down committees. So I think of these task forces and the framework itself as an attempt to lay the groundwork for what will emerge in subsequent strategic plans, as we begin implementing going forward.

Bovender: One unusual question I got during that Boston seminar was, is this not you intruding into the prerogatives of

the administration and management as trustees? My answer to that is no, this is what our President and our senior officers want from the trustees, which is involvement in strategic thinking. And also, as I reiterate, if you're going to do that, then you've got to have faculty and students as well as administrative leaders in these four areas as part of the process. So if you're going to get your best thinking, if you're going to get your pros and cons or anything you're doing, let's say the STEM initiative that's in number two here, advancing Duke science and technology, then you need everybody in the room. The meeting space gets pretty large, but if you manage the process, and everybody is respectful of everybody else and doesn't interrupt them while they're talking and so forth, you get a good process out of that. We're in our first year, it just started this academic year, so we don't know how effective this is, but I think we'll learn and we'll tweak it. This is an iterative process. But I think I really believe it's a more effective way of governance in an academic environment than just dealing with these fiduciary things that trustees typically deal with. Any other questions that you might want to ask?

José María Rodríguez García (Romance Studies): Thank you very much, Jack for pushing for greater transparency in the governance of the Board of Trustees. I fortunately happen to be one of Duke's faculty members who serves on one of the standing committees right now, and I think, at my first meeting with this committee, a month and a half ago, I think I became a disruptive presence, to use that language, because I thought that I was one of the dissenting voices on a number of issues. It just so happened that I was there on that committee

representing the faculty in general but also as Chair of the Arts and Sciences Council, which is the second largest governance body, led by one of only two elected officers at Duke. I think something that struck me is that not everybody on the Board of Trustees, at least on that committee, knows enough about faculty governance, how we organize ourselves, the faculty, how we deliberate, how we come together, how we try to arrive at a decision. Just as I think that not enough faculty know sufficiently enough, as well, about how the Board of Trustees works. So, if there could be some kind of initiative to bridge that gap, so that we are all more aware of how we come to the deliberation opportunity that the Board of Trustees has created, and what kind of a stakeholder we are.

Bovender: I agree with that, and I think maybe one of the things we need to put on the agenda, maybe we could do it in February at a planning session, is a full discussion by some of you, Don, and others, about how – let's go back to a phrase we heard earlier – the sausage making that goes on, including here, ECAC, and so forth. I will tell you, I came on in 2007, I think it was. It took me a long time to figure out how you guys do what you do as far as governance inside the faculty. Once I understood it, at least to some level, and understood what you were trying to accomplish, I think I understood the university as a whole a lot better. By the way, dissent is not disruption. Dissent is part of the whole process. It's just how you dissent. I've had, in my life, in my personal career, my professional career, a lot of what I call hand grenade rollers. You'd be at the table and all of a sudden a hand grenade would come rolling out on the table. That's disruptive, not honest dissent and

discussion about something. So maybe, again, we can figure out how to really talk to the trustees about how this whole process works with governance inside the faculty. By the way, I want to take a moment and ask Richard Riddell to talk about – he’s put together, talking about transparency, what happens after the board meeting with the information and the things we covered as trustees. If you could take a couple minutes and go over what you put in process here.

Richard Riddell (Senior Vice President & Secretary to the Board of Trustees):

The trustees were looking for a way to respond to interest in what they were doing, what were the reasons behind the decisions being made. We’ve always made public decisions, but we didn’t always explain a whole lot about what the thoughts were. So, I think it was our Vice Chair, Laurene Sperling, who was very keen on having some short summaries of all the committees and the task forces created after the meetings and I thought, well, let’s take those, look at them, make sure we’re not revealing anything confidential, and just make those public. And the trustees thought this was a good idea, and we’re creating one for the board meeting itself. We’re just going to start posting those probably about a week after the meetings, we’ll have those ready. And anybody can access them and read them. Then, shortly after that, although, with the vagaries of the academic schedule, we’re not going to have a meeting in open forum, which is what we’re going to have for people to come and discuss them, in December when no one is here. We’ll do it in January. But we try to do it as much as possible after the meetings. So, it’s an opportunity for people to talk to me, to talk to the students and faculty that serve

on these committees about what they read in the summary.

Jokerst: If I could finish up with one last thing. The Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges in 2017 published a Shared Governance: Changing with the Time case study of Duke University. I don’t know if you heard about this when it was published, Jack, but I just found it a couple weeks ago when I was looking at something, and they had talked to me when I was Academic Council Chair. And if you read this report, it’s a short report, three pages, but it says basically that Duke is a standout university because the trustees talk to the faculty, the administration talks to the faculty, and we all work together. And I talked with the report author after the report was published and he said that Duke was an absolutely outstanding and reasonably unique example, supporting what you said earlier, Jack, of how shared faculty governance, the administration, the trustees, really work together to the benefit of all of us. So, thank you everybody.

Taylor: Let’s have a drink. [applause]

[Meeting adjourned]