

**Minutes of the Meeting of the Academic Council held via Zoom
Thursday, February 17, 2022**

Erika Weinthal (Chair, Academic Council / Nicholas School of the Environment): We are going to start, even though there will still be people joining us -- I think the weather has many people outside enjoying it. So, welcome everyone, and thank you for being here today. We hope that this is going to be our last meeting on Zoom. Our plan is to return to in person meetings for the remainder of the semester.

Before we begin with our agenda items, I would like to acknowledge the passing of one of our esteemed colleagues: Walter Dellinger died yesterday. A faculty member who was in the Law School for over 40 years, I am sure that many of you are aware of his accomplishments beyond Duke and have likely read the tributes made in his honor since the announcement of his death yesterday. His accomplishments are far too numerous to enumerate here, and his service to our country on a number of legal fronts will serve generations to come. On behalf of the Duke faculty, I offer our condolences to his family and acknowledge his service and many accomplishments.

In terms of our agenda today, though we only have two items ECAC and I wanted to provide ample time for Q&A following both of these presentations. We intend to go to five o'clock today as our hope is that this will allow plenty of time for your questions after each presentation.

***APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE
JANUARY 20 ACADEMIC COUNCIL
MEETING***

Weinthal: We'll begin with the approval of the minutes from our last meeting on January 20th. The minutes were posted with our agenda. Are there any corrections to the minutes?

Hearing none and seeing no hands, and because we are on Zoom, we will consider the minutes approved.

Next, we'll turn to the first agenda item for today. This is a presentation regarding a proposal to establish a university wide Ombuds office that would serve not only the faculty and students, but for the first time offer the Ombuds as a resource to staff at Duke. Former Academic Council Chair Kerry Haynie and I were part of conversations and meetings that were held over the last few months that included our presenters today, the Provost, those in Student Affairs administration, the Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement, the Vice President for OIE, the Vice Dean for the Faculty in the School of Medicine, in addition to several others. This proposal has also had feedback from our two current Ombuds, Laura Svetkey, in the School of Medicine and Paul Manos from Biology. ECAC also considered the proposal and we were pleased that many of the recommendations that are included flow directly from the work of the Academic

Counsel's Diversity Task Force. This task force, that was established in 2014, conducted the bulk of its work over 2014 and 2015, and contained a subcommittee which expressly examined the role of the Ombuds. Those recommendations, which were from subcommittee 3, were reviewed by Executive Vice President Daniel Ennis and Associate General Counsel Neera Skurky and considered as part of the proposal you'll hear more about today. With that, I'm going to turn the screen over to Daniel and Neera to discuss the proposal and to answer your questions.

DRAFT PROPOSAL FOR A UNIVERSITY-WIDE OMBUDS OFFICE TO SERVE FACULTY, STAFF, AND STUDENTS

[Slides used in presentation](#)

Daniel Ennis (Executive Vice President): Great, thanks Erika. Wendy will be putting up the presentation. While she does that I just want to thank Erika and ECAC. We've had several conversations about this proposal and their guidance to me and to the team has been incredibly helpful.

I'll do the overview here while she gets the slides up. This topic actually came to me, and the reason I sort of took some point was, Kim Hewitt and conversations with staff through the anti-racism process had flagged that the Ombuds capability not being available to staff felt unfair and inequitable across our community. So, when I heard that feedback coming in I offered to take up the question with Kyle [Cavanaugh] and many others. You'll see the list of folks and Erika described it. As we went through the process we realized, of course, that the Diversity Task Force of the Academic Council had spent a lot of

time on this topic and had diagnosed similar questions about how the Ombuds was serving our faculty, as well as serving our students. So, we have dug into those recommendations that came from the Diversity Task Force and you saw those in the materials that Erika shared with you. The big overarching punch line is that we believe that the diagnostic work done by the Diversity Task Force was completely aligned with the work we had done as we considered the structure of this function. In large part, we are accepting of the recommendations that came out of the Diversity Task Force. We'll talk you through those just to remind you of that work and what that group came up with. But, that is the overarching message that we think that that group understood and diagnosed important issues the same that we were worrying about as we were looking at the function. That's in large part of the proposal that we're putting forward to you today, for your engagement and discussion.

So, this page shows you the folks that have been involved, as Erika said we also consulted with the current Ombuds and also have had conversations with prior Ombuds to inform this proposal. I just want to express a huge debt of gratitude to Neera who's been really driving a lot of this work in support of this entire team.

The topics today are why now, why are we bringing this forward, what are we proposing, in terms of reconstituting the function? A reminder of how the IOA defines the Ombuds function. I think that's quite important, and in truth, that informed a lot of what drove the task force on diversity's recommendations. Then, as we were going through this process, ECAC asked us to create a flow chart just for faculty to understand if you

have a differently constituted Ombuds function what are the total resources available to faculty as they navigate complicated issues in their departments in any form. So, we'll just talk you through, and remind you of that resource map.

So, just as a reminder, the findings of the Academic Council's Diversity Task Force were incredibly informative and it's just worth a quick skim through these. The first point is about clarity of the role and responsibility and confusion amongst our community. The second point is emphasizing the importance of the formal training associated with fulfilling the responsibilities of an Ombuds and that's where, in particular, it's important to reference the International Ombuds Association guidelines. We'll have a couple slides that speak to some of that. Third, is the systems in support of this function. There was a view that it was maybe more informal than it should be as a very important service and support mechanism for our faculty. So, there's this guidance identified by DTF [Diversity Task Force] about how that could be professionalized. And then the fourth finding was a question of diversity of options for faculty to consider for support. Those were the high-level findings. There was a lot more in terms of those reports, if you go back to them, that informed that summary list.

In addition, and this is actually where this group came into this, as I noted, we came at this first from the view of our staff expressing concerns about lack of access. Through that process, as we discussed the role, we talked to the current Ombuds, evaluated the history and the performance of this function - I think there is a uniform view that lack of clarity

and confusion about role and responsibility has been a challenge for this function, and I think that the faculty Ombuds themselves would be the first to describe how that's been complicated for them to navigate. Then the third, is when you have clarity confusion about the role and responsibility in a role as sensitive as this, you obviously have the potential to create risk for the institution in the conduct of the function. So, this is a much tighter summary of the recommendations that came from the Diversity Task Force that Erika and Sandra sent you, but the messages were clarify the role, bring more understanding about the function - and there they described best practices of other universities that we would strongly agree with - consolidate the function into a sort of centralized capability that would lend itself to some more professionalism system building reinforcement. I'll talk about that more in a second. The fourth point just reinforces that building more systems around this function.

So, this is what we are proposing to you all and really looking forward to your feedback. The first is that we would go ahead and create a professional dedicated Ombuds office that will serve all faculty, students, and staff of the university. We spent a fair bit of time with the Health System, and they will not be moving forward at this point with building out this function. It's just different and more complicated in the healthcare delivery environment. We would propose to recruit two Ombuds. One would be dedicated to staff and faculty. A second, which the recruitment is already underway and is being conducted as if this proposal were moving forward. Meaning, the job description talks about being part of a central Ombuds function. So, there's a student Ombuds proposed

and there's three finalists in that process. It's really interesting to see the profiles of those finalists - their outstanding backgrounds as Ombuds, as well as deep experience in student affairs connected functions. Third recommendation, and this is something ECAC felt strongly about and was recommended by the Diversity Task Force, that we assure that faculty and other constituents in the office can find a connection point in that office that feels comfortable and accessible. So, for the moment, we think that the faculty and student Ombuds can support and reinforce each other. But, if we find that this proposal needs more, by way of an additional Ombuds, we're prepared to do that. We will provide the appropriate administrative support so that the systems can be built, etc. Then the regular reporting, this was quite important through the recommendations of the Diversity Task Force, that the Ombuds have the great benefit and privilege of being made aware of complicated and potentially challenging areas around the university. And that those learnings on a deidentified, completely anonymous, confidential basis should be synthesized to inform Academic Council, ECAC, and university leadership. So, that's part of the proposal.

Then to the extent that there's comfort with moving forward, or when/if there is, ECAC thought, and we shared this, that it may require amendments to Appendix N of the Faculty Handbook. So, we would come back to you at that point.

Just as a reminder and the Diversity Task Force really leaned on this, the International Ombuds Association is very clear about the role. Its independence is vital, its responsibilities as relates to neutrality is vital, and its effectiveness

and confidentiality. So, that's the code of ethics and then there's a standard of practice, reinforcing the same messages, in terms of independence. That the Ombuds does not become an advocate, and further elaboration.

Trina I'll just finish this next slide and then come back to you. I see your hand.

This is just a little bit of the flow chart that ECAC thought would be helpful for our faculty to see. Which is to say the Ombuds is a vital resource, but will be fulfilling its function in a different way than it has historically in alignment with those recommendations and best practices, as we understand it from other institutions. But, there are other avenues by which faculty can and hopefully would seek support outside of their schools, outside of the classic and traditional departmental and school faculty affairs structures. So, Abbas has been intimately involved in this proposal and understands his office plays a vital role. There's the anonymous capability through the Speak Up line, and then obviously there's much more formal mechanisms below, in terms of OIE, and Internal Audit and even the Police, you know, in worst case scenarios. So, that's the summary and I'm happy to take questions and engage.

Weinthal: Thank you, Daniel. If you're comfortable fielding questions I will let you do that, if not, I can also help. But, as you said, Trina I will let you ask the first question and acknowledge that you were one of the co-chairs of the Diversity Task Force and thank you for your work.

Trina Jones (Law School): Thank you so much. As Erika just said, I co-chaired the Diversity Task Force with Nan Jokerst in 2014 and 2015. After that there was a

yearlong implementation committee that Sally constituted that also considered this role. Then in 2017 and 2018 while I was on ECAC with Emily Klein, we spent quite a bit of time looking at Appendix N and the faculty Ombuds position. So, there's been many years of research that has gone into this particular position. Daniel, thank you for your excellent overview, I'm very excited by the fact that the university is going to create an Ombuds office, which is something that we had recommended at the time. I think it may be similar structured to what UNC already has in place and has had in place for some time. I'm a little curious about the effects of this new office on the faculty Ombuds position, which is a position that we spent quite a bit of time considering. In the DTF recommendations we actually asked for two faculty Ombuds, because of the varying demographics among the faculty. We thought that it would be important for faculty to be able to access two different individuals, because we learned that there was some hesitation amongst some subgroups of faculty in terms of approaching one Ombuds because of that person's demographic, characteristics, or their reputation. So, it looks like this proposal might actually decrease that even further if there's going to be one Ombuds that will be shared by faculty and staff. I also just want to build upon that observation. This is based upon my anecdotal exchanges with my colleague Tom Metzloff, who was the past Ombuds before Paul assumed the position. To be sure, he was taking up cases from the Medical Center, but he said that there was quite a bit of work involved in just servicing faculty. Especially, when you put in the Health System. So, I'm really curious about this shared responsibility. One person for both staff, who have

overlapping concerns with faculty, but also their unique set of concerns.

That's my first question, the second question relates to Appendix N. We spent a year incorporating all of the recommendations that were made by the Diversity Task Force into Appendix N to address all of the issues that you had on your bullets. What is the role of the Ombuds, what sorts of training do we expect an Ombuds to have, what sorts of documentation do we need to make sure that there was accountability, and how the Ombuds fits with other entities on campus? So, I guess my question is, what further revisions to Appendix N do you anticipate because the faculty carefully considered those revisions in 2017 and 2018? We ran them by General Counsel Pam Bernard and Richard Riddell in the President's Office, and the Academic Council, who after a number of conversations, approved them. So, I think we've done the heavy lifting with regard to the faculty Ombuds. So, what do you anticipate doing with regards to this position as we move forward in the near future? Thank you so much.

Ennis: Thanks Trina. Thanks for your leadership. That report was incredibly well done and important and it's quite instructive for a newcomer to the institution, so thank you. I think the first thing to say about capacity, recognizing the recommendations from the Diversity Task Force is that there is a reenvisioning of the role. In terms of understanding how the Ombuds function is more classically delivered and executed on when you spend time connected to the guidance created by the IOA, and when you spend time with what transpires at our peers, and when you compare to what has been done historically. The Ombuds

has played a very active role. I mean, to the point of case management, active mediation, intermediation. That is not the norm for what an Ombuds is expected to do or is chartered to do under the IOA. So, a little bit as it relates to the question of what's the right staffing. We just had the view we needed to find this professional dedicated Ombuds and let that person figure out in the more traditional delivery of Ombuds services what will make the most sense for this office. We just didn't want to prejudge it, pending the process of discovery and a person coming in to fulfill the function. When we talk about the student Ombuds, we consider this to be an office that would be able to be reinforcing of each other, the two professionals, the faculty and staff Ombuds and the student Ombuds. We would expect that they could be in the client service mode across the population in the community, where and how that could be helpful and appropriate. We want the office to have the ability to reinforce and provide some redundancy. In some respects, we're starting with at least two.

By the way, I should make this clear, there is a student Ombuds in the School of Medicine which we will be working with and chart into the structure over time. That's a function that's been in existence and is well respected. We're just working with that person.

ECAC was very clear that we've understood the commitment and the interest in having two faculty and staff Ombuds and we're prepared to appoint two. But, we're just letting the new Ombuds - the leader of this office come in, get it up and running, and make recommendations to us on how best to fulfill the function as that person gets up

to speed. So, nothing's off the table, we're just taking this one step at a time here with regards to structure and capacity.

I don't have the history on Appendix N in terms of what you described, Trina, in that process. But, as we reviewed in relation to what we are proposing here, we definitely were of the view that there were amendments needed. So, Neera I don't know if you want to jump in here to respond to that question specifically.

Neera Skurky (Associate General Counsel): Sure. Hi Trina. You're right that the spirit of the DTF recommendations are pretty much already captured in Appendix N. I started to look at it. I think they'll just be technical corrections, like associating faculty Ombuds to say university Ombuds. To reflect the appointment not being part time or part of someone else's portfolio, but to be dedicated to someone who does this work full time. I also think that there's just a few like minor changes about confidentiality to make it more robust. There have been some changes to the Clery Handbook that would actually allow this to be entirely confidential. This role would not have to be a campus security authority under the Clery Act. That change must have occurred since Appendix N was last updated. So, if anything I think they're minor but just to be consistent with how this new office is going to be structured, those are the changes I think that we have in mind.

Weinthal: That is my understanding too having looked at Appendix N. That it is not a rewrite in any way.

Kerry Haynie (Political Science and African and African-American Studies): As Daniel and Erika indicated, I sat on this

committee, this was happening during the transition of ending my term and Erika beginning hers as Academic Council Chair. ECAC had discussed this during my time as well. There's a bit of background that I think is important to note here. In one of these meetings we had, Sandra Walton's owed a great deal of gratitude. Sandra went and dug out the minutes of a faculty meeting, an Academic Council meeting, 40 years ago in which the Ombuds office was created or at least recommended. What we discovered in reading the minutes, is that what the faculty wanted and created was misnamed as an Ombuds. Maybe what an Ombuds does has changed since that time. If you look at those minutes it is not in compliance with what the International Organization guidelines are about an Ombuds. And Trina, this may respond to your question about advocacy. So, it becomes less important to have the diversity that we talked about on that task force, if you look at the role of the Ombuds. It's not to advocate and didn't bother to speak to direct traffic as to where you go. And so it may make it less important to have that diversity if you think of it not as the role that the Ombuds had been planned to date - where they did do some advocacy and people wouldn't say things. As I understand what the rules required an Ombuds to do is to stay neutral and make you aware of what resources are available to you, and then direct you to those resources. So, that background was important that the faculty wanted something and voted for something called it, maybe misnamed it as an Ombuds. Now there is still a question of would we want a faculty advocate which would be separate from this proposal? But, they'd be someone that faculty can turn to as an advocate in some capacity. But, it's certainly not the

Ombuds given the international guidelines.

Weinthal: Thank you Kerry. That is very helpful background.

Harvey Cohen (Clinical Sciences):

Thanks. Actually, my question follows directly on Kerry's. Having sat through some part of that history, actually a fair amount, my question was going to be, what is it that the Ombuds has been doing for the past few years? Because at the time of the change in the actual person who is the Ombuds, as I recall a number of things were added into that role, some of that having to do with training and a variety of things. I'm curious to know what it is you're thinking, the Ombuds won't do, more specifically than what they are doing now? My recollection is similar to Kerry's that at the beginning this was supposed to be a person who could hear out the faculty member who might have a concern, even a dispute or whatever, and help advise them on what they could do. And that's kind of an advocacy role. And, if it's not going to be that then it's not clear to me what it will be.

The other thing that relates to, is when you show that organizational chart and the things down at the bottom. The thing that wasn't there, which I think is often been the next step from the Ombuds is the Faculty Hearing Committee. Because when I was on the Faculty Hearing Committee virtually every person that reached that level had been to the Ombuds. Whatever it was they were seeking couldn't be solved there. There were other things that were solved, but those couldn't get solved and so off they came to the Faculty Hearing Committee. So, I would have thought that would be in

that resources list; if you're going to have one. Anyway, I'd be interested on your thoughts on that.

Ennis: Thanks Harvey. I think the biggest difference in terms of what I've understood about how the function has been delivered, really relates to the role as mediator. It's one thing to be of counsel, to support and advise in that confidential neutral setting. But, in order to fulfill your responsibilities with regards to neutrality, that really limits any sense of case management and going intermediate in discussions and trying to proactively bring the Ombuds hat and solves the problem. And the way I think about it as an Ombuds, the other side of that negotiation could be your client tomorrow, and you have a responsibility to support that member of our community in the same neutral confidential way. In that moment of becoming a part of intermediation/mediation conflicts with what the Ombuds association, the practice of Ombuds role and responsibility is. It's a more delimited role than I think has been the practice as I've understood it.

Cohen: If I could just add - mediation is, by nature, a neutral process is it not?

Ennis: Yeah, I think the question is the way in which mediation gets structured and supported. I think the view in terms of the study of the Ombuds function and the expectations is that that isn't sort of a traditional role of an Ombuds in terms of the role in place. I mean mediation is neutral and there's mediation capability and services to be considered. But, it's that the Ombuds isn't fulfilling that responsibility, or playing that role.

Nan Jokerst (Pratt School of Engineering): Great to see everybody here and thank you Daniel for the conversation.

I have a few questions - first of all, there was a comment in there, that I didn't quite understand about the Health System. Right now, my understanding is the Ombuds does accept inquiries and does help faculty from the Health System. So, I'd be concerned about leaving them just out of it. The second question I have, is that the Ombuds in the past has often been a faculty member or a former faculty member. So, they bring a perspective of lived experience of a faculty member, which I think is important to the role. And if the Ombuds will serve, and I think it's great to have a staff Ombuds, by the way, if the new envisioning of the Ombuds will satisfy both faculty and staff concerns, it might be wise to have someone who has lived experience associated with a staff position as well. Working with staff and faculty in the position I have now, I will say that the concerns can be quite different, and I will echo some of the previous comments. I do think, and I once again, from experience, feel that someone who is approachable and might have a similar lived experience to those who have concerns. It is simply easier to go to that person and discuss what can be very painful experiences in confidence.

The last thing I'd like to ask about - sorry for having so many questions - is that what is the reporting structure? Because the independence of the Ombuds is very important, and I saw a skinny arrow going to OFA. In the past, the reporting has been, as indicated in your slides, to ECAC and to the President at a very high level, and so I was wondering about that skinny arrow to OFA, and what the

meaning of that was. Thank you so much for your attention to the Ombuds, it's really important, and thank you.

Ennis: Thanks Nan. Starting with the last question - reporting relationship. That was more that the Ombuds could refer over to the Faculty Advancement Office as appropriate. It wasn't meant to suggest a reporting relationship. The proposal would have the report be to the President as an organizational matter. But, then have significant responsibilities for reporting to Academic Council, ECAC, and university leadership in that confidential deidentified way with regards to issues of concern that need to be addressed. Sort of more systemic issues that they are identifying for the benefit of informing leadership, decision making, and action.

The Health System - just to be clear, this encompasses our School of Medicine faculty, our School of Medicine trainees, doctoral students, you know, this is not excluding that. So, when I was talking about Duke University Health System, I'm talking about employees of the Health System. Nursing staff, that part of the clinical delivery mechanism, but not in any way to exclude faculty, students, or staff within the School of Medicine or School of Nursing. They would still be connected to this capacity.

Two different questions you had. One, which we feel strongly about is the connection to the academy, and the sense of understanding what the faculty members life is like in some of the asymmetrical power relationships and all this, which is so much where an Ombuds is going to play a role. So, there will be a very high premium on that experience. I think when we honestly actively debated this in terms of considering a job

description, should it be geared exclusively to faculty members who now make their vocation as Ombuds, or would we consider professional Ombuds who've grown up in the academy or in a similar setting? We wanted to open it up more, but recognize the importance of the ability to connect to understand the nature of faculty life, you know, the complexities of faculty life. It will be a process and we will have faculty through ECAC intensely involved in the search.

The lived experience point is really an important point. And, it goes back to Trina's point. We're not prejudging the structure of the office. It could be that the person who comes in to build this and lead this function will think I need a staff focused Ombuds, I need another faculty Ombuds. And what we said to ECAC is we're going to be supportive and invest at their direction. So, I do believe that the nature of the services that it will deliver are substantially different than what we kind of have seen. It's just a little hard to predict what the capacity will be, what the case management needs will be, what the lived experience needs will be. So, it's just leaving it to the new person to fulfill it and be responsive to the concerns being raised by you and others.

Weinthal: So, I'm going to take the next two questions, Lee and Josh, and group them. Have them both ask their questions, then have you respond, Daniel and Neera. So, then we can transition to our next presentation, so we have enough time for Q&A there to.

Lee Baker (Cultural Anthropology): My question is sort of on ratios. I mean if we have something like 5,000 faculty members, we're adding eight times, 40,000 staff members. How are we

figuring in terms of overall numbers? I also really think that we need Ombuds people that really understand the student life, really understand the faculty life. And then with the staff, there's so many different staff positions. I mean a clinical person and a cafeteria worker have really different issues. I just hope that we have the capacity to have an Ombuds person that has both expertise, empathy, and just sort of can see it through their eyes. I think that's one of the most important aspects of the Ombuds.

Joshua Socolar (Physics): I just wanted to follow up and maybe emphasize a point that was a subtext in Trina's and Kerry's and Nan's and Harvey's comments. It's about advocacy. When the DTF was doing its work, we were reimagining what the Ombuds position might be in the context of a much broader reimagination of how faculty would pursue complaints or perceptions of unfair treatment. At that time, there was no such thing as the Office of Faculty Advancement. We were imagining that that office might serve more of an advocacy role for faculty so that some of the things that our current Ombuds does, that look more like advocacy, would have a home in another office. I would just like to urge everybody involved here to think about how that office can play that role well, in addition to all the other things that it is doing.

Weinthal: Okay, we have lots of hands with this. Daniel do you want to respond to any of this? Otherwise we have Harvey, Sally, and Joli [Olcott] and then we're going to stop.

Sally Kornbluth (Provost): You know Erika, I just actually have a comment in response to Josh's comment. If Daniel doesn't mind me jumping in with it. Josh,

you're absolutely right that a piece of the faculty advocacy goal lives in that Office of Faculty Advancement. One thing I'll say about it, I know that Abbas is putting together information for ECAC. I think a lot of this goes on, but it's sort of under the radar and a lot of it is confidential. A lot of it is faculty coming to consult with Abbas, working directly with Deans, working directly with Chairs, etc. I think a lot of that activity has been going on under the auspices of the Office of Faculty Advancement and a lot of it is not captured. So, you know, captured visibly to the community. So, I think we have to think about exactly what is being done, and then analyze if there is still any gap there and then place it appropriately not within the Ombuds role.

Weinthal: Thanks Sally. So, Jolie since you haven't asked a question or made a comment.

Jocelyn Olcott (History; International Comparative Studies; and Gender, Sexuality, and Feminist Studies): It's just a very quick one. Which is, and maybe this is Trinity specific, but with regard to the Ombuds and staff considerations - which I think it's actually fantastic - what this would be vis a vis any role that the HR office would play? Which also seems to have some folks who try to adjudicate conflicts for staff. That's all, thank you.

Weinthal: Harvey, do you want the last word? And then I'll let Daniel...

Cohen: I just wanted to point out that a few years ago it was decided that because the issues for School of Medicine faculty were often so different than the rest of the faculty, many who do clinical research and education, that it was advised that a separate Ombuds be set up. And in 2019

that was done. There is a School of Medicine faculty Ombuds in addition to a School of Medicine student Ombuds. So, I'm assuming that people from School of Medicine now are going to that Ombuds.

Ennis: That's right. I mean we have two part time faculty fulfilling the responsibilities. School of Medicine side and Campus side. And this relates, I think, to Lee's question about capacity. It took two different questions - one was just ratios and case management and making sure this is responsive to our community. But, then the lived experience point. You know, we are building out full time capacity here, as opposed to part time. We're proposing that these are folks who, this is what they do for a living. And so, we hope that adds capacity. And we have said, meaning you know, compared to where we are today that that actually is an increment to the existing capacity, against the volumes you're describing in terms of case ratios. We're just very clear about being flexible and responsive on both dimensions. That the proposal would be to give the leader the room to assure responsiveness to lived experience and diverse backgrounds and experiences that would resonate to members of our community. But, also to assure that populations are served. I do think Neera, it might be just good for you to describe UNC, which has obviously a very large population of faculty, students, and staff and how they staff their office just to compare.

Neera Skurky (Associate General Counsel): Sure, before I came to Duke I was at UNC and we had one full time Ombuds person and a second part time Ombuds person. That individual served the whole university. He was available to faculty, staff, and students. His name was

Wayne Blair, he's a professional Ombuds. And he was, I think, accessible to leadership, to faculty, to department chairs. He's worked closely with department chairs. But also, housekeepers. We had a huge Burmese housekeeper population and he was able to connect with them. This role I've seen it done with the right person who has the right mindset and approachability. He was able to serve the entire university community. He did have a second person who was a faculty member out of the School of Government who helped part time for a while. But, on the other hand, an excellent team. The office has now since turned over, but I have seen it work. And I think the key for this to be successful, is to find the right person for Duke, who knows how to connect with our community, and I think one person could be an accessible and approachable resource for everyone.

Ennis: Thanks, Neera. Now we can see to the HR question. We need the same flow chart for our staff about where the Ombuds role fits vis a vis the HR resources, and we need the same thing for students. We were, obviously, focused on our faculty in the context of the changes that are being proposed here for our faculty. But, absolutely need to detail that in a similar way. Josh, I appreciate your feedback on this and that advocacy role. What we recognize in bringing this proposal, we were very worried about the sense of faculty losing a place where they've been benefited from some advocacy and wanting to address that. And I think Sally and Abbas are very attentive to that concern and question in the context of the Office of Faculty Advancement. Not to mention, all the faculty affairs team building that exists in schools and departments as well.

Weinthal: Okay, with that thank you, Daniel, thank you Neera, for bringing this proposal to Academic Council for a revised Ombuds office. I want to thank everyone for these very helpful, useful, insightful comments that I hope Daniel and Neera, you'll be able to use in moving forward and the recognition on the part of the faculty for the importance of having a very robust Ombuds office at Duke. I see this conversation ongoing with taking into account much of this feedback that we received today. So, thank you everyone.

THE 2030 WORKING GROUPS AND OUTCOMES

[Slides used in presentation](#)

Weinthal: Now we're going to turn to our last presentation, which relates to the outcomes from the 2030 working group. This was a group which was convened by Provost Kornbluth roughly a year ago, or so. Some of you on this meeting have been members of one of the various subcommittees that were part of the working group meetings and conversations. I am just going to let Provost Kornbluth introduce the work that has been ongoing and some of the preliminary outcomes.

Sally Kornbluth (Provost): Thanks very much Erika. Laura Brinn will be running the slides for me. As Erika just said, I've been asked to share an update with you on the work of the 2030 teams. If you can remember all the way back to April 2020. You may recall that Vince [President Price] put two advisory groups into place. One was called team 2021, that was focused on navigating the pandemic. I think they did a great job and hopefully

we're tailing off here. The second was strategy team 2030. They really had two missions. One was to deal with long standing financial issues and to identify cost savings to help the university weather financial effects of the pandemic. I will not be detailing those today. I believe many of you have encountered those changes locally, and you're well familiar with the maneuvers we took, some of which we were able to reverse, in order to weather that storm. The second prong of the 2030 effort was much more aspirational. The real question we asked ourselves was where do we want to be in 2030? And what do we want our university to look like and how do we get there with action starting right now?

So, what was the process and who participated? In the first phase of the work there were really two committees. One was all of the Deans, me, Tallman Trask, who was then in the job Daniel now holds, Mike Schoenfeld, and Gene Washington, as well as Kerry Haynie, who was then Academic Council Chair and Peter Feaver, who chaired a parallel faculty committee, shown here, whose ideas were funneled into the Deans discussion. Which, as I mentioned, also included Peter and Kerry. So, the overall effort was co-chaired by me and Noah Pickus, who is here today, but is now the Chief Academic Officer at Minerva, but he's here, he can hopefully help me field some questions.

We spent considerable time on understanding the broader landscape of higher education, as well as formulating some Duke specific concerns and broader ideas. We then moved to a more focused stage, and I'm sorry that's a little hard to read, but with working groups that partially overlapped with the first group.

With a number of faculty and administrative additions. These groups focused on the topics shown here. New modes of research collaboration, renewing a Duke education, reimagining shared governance, and refreshing financial structures.

So, what did these groups do? The 2030 process was never meant to be a strategic planning process. As you know, Duke continues to operate under two strategic plans. One is called Together Duke on the campus side, and one is called Advancing Duke Health, which is on the Duke health side. There's also an overarching presidential strategic framework Towards Our Second Century. So, what was 2030? It's really been a process of engaging deeply with the changing landscape of higher education to identify opportunities to build our core identity, refine and invest in areas that we're strong, address problems that put us at a competitive disadvantage, and craft a vision for what might be distinctive about Duke by 2030.

The group discussed, and you know you've got a lot of different people with a lot of different opinions, but one thing we determined rather early on in the process is that we're already doing many of the things that will distinguish the Duke of 2030 in both the undergraduate education and research realms. We also concluded that our greatest opportunity is in leaning into the things that have the most potential to make Duke distinctive. As the place where faculty want to conduct high impact scholarship and where students know that they'll have a truly transformative educational experience. Although, their support for certain research areas that I've spoken about previously at many campus venues,

for instance, climate change, areas designated in the Duke science and technology funding. The 2030 group really had no appetite for kind of Manhattan project style, top down focusing of our research on one or two research areas. We just have too many faculty doing trailblazing research and we want to continue to encourage that.

Given our time constraints, I can only touch on some of the key recommendations today. I'm very happy to provide a high-level review of the working groups recommendations, and the report will be available. We can make the whole report available to those who are interested, through the Academic Council.

Let's talk about education a little bit. So, the education realm that the committee focused primarily on was undergraduate education. And you know, the university takes a far more decentralized approach to graduate and professional education. Duke offers nearly 150 graduate or professional degree programs, and each one of those is governed in large measure by the faculty, as you know, within each unit or school offering the program. So, much of this lies within the domain of the schools and the departments. Plus, it would be very difficult to make one size fits all recommendations in this space. The 2030 education working group was charged really with tuning Dukes educational undergraduate education model to three things. The changing needs of young adults, the evolving ecology of the residential and online education, and competitive pressures among peers to deliver the highest quality of education. We all want our students to experience a powerful and coherent set of learning opportunities that allow them to

discover their deepest purposes. So, how do we do this? There were really three levels of change in support of the vision. The first was to make a more coherent and powerful learning journey possible with a special focus on more firmly building research into our student experience -- leveraging the strengths of an R1 university. This is what distinguishes Duke from a Williams, an Amherst, a Wesleyan. We have a big research operation, and we want our students to participate. The second was attracting and retaining top faculty teachers by incentivizing innovative pedagogy and high touch teaching and mentoring. And the last was reimagining structures and systems to enhance flexibility and integration. So, what does that actually mean? Let's look a little more closely.

Undergraduates arrive at Duke. We hope they want to grow intellectually and personally. But you know, one of the reasons they've gotten here is because they do so well at everything and many experienced pressures that lead to like complete risk aversion and sort of a checklist approach to learning. You know, "I've done one of these and two of these." Some of our students are doing too much, some of them are doing it too quickly, some of it never synthesizes. It's a little incoherent and it leaves the total experience less than it could have been. So, we want to create a learning experience where all of our students have opportunity to engage in deep moments of discovery and to integrate their curricular and their co-curricular experiences. There really should be some sort of overarching sequence of learning. It doesn't mean it's identical for every student, but we want, in the first year, to have some sort of welcoming invitation to

deep inquiry and discovery. Such as, students really experienced through the Focus Program. As well, we're starting these university 101 courses that introduce essential aspects of Duke learning to as many students as possible. The first one on race, under the direction of Kerry Haynie, has been quite successful. In the second or third year, we want some kind of immersive and intellectually disruptive learning experience that's really connected to scholarly engagement. We have the Marine Lab, we have Duke Immerse, we have Data Plus, we have past connections, we have a lot of offerings that sit around the curriculum. The question is how do we really integrate them? Then we really want every senior to have some kind of culminating experience or integrative capstone. Now, I'm not saying every student should do an honors thesis. It could be an honors thesis, it could be a capstone project, it could be a capstone course, just some way to actually draw together their whole educational experiences. I should say that we are now launching a new effort to design a new undergraduate curriculum for Duke. This is a university committee that's going to be chaired by Scott Huettel. These recommendations are meant really to just have informed they're thinking. It also lays in the departments as well, in terms of how they think about their majors, etc.

The second lever of change the working group identified is really the critical role of faculty engagement in the undergraduate educational experience. It's a little difficult to incentivize teaching excellence and some of our professional school faculty really like teaching undergraduates, but find it fiscally and administratively difficult to teach or mentor undergraduate students. The

group set out to identify sustainable structures and pedagogical tools from faculty for all schools to deepen their engagement with undergraduates. We want to think, and this is a big endeavor you know, this is not an immediate thing. We want to support more high touch learning, mentoring, and research by reimagining contracts, compensations, and requirements for promotion across employment ranks, divisions, and schools. We also really want to enable deeper collaborations between professional school faculty and students across Duke. So, one idea would be to institute some sort of rotating undergraduate teaching designation that would be available for those who are interested, graduate and professional school faculty. Creating a cohort of some sort of cross university faculty devoted to new forms of teaching and learning.

So, over the past two years, our students, faculty, and staff have all experienced rapid shifts in learning modalities. You all know this from teaching during the pandemic. We've had altered calendars and schedules, even the places where we live and learn. As we begin to emerge from the chaos of the pandemic we now have the opportunity to intentionally rethink the systems and structures. These might include things like imagining new possibilities for the academic calendar that can accommodate different durations of learning experience. For instance, some courses might benefit from deeper, more frequent class time and be offered in 8-week modules within a standard 15-week semester. We could reconsider the academic calendar to make more efficient use of our physical plant. The pandemic has also eliminated the limitations and the possibilities for high quality online hybrid learning. And the rapidity with

which our peers are also experimenting in this domain. So, the committee has recommended that we should build on this experience by looking for ways to increase flexibility in completing a Duke undergraduate degree. How do we offer courses in hybrid format more frequently? Should we explore stackable online learning experiences? That can also take a Duke education beyond our own campus. This includes obviously alumni education. All these recommendations take into account Duke's existing strengths and culture as an R1 liberal arts university. We really wanted to just set it on a trajectory that will continue upward and establish a more robust culture of innovative and meaningful learning among students and faculty. We're going to need a bit of an experimental approach in which faculty and students conceive, build, test out the best way to achieve these larger goals.

Now, as I mentioned earlier, there's a lot of heterogeneity across our graduate and professional students' programs. You know we have a masters in Divinity, a PhD in Physics, a JD in Law. These are all quite different and distinctive in their intellectual objectives and relationship to career trajectory. But nonetheless 60% of our students are now either graduate or professional students and we need to give them attention as well. Even with the more substantial faculty engagement we forecast, the vision we have just shared for undergraduate education will surely depend on heightened participation by graduate and professional students as mentors, as colleagues, and of course graduate students are also playing a crucial role in our research enterprise.

So, many of you are familiar, and we don't have time to go into it today with the

[RIDE report](#), Reimagining Doctoral Education. This really involved fostering the development of professional skills to experiential learning opportunities, expanding opportunities for graduate and professional students to connect and engage intellectually across program and school boundaries. So, we're going to keep working on that. We are working very hard, and this is critical, I think, for Duke of 2030 to accelerate the diversification of student cohorts in graduate and professional students and investing greater supports for students from underrepresented groups, as well as international students. Finally, we really need to achieve greater consistency of excellence and advising for masters and PhD students. There's a lot to think about here, and you know we can't snap our fingers and make it happen, but those were the kind of overarching ideas in the education space.

So, if I turn your attention now briefly to the research working group. All of your research paves the way for the critical discoveries that we know from Duke. That enhance scholarship, that enhance public understanding, applications of knowledge at home and across the world. And the track record here in our research enterprise allows us to recruit world class faculty, build strategic partnerships, and really continue to secure the resources that propel new discoveries with impact. How do we continue to enjoy a conducive environment for such pathbreaking salient research? There's a lot of heterogeneity across the research. Again, we're not suggesting particular themes, but where we do have significant comparative advantage is in linking across modes of knowledge creation to create new interdisciplinary research avenues. The recommendations

presented here today will really focus on honing those strengths and leveraging them more effectively. I hasten to add, though, and I know this is always a concern when I talk about strengthening some of the interdisciplinary pathways. I want to ensure that the scholars that work in a strictly disciplinary or solitary mode can be highly successful, and I really do not see these goals as mutually exclusive. So, this working groups recommendations are careful to consider the increasingly complicated and rapidly evolving landscape in which research takes place at Duke. Complexity alongside cultural norms and expectations can lead to significant frustrations for faculty and I've heard them from many of you. It can even derail important research all together. What we want to do is develop a holistic system of research supports that will extend Duke's capacity to recruit and retain a world class faculty, embed those faculty in a thriving research ecosystem, and then celebrate and reward what we value. Where there's a lot of ideas here, but let me just talk a little bit about things we want to start now that will get us to where we want to be in 2030.

Obviously, recruitment and retention is incredibly important. Remember, you know, a long time ago now, when I was Vice Dean in the Medical School there was a proposal to essentially have like a second startup. In other words, allow folks who had just gotten tenure to get another startup which would be a reinvestment in mid-career to allow pursuit of new ideas. Given what the market has done I wish we had invested in that as an endowment at the time, but I think it had a really sound basis which is, we know that the transition to the associate professor level can be an inflection point for faculty. Just as people

sort of begin to feel liberated in terms of really spreading their intellectual wings, there's a lot more service expectations, there's less guidance and mentoring often. And you know faculty can find it difficult at this stage. This can be a big blow to the institution where we've already really invested in their success. If someone's just gotten tenure we'll ought to want to continue to invest in them. We'd like to provide mid-career faculty with a range of supports. These are described much more extensively in the report. Some are competitive, some are available to all, to be more expansive and willing to take risks. We think that this approach will stand out, demonstrating Duke's distinctive investment and commitment to our faculty, and generate the kind of high-risk, high reward research that can really have transformative impact. I have to say, this is also a great recruiting tool. If you think you're going to get an investment when you get tenure, I think that's a great thing. We also recognize that faculty at all ranks may need significant research investment to pursue promising new areas. So, there was a recommendation to create a high dollar internal grant competition that would go to recently promoted faculty and then have other grants which were more broadly available. These grants might be applied to purchasing an expensive piece of equipment, allowing a scholar or a member of their teams to undertake extensive fieldwork, expand staff support for research project, etc. Finally, you know we really want to offer mentoring and coaching in a way that would be available to all regular rank faculty through a mix of one on one coaching programs providing structural support for career planning and development. Abbas, in the Office of Faculty Advancement is already piloting

to these programs that have been enormously successful. I think that we're going to really want to expand that.

The 2030 process also helped us articulate common challenges that you all face in doing your work. A really big one is the need to develop a centralized data sharing and data access infrastructure that spans the University and the School of Medicine. Expanding access to data science resources to all faculty and ensuring that we have adequate numbers of research staff who support data management and complex efforts. That's just in one slice of the university. There are many other infrastructural supports that the group spoke about. We need to develop the right infrastructure that have resources to support research. And the other thing is, we have to change the culture around research administration to one that fosters creativity in partnership with our scholars, in addition to ensuring integrity and compliance. We already have a lot of that, but if you haven't met our new VPRI Jenny Lodge, I strongly recommend doing so when you have the opportunity. She's invested in this vision and we look forward to working with her and her team to bring about this kind of change. This is an example where culture is critical to what we want to achieve, and we know faculty want to be where you can do your work without a huge amount of hassle. We want to have a structure and culture that allow you to flourish.

So, over the last quarter century Duke has established a strong reputation, as I mentioned, for interdisciplinarity. We have to work on the funding mechanisms that include the continued recruitment and retention of interdisciplinarity faculty. And the working group recommended a number of approaches

across this domain. But I have to say, all of this would require significant fundraising, so stay tuned. There's a lot more related points you can see when we post the 2030 report, things like internal MOU's to lower the barriers or rather reducing the number of internal MOU's, how we engage with external partners. We have a newly created office of external partnership for those of you who are interested in working with industry and other external entities. And then finally, I'll say, that we wanted Duke to develop new principles to support a more flexible allocation of space. Now I know from my days doing space allocation in the Medical School that space is more valuable to people than money. It's very tricky, but if we could really get a much better overall university space plan this would really help our research enterprise.

So, finally, let me just say, because I know we want to have some time for questions. The governance group which was chaired by Don Taylor, also a previous Academic Council Chair, recommended things like looking at all of our committees. Many of you are asked to serve on committees. Some of them are incredibly productive and important for the university, and some of them might be better utilized. We really need to look at the slate of opportunities. We want to look at revisions to the faculty handbook. Those are coming because that is a little bit unwieldy. But, we also want to think about faculty governance across the board. I mentioned an undergraduate curriculum committee, I think this is a huge step in order to start thinking about what a great curriculum that builds on the next stages after curriculum 2000 would be. And it will allow us to really take in the needs of all the undergraduate teaching schools. I'm excited about that.

And finally, our next steps will involve figuring out how we're going to finance all of these activities. So, philanthropy and external sponsored funding certainly have roles to play, and Daniel and his team are working hard with the 2030 finance group to see how we might find further internal resources or reorganize our existing resources.

Now I'll take comments, questions. Noah may wish to chime in on some. So floor is open and I'm sorry that was a very quick tour of many people's hours and hours of work, but as I said, you'll be able to read it and discuss it. And there's a lot to sift through with regard to what we would do to implement, which things we will actually do, which things we have money for, which things we need to raise money for, and also what's the near term and what's longer term.

Weinthal: We will start with Shai.

Shai Ginsburg (Asian and Middle Eastern Studies): Thank you so much for all the work, energy, and time you put into this. It is quite impressive. I don't know if it's the nature of your presentation or the nature of the report itself, but it seems to me to be geared more towards the sciences. So, I'm wondering, and again, this is my experience with Duke, is that it's very generous with monetary resources and very stingy with time. Especially in humanities, we don't need labs, we need time and yet Duke has a sabbatical policy for the humanities and qualitative social sciences, that is not on par with its peer institutes. It's very difficult to buy time in some of the mechanisms that other universities have to provide time to the faculty. Like an institute for humanities, actually do not function in the same way

at Duke. So, I'm wondering whether the committee discussed these issues.

Kornbluth: I think honestly, Shai, sorry if I always give - I guess I more naturally gravitate towards science examples, but rest assured that much conversation was had about humanities and social sciences, and the committee had strong voices in that realm as well. But I will say, the thing I skated through very quickly about reimagining how we do compensation, how we do contracts, how we arrange our time is a really important component of this. And not to get out over my skis too much here because I wouldn't want to be held to this. But, I'll just speculate and say, Duke has like 6,000 courses for undergraduates. And when we talk about how we want faculty to spend their time - if we want faculty to be doing more research, mentoring, having more time for their scholarship, having time to innovate and pedagogy maybe we have to think more flexibly about what teaching equivalence are, if you know what I mean. In other words, it's not everybody teaching the same number of courses in a department. It's looking at the faculty flexibly as a workforce that has to think about all different aspects of faculty life and how they spend their time. Can you imagine there being fewer courses and people spending more time on some of these other activities? We just have to figure out what that looks like and it's not trivial, don't get me wrong, but I hear you. I think that the conversation was not all about money, it was really about how we can reconfigure the way we spend our time, the way we have our calendars, and we're going to have to think about what the next phase of implementation looks like to be able to figure out detailed plans. This provided a kind of framework for it.

Mine Cetinkaya-Rundel (Statistical Science): Thank you for the presentation. Something that I thought was missing or at least I wish there was a bigger potential emphasis on is teaching spaces. I think that those haven't really improved in the one decade that I've been here and I'd really love to see that improved in the next decade. I think doing modern teaching is very difficult in some of our spaces. I think the pandemic has highlighted that a lot. I mean we've had to bring in things called Zoom carts, like this doesn't need to be the case right. But also, I think, even more importantly doing inclusive teaching is difficult in some of these spaces. I know that space is very expensive and reconfiguring things is hard but I think we have some classrooms where sometimes when I visit other universities I'm thinking "Wow we have a lot more resources at Duke. I would really love to see more of these." And, importantly, not just prototypes that are smaller classrooms but being able to innovate at a small scale, but also carry that to our 100-person, 200-person classes. As some of the teaching demands are increasing, like class sizes are increasing there's this give or take between modern and inclusive approaches and your classroom size. I'd love spaces that allow us to do better on both of those angles.

Kornbluth: First of all, I agree with you 100%. Second of all, this did come up in the conversation. Because of the need to compress the reporting on this I didn't really say anything about this, but we have definitely been having conversations about how we're going to modernize and upgrade our teaching spaces. I agree with you completely. Daniel, do you want to add anything about that?

Ennis: Just to say I agree strongly and we have our work cut out for us in this regard in all forms of teaching. More to come in terms of our fiscal planning.

Campbell Harvey (Fuqua School of Business): Thank you. I look forward to reading the details of the report. I'd like to follow up on a question that I asked a number of years ago about this effort and Tallman [Trask] answered the question. It had to do with the structural deficits that Duke University faces in many of our divisions. And I noticed that the first couple of bullet points of the charge for the 2030 initiative have to do with identifying priorities for financial resources and then also identifying situations where, basically, we need to rationalize. So, I'm wondering – I have two questions. Number one, I was told by Tallman [Trask] and the Council was told that the 2030 effort would deal with the structural deficits. So, should we expect that in the financial report, that is forthcoming, that we will basically make recommendations to undertake the tough decisions that have to be made to eliminate the structural deficits? And the second part is, when can we expect these recommendations?

Ennis: The structural deficit, sort of, framing is a little complicated, in terms of at what level we're speaking. What I would say is, there is as a matter of fact, at the university level that operating performance had deteriorated going into the pandemic and then obviously there was a serious pullback and dramatic moves made to address that crisis. As I've noted here and has allowed us to restore benefits, salaries, and things. We definitely feel healthier and stronger. And yet, there are, as for all major elite higher education academic medicine intensive

institutions, complexity in our financial model. So, I think the report and where that committee, that working group, has been focused is how do we build resilience into the financial model, how do we consider alternative revenue sources and be willing to understand values, brand, programmatic tradeoffs to be flexible for those opportunities. It seems clear that there's opportunities on cost, but that it's much more likely that we will have to find new sources of revenue and support for mission excellence. I don't find the structural deficit framing to be particularly constructive. It's also a factor when you think about deficits, are you at the university level or are you at the school level? Within the school, are you talking about the unrestricted problems or the aggregate? And I would generally, and you would see this with the work we'll show from that group, that's not the frame within which we will operate in terms of supporting the recommendations, the mission related recommendations of 2030.

Baker: Thank you. This is really exciting and Sally I really liked your vision of leveraging professional school faculty to teach in the undergraduate space, as well as being a little bit more inclusive with the undergraduate teaching units in the faculty governance or the governance over the curriculum. My question is, is this really a strategic direction and, by doing so, does it sort of take away from the engineering faculty governance and arts and sciences council? Or are they still going to be the people responsible for the curriculum? Then subsequently, I mean you could think big. Is there going to be a Duke degree opposed to Trinity degree that encompasses all of the other schools? What happens with Pratt then? Some of

those things. If this is strategic, that's great. What I hope it's not is just sort of undergraduate education creep. We're just accidentally moving in this direction.

Kornbluth: A couple things. One is the content of what people are teaching is not moving to some uber committee. I think this central committee really was to have the voices of, you know, Sanford and Nicholas in the room, and somewhat Pratt. But again, Pratt really has its own curriculum for a lot of different reasons, because of what engineering and comp education needs, but also their accreditation and everything else. No, it's more about really leveraging what's unique about Duke to the strength of the education. For example, we already have a lot of professional school faculty who participate in Bass Connections, or Duke Engage, etc. They're obviously wanting to engage in undergraduate interactions and activities, but they've all been decorated around the edges of the curriculum. Giving all of our undergraduates a more substantive engagement with these faculty who want to engage and bring different perspectives, is really what this is about. It's not a homogenization. It's not taking a Trinity education, out of the hands of Trinity. It's really thinking about how all this stuff that's going on can actually be incorporated in a more normative experience for our students. And, by the way, allow those faculty who were really enthusiastic about doing this, to participate.

Baker: Okay, thank you. That was great answer.

Kornbluth: Vince, did you want to make a comment?

Vince Price (President): Sure, just to follow up on that point. I mean the vision would be, in this network of fabulous Duke researchers and teachers, and I would add, by the way, in our alumni population we have a lot of resident expertise. How do we mobilize as much of that as we can to serve the needs of each student who comes through the university? As opposed to pocketing them in a program, department, or school. So, that's the vision. The challenge is how to build structures that make that viable, and possible. But, we have a sort of a mix and match challenge. That we have expertise in some parts of the university, you know inadequately leveraged really, to be mixed with and matched with the needs and interests, not just students, I would say, other faculty. So, that's the vision. And the challenge is to chart a series of practices, structures that lead us closer to realizing that vision. I think that we shouldn't overlook our alumni population in that conversation because they also bring a lot of value. But, we tend to think of them in pretty narrow terms, you know, career paths for students, as opposed to ways that you could animate what we do on the campus. I just wanted to add that.

Weinthal: I might suggest that Victoria and Joli both ask their questions and then we'll have the response so we are respectful of everybody's time on a beautiful Thursday.

Victoria Szabo (Art, Art History, and Visual Studies): Thanks very much for the report. I am really noticing the mention of the term hybridity and this idea of reaching out. I'm wondering to what extent this future vision is also about the university without walls? If you want to call it that. You're talking right

now about the different things we can bring to bear for the current students. But, there's also this other thread that seems to be about Duke out in the world, out with the alumni, out with the communities. So, can you just say more about what direction we see the role the strategic plan taking in regard to all of that? Thank you.

Olcott: Mine is actually maybe a follow up to my question about the Ombuds person which is that I think this is really exciting. None of it is really going to work if we can't have a very strong administrative staff and it's increasingly difficult for us to compete with all of the new employers that are coming to the area. I've had occasion in the past year or so, to be involved in efforts to hire administrative staff in departments I'm affiliated with. And we often have only one candidate and one candidate who's not necessarily overqualified for the job. I've encountered a lot of problems myself with, you know, grant proposals that get tossed out because the staff that are supposed to be doing compliance don't do the compliance review. We need to have really strong staff if we're going to make this work. I think, particularly the interdisciplinarity stuff. All of the administration of that ends up falling on faculty. And, in addition to that there's a lot of policy changes. So, the amount of time faculty now spend wrestling with Concur to just get our receipts submitted. I have 8,000 unanswered emails in my inbox right now. Three just showed up while I was on this call. I think there's just all of this administrative stuff that's falling on staff. And when I think about our peer institutions or maybe our aspirational institutions, where they really have their faculty doing innovative research, they are giving the kind of staff support that

Duke is not giving right now, because we're not offering a salary structure that would attract the kind of staff, for professionalized staff that I think we need. And this is with all due respect to the staff we have. I think we have people who work incredibly hard and many of them are amazing at what they do, but the world around Duke has changed considerably, even in the past five years. And I feel like we haven't quite kept up.

Kornbluth: So, 100% agree with that. There has been a ton of conversation about this. It's gotten even more complicated because we have people like grant managers who can work at Stanford but here and receive California level pay. So, there is a ton of conversation going on about this. We talked about project managers or program managers, as part of the 2030 recommendations. But you know, I was talking with Toddi Steelman about a program manager for one of the climate initiative pillars, and I think they got like zero applications. It's just such a competitive landscape. This is something that Daniel and team are thinking about really carefully. Because, I agree with you. We got to think about how we're going to navigate that.

Vic, with your question - you're probably aware that we have the search going on now for the Vice Provost for Learning Innovation. That actually builds on the kind of vision you're talking about. Which is, not only what is learning beyond the walls of Duke mean, but also what does lifelong learning mean. Do we have students who start here that are going to continue taking Duke courses and engaging in Duke offerings throughout their whole lifetime? Let me come back to Daniel's comment about increasing revenue. This is, you know, a really robust

enterprise here with what hybrid, online, etc. opportunities look like. Done right this could really help shore up our programs that are on campus. We've got 9 outstanding finalists that are coming into interview, and I really hope there's someone who's going to help drive this. So, you're right. Sort of Duke reaching out beyond the walls is definitely a part of what we're thinking about going forward.

Weinthal: Thank you Sally. I expect that we'll hear more over the course of the next year on the progress that's being made, and if anyone on Academic Council

has additional questions you can send them to our email at acouncil@duke.edu and we'll forward them on to the appropriate people, Sally, especially regarding these working groups.

With that our next meeting will be on March 17, which is also considered the Annual Faculty Meeting, and that will include an address from President Price. Our intention is to be in person at that meeting. So, I'm looking forward to seeing everyone then. Thank you for joining today and with that our meeting is adjourned.

