Academic Council

012 Allen Building
Campus Box 90928
**Phone:** (919) 684-6447
**FAX:** (919) 684-9171
**E-mail:** acouncil@duke.edu

Minutes of the Meeting of the Academic Council
Thursday, February 16, 2017

**Nan Jokerst (Chair, Academic Council / Electrical and Computer Engineering):** Welcome, everyone. If you could take your seats, we'll start the meeting. Thank you for coming to our meeting today and I'd like to call the meeting to order. Provost Kornbluth is unable to join us, since she is attending a Provost's conference with other Provosts from peer schools. She will rejoin us at the March Council meeting.

*APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 19TH MINUTES*

**Jokerst:** Let's get started by approving the minutes from our January 19th meeting, which were posted with today's agenda.

*(Minutes approved by voice vote without dissent)*

*ANNOUNCE RESULT OF THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL CHAIR ELECTION*

**Jokerst:** We recently concluded the election of the next Chair of the Academic Council. I'm pleased to share that we had an 80% participation rate in voting. The result of the election was verified by the Chair of the Academic Council election committee and member of ECAC, Josh Sosin.

I would like to offer our most sincere thanks to Don Taylor, from the Sanford School, and to Ellen Davis, from the Divinity School, for their willingness to stand for election.

Professor Don Taylor, from the Sanford School, will serve as the next Chair of the Academic Council and will take office on July 1st. On behalf of the Council, I offer Don our warmest congratulations. Don, will you please stand? (applause) I hope that you will enjoy serving as the Academic Council Chair, and have the same tremendously engaging and fulfilling experience that I have had as Chair.

*VOTE ON THE PROPOSED NEW MASTER'S DEGREE IN INTERDISCIPLINARY DATA SCIENCE*

**Jokerst:** We will now proceed to the vote on the proposed Master's degree in Interdisciplinary Data Science. Robert Calderbank, director of the Information Initiative at Duke, and a professor in Electrical and Computer Engineering, Computer Science, and Math, and Tom Nechyba, director of the Social Science Research Institute and a professor in Economics, are here to respond to questions that were raised to ECAC and transmitted to them, and to answer any other questions that you might have before we proceed to our vote.

**Tom Nechyba (Director, Social Science Research Institute / Economics):** Robert is here in spirit but he's at a dissertation and wasn't sure if he could make it. We gave our presentation last time so we have no formal presentation this time. There was a question that came by email last night that I was asked to respond to quickly, so let me do that and take any other questions. The question we had was concerning a question we got last time about Machine Learning in the program and the fact that Machine Learning is not a course that's a required core course, but it is a required core course in NYU's data science program, which is one of the premiere programs out there. So we were asked to respond to that. So the way we look at this is that every program like this has to find a balance and do so with the programs in mind. We're not trying to replicate the NYU program and they're not trying to do what we're doing. We're doing an interdisciplinary, team-based approach to data science education. To do that within this overarching data-to-decision framework that we explained last time, we leave lots of flexible paths open to learn about what those paths should be and how they could be institutionalized over time as we learn. So in that spirit, we've been collaborating with lots of units. We've actually been meeting on a monthly basis with Statistics, Computer Science, Math, Pratt, various Social Science departments, to take that high level description of the curriculum in the proposal and really flesh out what exactly the sequence of the topics and courses is going to be and how they are connected to each other and how they are going to be supported by virtual resources. All toward the goal of preparing students to be successful in the electives that all of these partnering units are going to offer.

So in that set of discussions, the issue of Machine Learning has come up. We've learned that there is no Machine Learning course currently at Duke that's pitched at the level that we need for our students to take in order to then take the more advanced courses that are offered in the university. So we've committed to actually help design and sponsor that course and create it for our program and also for the Duke curriculum. So the only question that remains is, should that course be a required core course? I'm not sure that we won't change our mind on that, but at this point we take the view that part of the goal here is to have flexibility to actually prepare some of our students for jobs that probably didn't exist ten years ago in local governments, state governments, nonprofits, smaller-scale businesses that are beginning to get into this world of data science. When we talk to those employers, they're talking about the kind of student we're trying to shape, they're not talking about Machine Learning as one of the essential skill sets that they require in those careers. We certainly don't want to create a program that's only for those students. We want to be able to place students and have them go through a track that prepares them for the kinds of places that NYU's program prepares them for, but we'd like to experiment with preparing students for that emerging market and learn, in the process, what's needed. So that's the rationale for how we ended up with, yes, Machine Learning, absolutely; I suspect most of our students are going to take it, but also leaving the flexibility with learning about other paths.

**Jokerst:** Are there any other questions about this program before we go to a vote? Thank you, Tom.

*(Master's in Interdisciplinary Data Science approved by voice vote without dissent)*

Thank you – the Master's in Interdisciplinary Data Science is approved and will go to the Board of Trustees for approval at their meeting later this month.

### VOTE ON THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE FACULTY HANDBOOK REGARDING NON-TENURE TRACK REGULAR RANK FACULTY

**Jokerst:** Our next agenda item is to proceed to a vote on the proposed changes to the Faculty Handbook regarding Non-Tenure Track Regular Rank faculty who serve under the Provost, namely, faculty who are not in the School of Medicine or in the School of Nursing.

Currently, the Faculty Handbook text regarding Non-Tenure Track Regular Rank faculty is located in Appendix C, on pages C7-C10, whereas the corresponding text for Tenure Track Regular Rank faculty text is located in Chapter 3. Part of the motivation for the proposed changes is to better recognize and respect the importance and value of all of our faculty by placing review for all faculty who serve under the Provost in one section of the Faculty Handbook. At this point in time, the relevant faculty in all Schools who serve under the Provost have been apprised of the proposed changes, and all comments have been forwarded to the proposers. ECAC and the proposers have proactively engaged our colleagues in discussion on the proposed changes to ensure that everyone's voice has been heard. Our efforts to engage faculty in this process have been fruitful. We have received some input on the proposal after the presentation at our January meeting, and we will now discuss a set of friendly amendments to the proposal.

The original proposal that was introduced at the January Council meeting called for the removal of pages C7-C10 from the Faculty Handbook. However, a faculty member correctly pointed out to ECAC that pages C7-C10 apply to all Regular Rank, Non-Tenure Track faculty, including faculty in the School of Medicine and in the School of Nursing. Since the proposed revised text applies only to faculty under the Provost and not faculty in the Schools of Medicine and Nursing, Appendix C should remain unchanged. So a friendly amendment to the proposed text presented to our Council in January removes the proposal to excise pages C7-C10 from the Faculty Handbook, and includes text at the bottom that indicates that the proposed new language will supersede the text in Appendix C for faculty who serve under the Provost, again, namely, faculty in all Schools except Medicine and Nursing. The original proposal and the amended proposal are shown on the screen (refers to slide).

To proceed, first we will vote to accept the friendly amendment to the proposal. Then, we will vote on either the amended proposal or the unamended proposal, whichever one we choose to vote on.

To start the first step in this process, I would like to ask for a motion to accept the friendly amendments to the proposal. Do I have a motion?

**Jane Richardson (Biochemistry):** I have a question.

**Jokerst:** We're going to go to questions after we actually put it on the table to talk

about. So do I have a motion?

**Speaker:** So moved.

**Jokerst:** Is there a second?

**Speaker:** Second.

**Jokerst:** Thank you. Now this is open for discussion, and we're talking about the amended proposal on the bottom of the screen.

**Richardson:** I'm unclear whether there will be extra text referring back and forth in both places. Because you don't want to have the only text in the Appendix without an explanation that sends people to the amended one in Chapter 3.

**Jokerst:** That's a good point. We should probably refer back to that. Would you like to propose some text?

**Richardson:** I think it would be better to work it out.

**Speaker:** How about, the following text is superseded by…

**Judith Kelley (Senior Associate Dean, Sanford School of Public Policy):** I'm not a voting member, but as the original drafter of this, we could propose that, immediately preceding C7-C10 in the Appendix, a line would be inserted that says that the following pages C7-C10 are superseded by the section in Chapter 3 of the Faculty Handbook that is preceded by the text… (laughter)

**Jokerst:** I know, it gets convoluted.

**Josh Sosin (Classical Studies / Member of ECAC):** I think we could generate language that is a little simpler than that. I want to suggest that if we pursue this, prudence seems to suggest that each points to the other.

**Richardson:** Then I think the one in the Appendix should start off saying, "for Tenure Track faculty in Medicine and Nursing, please…"

**Alex Rosenberg (Philosophy):** I move as a friendly amendment to the friendly amendment that the text be preceded by the sentence "For faculty who do not serve under the Provost."

**Jokerst:** Perfect.

**Lee Baker (Cultural Anthropology):** Can you remind me why the School of Nursing and School of Medicine faculty are going to be in the Appendix and not with everyone else?

**Jokerst:** The proposal was only to propose changes to the review process for faculty who report to the Provost. So I'm going to defer to Judith and Kevin.

**Kelley:** We were certainly not asked to include those units in the discussion by the Provost when we first started out. Actually, there were some expressions of interest from those units, and also wanting to simplify it, but their faculty is so different that it was recommended for them to have their own process.

**Baker:** But couldn't that be on page 4? I mean, just following this, not in the Appendix, but in the text.

**Kelley:** Yes, but they would have to take that up, those two schools, and figure out what that language would look like.

**Jokerst:** I will also comment that,

regarding the review process for School of Medicine faculty, I am in conversations with Ann Brown (Vice Dean, Faculty, School of Medicine) about the revised wording and what is the process right now. So those conversations are ongoing but the reports to the Provost conversations have matured more quickly than those in the School of Medicine and School of Nursing. So by no means are we leaving behind in any way the School of Nursing or the School of Medicine, however, the report that came up from the Provost's office are for those faculty who report to the Provost. These other faculty in Nursing and Medicine report up to the Chancellor.

**Joe Izatt (Biomedical Engineering):** I apologize for bringing this up now and not earlier, but I've been reading these in preparation for this meeting. The proposal is to insert this text in the middle of Chapter 3, that is, before the concluding paragraph, which is labeled "Confidentiality." Has someone carefully looked at the whole of Chapter 3 as it will look after this is done? For example, when this text is appended, there are several paragraphs with bolded headings on them. Will it be clear that everything here only applies to this particular class of faculty? More importantly, does this change the meaning of any pre-existing text in Chapter 3, which is not as carefully labeled to apply only to Tenure Track faculty as it would be if we were going to rewrite the whole thing? Personally, I would feel most comfortable voting on this if I had in front of me a complete version of Chapter 3 as proposed and a complete version of the Appendix as proposed, rather than a little bit of language about what is going to happen. Final question, if I can get it in: Appendix B is the checklist; is this proposed to be

inserted or not?

**Kelley:** No, that's not proposed to be in. That's a set of guidelines that will be posted on the Provost's website. It's a cut and paste exercise. We had brought up that there are little places in the Faculty Handbook that need to be adjusted, like there's a place that references the Appendix, and things like that, so we had brought this up. I think that it's normal that when such a change is made, that the records say logical adjustments are made to make sure that things are clear.

**Izatt:** There's also a paragraph existing in Chapter 3 that refers to Non-Tenure Track, it doesn't refer to them as Regular Rank. I think that actually doesn't appear in Chapter 3 anywhere. So there are some little inconsistencies. I would personally like to see the exact language, including all the tweaks, before I vote.

**Roxanne Springer (Physics):** Of course I'd like to echo my agreement of this idea, but I also wonder, because one of the original motivations for doing this was to make sure that the Non-Tenure Track Regular Rank faculty receive the same sort of identification as Tenure Track Regular Rank faculty, even if this vote is delayed to accommodate this additional scrutiny, I'd like to suggest that the change not actually be made until the process has also gone through the School of Medicine and the School of Nursing so that the Handbook can be modified all at once to bring everybody up into the main text.

**Jokerst:** Judith and Kevin, do you want to comment on that?

**Kelley:** I suppose one could always say, let's wait for everything to get done

everywhere, but there are actually real implications of this as well in terms of the expediency and the appropriateness of the reviews that are being conducted as we speak. While I'm certainly sympathetic to the fact that we may delay the vote for a while so that we can have this laid out because we're not sure that Nan will figure these things out properly, honestly, this has taken two years just to do this. So if we're going to wait another two years until the Medical School and the Nursing School go through the same process, there are actual people and real properties and timelines in the meanwhile that are going to be continued to be backed up. We've discussed a lot of different ways, just in practical terms of what has to be submitted where, how much has to be submitted, how appropriate it is, and things like that, and it's all just going to sit there for possibly up to two years until the School of Medicine and School of Nursing get their stuff done. As somebody who is constantly dealing with these files, I see a lot of efficiency gains and a lot of equity gains to be made by proceeding and we have a proposal that we've discussed and vetted extensively with the faculty that will be affected by it, so it would be a shame to put all these things on hold to let the others catch up for more or less cosmetic purposes. Two years from now, if the Schools of Medicine and Nursing are able to come up with something, surely one should be able to straighten out and fix it when that is on the table.

**Springer:** I would like to ask what can be done to expedite this?

**Kelley:** I don't control this.

**Jokerst:** Josh, and then Alex.

**Sosin:** I hear virtues on both sides of this but I wanted to respond, just to offer my perspective on one aspect of Roxanne's comment. I like fussing with text and I feel very strongly about the coherence of the Handbook so that place where you're coming from, in suggesting that the thing ought to make sense, I'm fully on board with. What worries me more about the suggestion that we pass it but hold off on instantiating it in the document is that this creates a world in which the rule that governs is independent of the document that anyone can point to. I just want to suggest that we do not go down that road. I think we can find ways of expediting this; ECAC as a matter of course sees suggestions that are offered only in the spirit of clarifying matters and catches little bits that didn't get updated when some other change was made. So that's part of our normal business and when anything rises to the level of worry, we take it to Council. We don't just make the changes on our own. So it might just be that the path to expediting is just for ECAC to do what ECAC does. I imagine the worry is that there are some things that may look like small changes that, in fact, have more serious implications but I can't speak to how likely that would be in this case.

**Kelley:** I did look through, and that's why I had contacted Nan to ask her, because there are places where there are cross-references and things like that, and implied was, we can take care of those.

**Jokerst:** Yes, and I indicated that ECAC can take care of those little cross-references. But anything substantial, the Academic Council has to vote on.

**Rosenberg:** I was going to add my amendment that the document be

examined for consistency and changes required in order to ensure consistence be brought back to the Academic Council.

**Billy Pizer (Sanford School of Public Policy):** I'm completely sympathetic with the desire to make sure it's internally consistent, but I also feel like we had a pretty coherent and clear presentation of the movement of the text at the last meeting, and the proposal has been around now for two months or so. So I think that the process we have in place, assuming we all agree with the idea of bringing this into the main text, I'm very comfortable with the idea of ECAC doing what ECAC does and we have a lot of stuff to do at this meeting, so going through and wordsmithing text is not the way I would prefer for us to spend our time as a deliberative body. I would actually be much more comfortable with just approving it and if there are significant changes that arise when ECAC goes back through the text, to then bring it back if necessary.

**Rosenberg:** That's the sense of my motion. I meant that it should now be approved and entered into the Faculty Handbook and matters of consistency be brought forward at a later date.

**Izatt:** Just one more comment. I'm actually sympathetic to Roxanne's comment but I would like to separate mine from hers. I believe there are fairly substantial matters, not just of detail, but of definition in Chapter 3 that are affected by this addition. Also, can ECAC make changes to the Faculty Handbook without a vote of the Academic Council?

**Jokerst:** We make minor changes on behalf of the Academic Council, but anything that is a major change, we bring to the Council.

**Izatt:** Who decides what's minor and major?

**Jokerst:** ECAC does.

**Izatt:** I'm uncomfortable with that. That's my comment.

**Jokerst:** As having been the person with Kirsten Corazzini (member of ECAC), who went through proposed changes, you probably don't want to look through all those, but I will say this: if anyone would like to volunteer to help ECAC, that would be most welcome.

**Izatt:** I'm just suggesting, if we're voting on a change to the Faculty Handbook, I would prefer to vote on the complete text of the change, rather than the spirit of something, and then a bunch of changes happen.

**Jokerst:** Understood.

**Kelley:** It's more than the spirit. We really have thought this through and we really have vetted this with a lot of people. As a matter of fact, we put it out for comment again. It's been put out twice for comment and we got several comments back and the comments that we did get back tended to be, "We can't wait to get this done because we want to get going on working according to these new ways." We also got comments from Regular Rank faculty who are not Tenure Line that they are looking forward to it getting done.

**Dennis Clements (School of Medicine):** Call to question.

**Jokerst:** We have a motion to call to question. Do I have a second?

**Speaker:** Second.

**Jokerst:** Alright, we're going to call to question. So the question that is being called at this point is whether or not we're going to vote on the amended text shown below. We're not voting on the text yet; we're voting on whether we're going to accept the friendly amendment shown below.

*(Call to question approved by voice vote with one opposed and one abstention)*

Thank you. The proposal that we will vote on now includes the friendly amendment.

Before we vote, the floor is open for further discussion of the amended proposal.

**Ruth Day (Psychology and Neuroscience):** My colleagues and I have been having discussions about part of the proposal. There are two areas; one has to do with Institutes and Institute Directors being able to appoint people in this general category. As we know, Institutes are wonderful but they come and go, and the possibility that an appointment could be offered which outlasts the Institute is one issue. And the other issue, which I think has more ramifications, has to do specifically with professors of the practice, who have heavy teaching duties, especially undergraduate teaching duties. So their review could benefit, perhaps from more participation from Arts and Sciences where our undergraduates are. So some oversight, either of the Dean of the Arts and Sciences office, or the departments, which are really hosting their teaching, would be a good discussion point for the Council. An example was brought to our attention by another member of the Academic Council

who is away on sabbatical, Tina Williams, in our department. She pointed to the undergraduate major in Neuroscience, which is administered by a couple of different departments and that their experience in that structure has recently changed and that would be an interesting model to look at before we actually vote on this without taking these considerations into account.

**Jokerst:** Before we go any further, I'd like to ask Judith Kelley, the Senior Associate Dean of the Sanford School and Kevin Moore, who's the Vice Dean of Faculty in Arts and Sciences, to come to the podium and to interact with the Academic Council to take these questions.

**Kelley:** I think we both appreciate the spirit of the question here. One thing that we tried to put forward last time is the fact that everything that's now in the Appendix makes it really difficult to red-line it for amendment, such as the one you're proposing. Part of the benefit from adopting this proposal and bringing it into the chapter is that in the future, should somebody want to think differently about how things are done in a specific area such as you're proposing, such a proposal can now be put forward because you can seek an amendment to the text of the Handbook, whereas this Appendix, you can't amend, because it's actually an old recommendation from 1990. You can't historically change a document that was issued in 1990 or 1991. Our spirit, when we took this on, was to leave the status quo as much as possible, and the text was worked out, in terms of the Institutes with the Provost, in the spirit of changing from what the status quo is, as little as possible. So we can first make this change, rather than bundle this change with all sorts of

8

substantial changes people might actually want to be making. So that's why I would hope that, in the future, that this is the kind of thing people could discuss. Do we want to do this differently? If so, let's put a proposal for that on the table as a separate matter. But I would hope that we don't start bundling all these specific substantive issues with how the whole world ought to look before we can actually make this change, because I'm afraid that then we'll never be able to take that one step forward. We'll just get bogged down in so many different specific issues. Right now, what we're putting on the table is from a substantive perspective, this gives everybody the option, every School and Institute, of sticking with the status quo, but provides some flexibility to Schools individually to take some positions to change things in consultation with the faculty and the approval of the Provost. We think that's a good first step. I guess my answer to you is, could you hold that thought? Could we get on with this and then that makes other things like your ideas possible to have discussion about?

**Day:** I'd be happy to hold the thought but it would be very nice to get additional comment, perhaps from Kevin or others.

**Kelley:** About the spirit of that, but it's a digression. We could have that discussion, but there are other items on the agenda I'm sure Nan would like to get to.

**Kevin Moore (Vice Dean, Faculty Affairs):** With respect to your first question, Ruth, about the duration of appointment of Regular Rank Non-Tenure Track faculty in Institutes and Ed Balleisen, who is here, can confirm this, but I believe they cannot be longer than five years. They can be renewed for five-

year periods. I believe that was put in place precisely to guard against the possibility of an Institute, like ISGP, for example, sunsetting.

**Ed Balleisen (Vice Provost, Interdisciplinary Studies):** Five years is a maximum, some are three.

**Kelley:** But this proposal does allow Schools and Institutes to increase the flexibility in that length, with the Provost's approval and faculty approval first.

**Day:** So do you anticipate a second round? Say we approve this today, and it's done. Do you anticipate a second round where all the Schools can come forward and consider how they'd like to operate? Would we have to come back here?

**Kelley:** That's a great question because what would happen here now, after we adopt these changes, if we adopt these changes, is that each School can say they're fine with the way things are and have things keep going with the way things are, but it's also an invitation for each School to go back and think about how they're doing things. By now, the way that's defined is that each School has the power to do that, but they must go through the faculty process at their School and then the Provost must sign off on it. But it doesn't have to come back here. That's between the Provost and the Schools. In the same spirit that many other bylaws are between the Schools and the Provost. The bylaws vary greatly from one School to another because we are so different.

**Jokerst:** Other questions? Alright, thank you.

May I have a motion to approve the proposed changes, with the friendly amendments as indicated?

*(Changes to the Faculty Handbook were approved with one opposed and one abstention)*

Thank you – the changes to the Faculty Handbook have been approved. I will make this pledge to you, that ECAC will look at this in detail, again, in Chapter 3, and we will bring back any concerns that we have to the Academic Council.

### PROPOSED JOINT PhD BETWEEN SANFORD SCHOOL AND ARTS & SCIENCES

**Jokerst:** Next we will hear the proposed joint PhD program between the Sanford School and Arts and Sciences. Professors Steve Vaisey, Elizabeth Marsh and Ken Dodge are here to present a proposal to establish a joint PhD between the Sanford School of Public Policy and the departments of Psychology and Neuroscience and Sociology from the Arts and Sciences. The proposal and supporting documents were posted with your agenda and we will vote on this item at our March meeting.

**Ken Dodge (Sanford School of Public Policy):** Thank you, Nan, and thank you, faculty colleagues, for serving on the Academic Council. We are here to propose a set of joint PhD programs between the Sanford School and its allied disciplines, particularly here, the department of Psychology and Neuroscience and the department of Sociology. A little bit of history: the Sanford School PhD program in Public Policy began about a decade ago. The PhD programs in Sociology and separately in Psychology and

Neurosciences are longstanding PhD programs. Over the past decade, we have a strong record of collaborating on courses, on dissertation committees, on research, and we now see even new areas to expand that research and training collaboration. So we propose a new track within each program for a joint PhD. So if a student comes in through Public Policy, the title would be Public Policy and Sociology, or vice versa if they came in through Sociology, or Public Policy and Psychology and Neuroscience, or vice versa. Beyond names, the proposal represents true intellectual melding. Perhaps very importantly, we are proposing no increase in the total number of students or any change in the total funding. Very quickly, to review to date: the proposal was crafted in the Sanford School, faculty approved it, the Dean approved, the faculty in the Department of Psychology and Neuroscience discussed and approved it as did its Chair, the faculty of the Department of Sociology have reviewed and approved it and its Chair approved it. In the interest of full disclosure, I should let you know that similar proposals are currently being reviewed by the Department of Economics and the Department of Political Science, but they have not fully reviewed them yet or acted on them and we're not coming forward with that today. The Executive Committee of the Graduate School reviewed and approved and the Dean approved, and likewise the Academic Programs Committee reviewed and approved the proposal as well. So now it comes to the University Academic Council. Our rationale: from the Sanford School's perspective, the PhD program in Public Policy involves training students to conduct research that brings theory, methods, and findings from the discipline to Public Policy. Not all research in Public

Policy is of that sort, but that is one prime model. The students, in fact, must concentrate in an allied discipline from among the four choices of Sociology, Psychology and Neuroscience, Economics, and Political Science. We're finding, in the decade that we've been in existence, that the job market placements are good and they do span disciplines, but they are limited. So we seek to expand the job market prospects. Perhaps equally or more importantly, we seek deeper disciplinary experiences so they'll be qualified for the broader job market prospects and options. From the perspective of the disciplines, my colleagues will address those in a moment, but I believe that, increasingly, students in those areas are finding an interest in the research translation to policy problems. Some of those students want expanded experiences as well as job options. The third rationale is we seek an intersection and a deepening of that intersection to identify new research questions. Let me give you a couple of examples, not in any great detail, but imagine a student studying the problem of income inequality and its solutions. A student might come to that from the perspective of a discipline, modeling of income data or a psychological study of the health impact of experiencing inequality, or from a policy perspective about income inequality solutions. You could imagine a disciplinary student wanting more policy experience and the policy student wanting a deeper grounding of the discipline. A second example is the student studying the problem of inadequate kindergarten readiness. You could imagine a psychology student studying psychological interventions to enhance language development or parenting interventions, who then wants to understand how to disseminate or scale up such an intervention but needs to understand the policy context of funding, the financing, the politics, the community perspectives. Likewise, from the perspective of Public Policy, a student studying pre-kindergarten policy in America might well benefit from a deeper grounding in child development or psychology or social stratification. A couple of key features: no change to the total enrollments or funding. We propose that applicants submit to either unit by checking a box on the application and completing an essay describing the student's interest in this joint program. It will be reviewed and if approved by a home unit with a primary faculty member, it will be carried across the quad to the joint unit for review and approval by that joint unit. Either unit can veto; a student is admitted only if the student is approved by both units. We also have a provision for current students who could apply but with absolutely no guarantee that they could transfer in to a new joint program. Once admitted, the new joint program is responsible for the substantive education. The curriculum and requirements are aligned with and approved by both units. We require two dissertation committee members from each unit, possibly with joint mentoring, but the home unit is responsible for the funding. We propose that we evaluate the program in three years by each unit separately as well as jointly. We're recognizing some logistical challenges that we're having fun contemplating and overcoming. The primary is the need for intellectual community of the joint program students and faculty that we're looking forward to. We understand the need for joint administration. Initially, the Public Policy Director of Graduate Studies will be responsible to the Graduate

School. It will coordinate with the Graduate School for the application process. We also know we need to ballast relationships with the existing programs. So if an applicant is rejected by the joint program, the applicant might still be able to be considered by the unit. If a joint program student is terminated or wants to quit the joint program, there's no obligation by the department to accept the student. Let me turn it over to Steve to give a Department of Sociology perspective.

**Steve Vaisey (Sociology):** I have a couple of quick points. From the point of view of our department, we're excited about the intellectual engagement and interdisciplinary realm of policy. We have a lot of students and faculty who are interested in the policy implications of the sociological research. We believe that this joint program will help create those connections both for faculty and for students and increase the connections that are already present. We also, in this time, are working on admissions. It's become very clear over the past few years and now that there are many students who are applying who are interested in the policy aspects of sociological research. So this would be, in some cases at least, a pretty decisive tool in recruitment because there are similar joint programs out there that we're competing with. I think this will give us an advantage for those students.

**Elizabeth Marsh (Psychology and Neuroscience):** I just want to give you a brief overview of our perspective. We've had a long history of interactions with Public Policy. We've placed students in Public Policy, faculty positions before. So, you might say, why do we need this next step? We actually became very excited in

our committee, discussing all the different options, because it became clear that across areas of our department, from clinical psychology to social psychology to cognition, that there were intersections that we didn't notice before. So, for example, as a cognitive psychologist interested in learning, much research now has to be done in schools, something that, if you've ever worked with a school, some policy knowledge would certainly help. We found examples across areas and then we worked with Public Policy to try to ensure that our students wouldn't lose that research apprenticeship field that we value so much in our department so that it would not be an overly heavy burden of courses. The result is that we're pretty excited because people who never thought about this before are seeing connections. So we're excited about building the community and we really see potential, not only for recruitment, but for new interactions among our faculty.

**Jokerst:** Thank you. So this proposal is now open for discussion.

**Lori Bennear (Nicholas School of the Environment):** Can you just talk a little bit about how students who are already in Public Policy and the Sociology track or in the Neuroscience and Psychology track would then be different from students who are in the joint program? Do you expect that there would actually be students who would want to stay in the Public Policy program in Sociology or Psychology and not do the joint degree, and why?

**Dodge:** So they are currently required to have a concentration. So they do take some courses in a discipline. This is not a dramatic qualitative shift but a deepening of that, enhancing the courses to a greater

12

degree, requiring the membership of faculty from that department in this joint program. So if your question is why would a student not want to join the joint program, it might be that the student's interests are really broader than that and the concentration provides enough depth and they really have interests that span three disciplines or four disciplines. There is sacrifice by the depth, that is the sacrifice of breadth, so some students may want that. In faculty discussions, that came up, some of our faculty have their PhDs in the Public Policy program and some have their PhDs in a discipline, so they come to work with different perspectives about that. So within Sanford we wanted to allow either option. Likewise, of course, it's easier to see in the disciplines somebody that might not want Public Policy. So we thought, at this point, it's best to allow either within Sanford. One part within Sanford is that no more than half of the admitted Sanford PhD students, total, would be in the joint program for the first three years. So we would maintain. It won't be a rush to have all of them go in. So we would have some of each and see how it goes.

**Bennear:** Could all of those be in Sociology and Psychology and the Economics and Political Science, where this isn't an option, be the half that are not?

**Dodge:** It might be the case, I can't presume the future. It might be the case that joint programs in Political Science and Economics do emerge. So that's a possibility. Until that happens, at the moment, the majority of students are in Economics or Political Science tracks. These are smaller tracks. It might be that that happens. Our numbers are so small that we'll just have to see over time. In

Sanford, we have a class of about 8 new students a year.

**Richard Brodhead (President):** I apologize. Attending a meeting like this makes you want to ask a question. This all makes perfect sense to me. Is there a way a student could, without doing what you had in mind, use this to transfer from one program to another? That's to say, you start in a discipline, you go into the joint program, and then you exit the joint program in the other unit? Might that be a source of one-way traffic?

**Dodge:** So, we very explicitly state that there is no presumption. That would require independent votes. So if a student starts in a discipline and wants to join the joint program, that would require a vote. Likewise, the other direction. That would be true both coming in at the beginning of Graduate School as well as in the middle. It's plausible that such an idea would be a terrific one, but we want to make very clear that there's no back door into any program by making it very clear that that's not the case and by having it be number of student- and funding dollar-neutral. It's up to the respective units to decide whether they want that or not.

**Josh Socolar (Physics):** Could you just clarify for me: is this formally recognizing something that can happen anyway? Is there anything that would prevent a student who is in the current program from having two members from a discipline on their committee, from taking courses, if this is going to generate a new set of courses that don't exist already?

**Dodge:** Great question. We hope, over time, it might generate new courses or a change of courses. We don't know. Certainly, current students could have

two members from each discipline on a committee and could take whatever number of courses. But the student wouldn't have the intellectual community, wouldn't have what being a program brings, as far as endorsement from the respective units, would not have the name on their vita as they go out on the job market, and might have less commitment from the faculty in the other unit. Whereas having an official joint program fully endorses and recognizes that faculty from both units are supposed to be fully participating.

**Marsh:** I just want to add, it also allows some streamlining of courses. So, normally we wouldn't accept certain Public Policy courses for our requirements, but we've arranged to have some courses count for both. So it would be more efficient to do it in the joint program.

**Vaisey:** I'll also say, having this in my end, I've been working on this for a while as we're currently doing admission. The students who are coming in from Policy with an interest in Sociology are much more on our radar this year than has been the case in the past. For example, we have a student who is admitted to Policy who is interested in the joint program should it come to pass, and she will be attending one of our days of the visit weekend, for example, which is something that we've never done in the past before. So there's already a greater degree of social integration that I think the joint program will bring. We've experienced these students in the track but they're kind of on the periphery. This will help integrate them much more than they are now.

**Speaker:** I have sort of the same question. I wonder if there's a way to try

this but not so much in a bureaucratic way. I guess I am worried about those students who maybe don't have prelims in one of the disciplines or what happens there. Duke is a really interdisciplinary place. You find intellectual community in a lot of interdisciplinary spaces. This just seems like a very heavy-handed way to accomplish what most people could do at Duke anyway.

**Dodge:** I hear you. A student cannot presume to be back-dooring into another discipline or to have the escape route if the student passes a prelim exam from one program to move to the other. They will be told that. We'll have to honor that and act in that way. There is more than simply filling the requirements to the program. There's the intellectual community, there's the endorsement of the faculty, there's the recruitment of the students from the beginning. You may expect that the students who enroll in either unit will be different in the future because of this. They will have that in mind. We presume and hope that when they exit, they will have better job market prospects. So they could do some of the things that you describe. But the other things are new. Are they so dramatically new? We don't think they're so dramatically new to request more funding or more students. But we want to enhance the experiences of our faculty and our students.

**Baker:** In year one, they're taking 901 and 902, your sort of core theories course, or whatever it is. Are they also at the same time taking the core theories course in Sociology or Psychology and Neuroscience? Are they taking all those basic first year PhD seminars, developing two sets of cohorts?

14

**Dodge:** Right. So to the extent that those courses might be redundant they don't have to. They do have to meet the number of required courses in the discipline that we say as well as I think there are four courses in Public Policy: 901, 902, 908, 909. There is a slight increase in the total number of courses that they have to take but it's not more than one or two, depending on the unit over the total.

**Baker:** Are they being socialized as graduate students in two different units at the same time? Because those courses are socializations as much as information.

**Dodge:** Yes. So for 901 and 902 in Sanford, which I know best, that would be populated by students who are in Public Policy only, as well as joint program students.

**Baker:** They would be in there at the same time?

**Dodge:** There would be a unique club for only one. So we want to respect that. At the same time, we also want to grow a new intellectual community for the joint program. Part of this is, if we had 100 students, these would make a big difference. But in Sanford we take 8 students a year, so as Director of Graduate Studies, I'm really already dealing with 8 programs and helping each student. So I don't know that it would be all that different.

**Jokerst:** Thank you so much. As is our practice, if there are further questions about this program that haven't been addressed yet that you would like to have addressed before the discussion at the next meeting, send me an email or send the proposers an email and I will forward the email to the proposers and we'll try to

get the answers to your questions if you weren't able to ask them today.

***PROPOSED REQUEST FROM THE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE'S POPULATION HEALTH SCIENCES CENTER TO TRANSITION TO A DEPARTMENT***

**Jokerst:** We have two more items on our agenda. Our next is the proposed request from the School of Medicine's Population Health Sciences Center to transition to a Department. I would like to call Dr. Ted Pappas and Dr. Lesley Curtis to the podium to present the request from the School of Medicine's Population Health Sciences Center. The supporting materials were posted with the agenda and we will vote on this item at the March meeting as well.

**Lesley Curtis (Director, Center for Population Health Sciences):** I will begin by thanking Dean Andrews for joining us today. I do appreciate her being here. First of all, thank you to Nan and thank you all for allowing me to present this proposal to create a Department of Population Health Sciences in the School of Medicine. Within most universities, a variety of entities conduct population health research, including schools of public health, departments or divisions within schools of medicine, and university-wide institutes. Of the top 20 schools of medicine, only Duke and UC-San Diego do not have a school-, department-, or university-wide institute focused on public health or population health sciences. The absence of such an entity truly limits the institution's ability to recruit and retain faculty and represents a lost opportunity for the school and for the university. Quite bluntly, Duke lags behind its peer institutions in this regard. During today's

presentation, I'll begin by providing some context for this department within the School of Medicine and briefly describe the faculty and the disciplines they represent. Next, I'll touch on the research, education, and service missions in the new department, and talk about the impact of the new department on existing departments. Finally, I'll provide an overview of the funding model. The School of Medicine has 22 departments. Seven of them do not provide any clinical care. 15 of them have clinical care as part of their mission. These range in size. The smallest department in the School of Medicine is the department of Immunology with 14 Regular Rank faculty members. The largest is the department of Medicine with 650 Regular Rank faculty members. The proposed Department of Population Health Sciences will be a non-clinical department and a primary academic home for School of Medicine faculty with doctoral training in the disciplines listed there (refers to slide). Currently, those of us with doctoral training in those areas have appointments in clinical departments within the School of Medicine. The new department will have both tenured and non-tenured faculty lines consistent with other departments and will allow for secondary appointments for faculty with clinical responsibilities and whose research interests are aligned with population health sciences. There will be a national search for a Chair of the department. The faculty expected to transition to the new department represent a number of related disciplines, including health services research, health behavior, epidemiology, health measurement, clinical decision sciences. In total, we expect 32 Regular Rank faculty to transition to the new department. The Basic Science Faculty Steering Committee

raised some very good questions about the mentoring experience of these faculty. Some, but not all, are experienced mentors. So we're working with Ann Brown and Mark Dewhirst to make sure that our faculty receive the training in the national research mentoring network curriculum that Duke has adopted. I'll note that there's a really high level of enthusiasm among the faculty about the proposed department and they've been engaged individually and in small groups to solicit their input and refine priorities for the department. Of the 32 Regular Rank faculty who are expected to transition, six of them are tenured professors in the School of Medicine and three are on Tenure Track positions but they are not yet tenured. There are 8 Regular Rank faculty not on the Tenure Track who have been on faculty in the School of Medicine for more than 11 years. And I note 11 years because in clinical departments, the tenure clock is an 11-year clock. There are 14 faculty who are not on the Tenure Track and who have been with Duke on the faculty for 11 years or fewer. This relatively low proportion of Tenured and Tenure Track faculty really reflects the fact that tenure hasn't been an option in the clinical departments. the proposed department really does create that possibility of tenure for faculty for whom that would not otherwise be an option. We understand that that is a transition that will come with challenges but we believe that it is essential. In the context of the School of Medicine, the new department will be the 8th non-clinical or Basic Science department and the second-largest non-clinical department behind Biostatistics and Bioinformatics. We've anticipated that we might add 10-12 faculty members over the coming five years, and even with those additions, our

relative position in this line up won't change at all. Similarly to Biostatistics and Bioinformatics, the proposed department has a really strong quantitative emphasis. The focus is on development and application of methods to support principled study, if you will, of the determinants of health and outcomes. I'll also note that the proposed department and the faculty within that department have strong, existing collaborations with clinical departments, with institutes, and we're really committed to establishing similar partnerships with our colleagues in the Basic Science departments. Broadly defined, the research mission of the new department includes examining underlying causes of health in populations. Integrating data regarding environmental, social, behavioral, physical, genetic determinants of health to focus on improving health. Informing policies that shape access to, financing, and delivery of high-quality healthcare, and really developing new scientific methods and tools to address each of those. The education mission of the proposed department is really to grow the next generation of scientists who are devoted to the principled study of health outcomes and determinants of health and disease in populations. We're in the process of outlining the curriculum for potential graduate programs and that core curriculum will be driven by comprehensive needs assessment. Tom mentioned something similar in his presentation about the new master's program in data sciences. We've already begun to field a least a pilot survey of potential employers to understand what it is that they are looking for in the folks that they're hiring. Again, when we presented this to the Basic Science Faculty Steering Committee, they strongly advised us to make sure that our proposal

and budget included protected time for faculty to both develop that new and effective curriculum and also to teach classes and mentor. So our proposal and the budget that we have presented does incorporate those suggestions. The department will fulfill its service mission in two ways. The first is the creation of an electronic health data core shared service that will really be a robust, secure platform for Medicare claims data and other kinds of electronic health data. This will really allow us to leverage historical and ongoing investments from across the school and university. As an aside, a lot of my work has used these kinds of data and making them available to the broader university committee is a high priority. The concept for this core, or shared, service really lays out a menu of options that includes not only secure storage and regulatory support, which is very important with these kinds of data resources, but also the educational programs that wrap around the use of these kinds of data and analytic services when needed. In addition, we're proposing a health measurement core research facility, if you will, that will be created to support a range of health measurement activities, including identification and selection of measures from existing constructs, measuring patient preferences, curating and developing new measures, integrating those measures into the process of care, into the delivery of healthcare research, and statistical analysis of those longitudinal patient-reported outcomes. We're confident that the proposed department will have a positive impact on the school and university and more than being confident we're fully committed to making sure that happens. The bulleted list here identifies at least what we believe some of the items of that positive

impact will be. First and foremost, the department will create that tenureable home for non-clinical faculty in the School of Medicine who otherwise would not have that option. In addition, because the nature of the work is highly collaborative and trans-disciplinary, to the extent that the department will improve our ability to retain and recruit high-caliber faculty, that in turn improves the ability of the other departments to do their work. I think the proposed service course that I've mentioned in electronic health data and health measurement also directly increases the capabilities of other departments in the School of Medicine and I would hope, around the university. The department will also foster productivity by creating a more robust infrastructure for the non-clinical faculty in the department. As I mentioned at the outset, we're currently scattered among different clinical departments and divisions and groups within those departments, so that infrastructure is scattered as well. This gives us an opportunity, I believe, to create a more robust infrastructure that really supports our faculty. The department built upon very strong university-wide collaborations. The faculty who are expected to transition to the new department collaborate extensively with clinical departments, colleagues in Arts and Sciences, Biostatistics and Bioinformatics, School of Nursing, DGHI, it's a long list, and now the Margolis Center for Health Policy. I think there's a great potential for joint hires, co-listing of course offerings and training opportunities as those evolve, and of course trans-disciplinary research. From the beginning of this process, we were very mindful that the creation of a new department would result in change for existing departments. We examined two

specific areas here. The first, just looking at the number of faculty, where they are and how they would move and the second being the research dollars and how they might move. With respect to the number of faculty, 28 of them are expected to transition to the new department from the Department of Medicine. As I mentioned, we exist in several different divisions within the Department of Medicine, but 28 come from the Department of Medicine. One is currently in Psychiatry, and three are in the Department of Community and Family Medicine. So as the figures suggest, the impact is relatively modest from a sheer numbers perspective of faculty. Research dollars are an important metric, of course. Although most research dollars move from Medicine here, a higher proportion of Community and Family Medicine's research dollars are affected by the move. That's an issue that we're mindful of. As some of you may know, the Dean has initiated a search for a new Chair of Community and Family Medicine and in her charge to that search committee, of which I'm fortunate to be a member, she specifically called out the need to collaborate with and help that department build its patient-facing research portfolio. Recognizing that there are risks and that change and transitions are not always easy, we've taken a couple of specific approaches to addressing risk. The first is to transition in a measured way when we can. With Medicine, for example, we developed an approach to transitioning grant funds that leaves grants in their last year where they are and then allows up to a year to move other grants into the new department. This is something we reached with the Chair of Medicine, very supportive of that. More generally, I think we're committed to solutions that create synergy and foster

collaborations. The ultimate goal here is to grow the pie, not re-divide the pie. That happens through collaboration. That's why we're so committed to that. This is my last slide. We have developed, at the request of the Dean, a detailed budget for consideration by her and the Chancellor and based on those projections and I would say some conservative assumptions, we've estimated that it will cost about $8.25 million dollars over four years to make the department fully operational. This will be funded by new investments from the health system via the Chancellor and the School of Medicine, with those resources earmarked for this purpose. We're also working to bring in additional outside funding for this and have a supplemental funding request under consideration with the Duke Endowment.

**Jokerst:** Thank you. This proposal is now open for questions.

**Garnett Kelsoe (Immunology):** This is a wonderful presentation. I have two questions. The first is in regards to the change of grant funding. Are the funds that are to be transferred, does that represent the principle investigator or the portion that is subcontracted?

**Curtis:** That's an excellent question. I should have been clear about that. That's associated with the principle investigator. So the faculty who are moving into the department are principle investigators of NIH and other studies.

**Kelsoe:** The second question, if I may ask it is, except for Biostatistics and Bioinformatics, I think of the Basic Science departments, this would be one of the largest for Non-Tenure Track faculty.

**Curtis:** That may be true. Dean Andrews, would you like to comment?

**Nancy Andrews (Dean, School of Medicine)**: Yes, thank you. That's absolutely correct. Biostatistics and Bioinformatics has a higher proportion of Non-Tenure Track faculty than what is projected for this department. Currently, all of our departments have both Tenured and Non-Tenure Track faculty members, including our Basic Science departments, where, historically, there were fewer Non-Tenure Track faculty members, but actually, as you know very well...

**Kelsoe:** Actually, I do know that very well. The ratio is what I'm trying to address.

**Andrews:** So this would be between Biostatistics and Bioinformatics and the Basic Science departments.

**Kelsoe:** In the future, would those individuals be responsible for securing their independent support? Or would they provide service for it like Bioinformatics, for example?

**Curtis:** No. Of the 32 faculty, I would say, all of us, really, are responsible for securing our independent support. Probably two-thirds of us have had or currently have R01s, multiple R01s in some cases. So we are an independent investigator faculty. Does that help?

**Kelsoe:** Yes, thank you.

**Cam Harvey (Fuqua School of Business):** You benchmark a lot to US News Global Report rankings and I'd like to get your opinion of where, out of the gate, you would theoretically be, with 32 faculty, in terms of these rankings?

Second, where do you hope to be with 10-12 hires? The real question is, if we can't deliver top ten in public health, is there an unintended consequence in terms of the reputation, which is very coveted, of our medical school?

**Curtis:** That's an excellent question. The US News rankings, as we've looked at them on the public health sites, the schools of public health are ranked separately from departments that are doing this kind of work. I'll say that, right now, the competition with departments who are doing this kind of work, we would fare extremely well against them, given the scholarly productivity and grant support that our faculty bring in. I'd say top 5 would be the goal here. So it's a great question.

**Richardson:** What would be the expected interactions with all the emphasis that Duke is putting into global health at this point?

**Curtis:** Actually, I think of the 32 or so faculty here, at least four or five, maybe even six, are global health faculty. So I should have mentioned it at the beginning, but we have letters of support from several folks in the proposal, and Mike Merson is one of them. I think he recognized the real importance and opportunity here for DGHI.

**Craig Henriquez (Biomedical Engineering):** You mentioned the sort of creation of a graduate program. I'm curious how many of the current faculty, the ones that are moving over, have graduate students, where are they located, and are they also moving into this department?

**Curtis:** In the 32 faculty, many of us teach in other graduate programs because we don't have them here. A few of us, I would say probably a third of us do have some fellows, pre- and post-doc fellows that we work with coming from other institutions to work with us. They would, of course, come into the new department as well. Does that answer your question?

**Henriquez:** So right now there's a small subset of graduate students. But then you would expect that you would grow a graduate program of roughly what size, do you imagine?

**Curtis:** It's a little early to throw out an estimate. I would say maybe 10-15 PhD students at a steady state. That would be my guess.

**Jokerst:** Thank you very much. We'll vote on that proposal at our next meeting and we'll have an opportunity for discussion at our next meeting as well.

### *STATEMENT INTRODUCED BY ECAC REGARDING THE U.S. PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDER ON IMMIGRATION*

**Jokerst:** The final item on our agenda regards a proposal to the Council by ECAC to issue a statement by the Academic Council concerning the US Presidential Executive Order on Immigration.

This is the second instance that ECAC has brought a statement to the Council for approval. The first instance was regarding North Carolina State House Bill 2 (HB2). There may be more instances in our future where ECAC brings statements to Council for your consideration, and ECAC discussed the need to moderate the number of these statements in order to preserve the impact. However, the

20

concern that ECAC has regarding the Executive Order on Immigration rises above the bar and ECAC posits that this merits a statement by our Council. I would like to thank Andrew Janiak, Professor of Philosophy and member of ECAC, for his work in formulating the statement for the Council, which he will now present to you.

**Andrew Janiak (Philosophy / Member of ECAC):** I'd be shocked if you need any long introduction to this issue. But I will say a couple things that might not be obvious. First of all, I read a lot of statements that other faculties have issued, faculty senates around the country. One does get the impression that, because of the repetition of certain phrases, they may or may not have read the executive order. They were relying on news reports. So this one is actually crafted based on a reading of the order itself. I don't know if any of you have taken the time to do that. I'm not an attorney but I did my best to understand it. One thing that I'll point out is that section 5(b) is especially pertinent to determining whether you think it's a functional equivalent of a religious-based test and, in particular, in sections 5(e) and 5(f), the order goes back to 5(b) and says "The President directs the Secretary of State to report on the progress that we are making in allowing religious minorities in, despite the rest of the order." So a major emphasis of the executive order, which may or may not be obvious to you from the news reports. As you can see, it's relatively straightforward. We tried to keep it as brief as we could. I'm sure some of you would like to see a more extensive, more confrontational approach. Others may like to see a less confrontational approach. We tried to find some middle ground. I don't

know whether we've achieved that, you'll let us know. The last thing I'll say is that we tried to focus in particular on the aspects of university life that could be harmed by this order. The prevention of the free exchange of people and ideas that are obviously at the heart of a large research university like Duke. With that, I think we can just open it for thoughts.

**Jokerst:** Questions? Discussion?

**Janiak:** Maybe I'll add one last point, which is, we thought of course we only get to meet once a month, and for this to be timely, we had to try to get it into today's agenda. No one knows what will be going on in March.

**Brodhead:** If I could just say something that might interest people. The university has been called on and has felt itself called on to make a variety of statements on a variety of issues these last many months. I was very struck by a phrase of Nan's, which is, the need to moderate these things in number to preserve their impact. If a university issues a statement every day or every hour, it seems to me the only effect is to have all of them cancel all of the other ones out and in some sense being in danger of letting someone else be the puppeteer in determining your emotions. Nevertheless, there are some of them that do so fundamentally go to values, not just of culture but of the university, that there are several we have made statements on. When I read this, I was struck by the singling out of 5(b), which hasn't been in the university statements, but otherwise I regarded this as completely consonant with the statement we've signed, for instance, last week, together with other schools in our association of universities, and specifically with the amicus brief that I

21

know you all had a chance to look at that the university signed on to that was on the Duke website on Monday.

**Jim Smith (Fuqua School of Business):** I have a question or comment about the last sentence. I wonder if that's the right thing to ask for in the end, to urge the rescinding of the executive order. My understanding is that the Trump administration intends to rescind the order and replace it with something that has the same intent but is more legally well thought out and founded. So rescinding it may be not what we want. I would like to see the statement end on something more positive, that we urge the President to rescind the order and respect the values that are expressed a little higher up in the statement, namely the ideals of religious tolerance and supporting the free exchange of students, faculty and other scholars across international boundaries. I would also maybe ask for Congress to help as well, that is, end by urging the President and Congress to respect these positive values. We should emphasize the positive aspects because they could rescind the order and then implement something that would be worse for us.

**Janiak:** I take that to be a friendly amendment, which we can adopt if others agree.

**Jokerst:** A friendly amendment has been proposed. Is there a motion to accept the friendly amendment?

**Speaker:** So moved.

**Jokerst:** Is there a second?

**Speaker:** Second.

**Jokerst:** All voting to approve the inclusion of the friendly amendment, please say aye.

*(Friendly amendment approved by voice vote with one abstention)*

We have a friendly amendment to revise the last sentence. And I think we understand the gist of what you propose and we've recorded it, so we'll get it right. Other discussion? Thank you, Andrew, we'll move to a vote.

*(Statement approved by voice vote without dissent)*

Thank you, the statement has been approved by the Council. Have a great afternoon. This concludes today's meeting. We meet next on March 23rd.