

**Minutes of the Meeting of the Academic Council held via Zoom  
Thursday, February 18, 2021**

**Kerry Haynie (Chair, Academic Council / Political Science / African and African American Studies):** Good afternoon, everyone. Welcome to the February Academic Council meeting. I will call the meeting to order. It seems like our February meeting is jinxed. Some of you may recall, a year ago we canceled the meeting in February due to inclement weather. I'm looking into establishing the Virgin Islands as the permanent location for our February Academic Council meeting. I'll be talking to our folks in Development about funding this operation. February seems to be jinxed here in Durham. I hope everyone is warm, safe, and dry.

Before we begin with our agenda, I have a few announcements to make. First, Erika Weinthal, Professor of Environmental Policy and Public Policy in the Nicholas School of the Environment, has been elected Chair of the Academic Council. She will begin her term as Chair on July 1 of this year and will serve through June 2023. Erika will begin attending weekly ECAC [Executive Committee of the Academic Council] meetings later this month. Erika, can you say hello so folks can get a chance to see you?

**Erika Weinthal (Nicholas School of the Environment):** Hi, everyone.

**Haynie:** Please join me in congratulating Erika and also thanking our colleague,

Larry Zelenak from the Law School, for his willingness to stand for election. Congratulations, Erika, and thank you, Larry. [applause]

Speaking of elections, the annual election for members of the Academic Council is taking place right now. Please encourage your colleagues from your school or division to serve if they are elected. You can mention the possibility of going to the Virgin Islands as an inducement! We do need folks to agree to serve if they are elected. The election will close at the end of this month. Once the election is over, ECAC will begin the process of determining nominees for our ECAC election that will take place in April. A slate of six faculty from the Academic Council will be put forward for election to ECAC to fill three spots for next year. According to our bylaws, any five faculty as a group can nominate a member of the Academic Council to stand for election to ECAC. Note that these nominations go to ECAC for consideration. In deciding the final slate, ECAC will choose nominees from the schools or divisions not already represented by the five continuing ECAC members. So please stand by for the nominations and elections to ECAC, beginning soon after we finish the Academic Council election.

Next, I would like to recognize our School of Nursing and the recent news of the 2021 US News and World Report. The

School of Nursing's ranking as an online nursing program jumped four positions last year, to be named the number three program in the country. In addition, US News and World Report recognized four of the Nursing School's online programs as the **best** in the country. You may not be aware that the Nursing School will celebrate its ninetieth anniversary this year. So, ninety years of Nursing School here at Duke. For almost three decades of those ninety years, the school has been a leader in distance-based education. A hearty congratulations to the School of Nursing faculty, students, staff, alumni, and to Dean Marion Broome and her leadership team for these outstanding achievements! It's always good to see hard work and good leadership bear fruit. Let me also add our very best wishes to Dean Broome, who is stepping down in June after almost seven years as Dean. Congratulations to our colleagues in the Nursing School. [applause]

***APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 21  
ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES***

**Haynie:** Next, we will move to the approval of our January 21 meeting minutes. As usual, the minutes were posted with the agenda on our website. Are there any corrections or edits?

*[minutes approved without dissent]*

***INTRODUCTION OF EXECUTIVE VICE  
PRESIDENT DANIEL ENNIS TO THE  
ACADEMIC COUNCIL***

**Haynie:** I would now like to welcome to his first Academic Council meeting as a presenter Daniel Ennis, Duke's new Executive Vice President. Daniel began his role as Executive Vice President on

December 1 and was previously the Chief Financial and Operating Officer at the Johns Hopkins University. Before his time at Johns Hopkins, he served as Harvard Medical School's Executive Dean for Administration. Prior to joining Harvard's Medical School, he was Harvard University's Associate Vice President for Finance and Financial Planning. Daniel, welcome to Duke and welcome to the Academic Council.

**Daniel Ennis (Executive Vice President):** Thanks, Kerry, I appreciate it. It's a real pleasure to be here today, and I appreciate the opportunity to speak with you. What Kerry and I talked about, and I hope this still makes sense, Kerry, you can direct me if I should go elsewhere, but I'll just share some introductory thoughts in terms of coming in to the institution and joining this community. Then I'll give a little bit of a high-level update on where we are financially and then some direction for the planning guidance that we've been working through with the Deans and ECAC and UPC [University Priorities Committee] recently. Those will be the topics I'll go through and then hopefully we'll have lots of time for discussion and questions.

**Haynie:** That sounds great, Daniel.

**Ennis:** Okay, thanks, Kerry. First, just to say, it is an extraordinary privilege to be a part of this institution. I've admired it from afar and was thrilled at the opportunity that President Price, the Board, the leadership team, the search committee – some of whom are on this call – gave me to join this institution and this community. I'm thrilled and feel fortunate and I'm looking forward to the opportunity to meet you. As you can appreciate, coming into this university,

coming into this town, this city, under these circumstances is a little less than ideal, but I still feel an incredible welcome from you and I look forward to having the opportunity to spend time together.

I talked about the next topic with ECAC and they thought it might be helpful for me to share these thoughts with you all as well, which is a little bit about how I think about the role of administration and administrative leaders like me. At its core, my view of our job is supporting the talent of this institution as it achieves excellence in our incredible missions. Every waking moment, in terms of what the administrative team should be doing, should be about leveraging the scarcest resource we have, which is the time available to our faculty, staff, clinicians, trainees, and students as they do the amazing things they do in pursuit of excellence. That should leave no detail, no stone unturned with regards to how we can best support you. Listen, we will not get it right all the time. There are times when, for any number of reasons, we'll create more friction than anyone would like, relative to compliance and our stewardship responsibility, but please know that the starting point is profound respect and appreciation for the work that you all do, teaching our students, delivering clinical care, and driving inquiry. Please know that at every turn, we will be looking for your feedback and reactions to how we are best supporting you against your mission activities. As I said, we will definitely not always get it right, but I can assure you, speaking for myself and my team, we will do everything possible to enable your greatest work.

The third thing I thought I would talk about, because in truth it's actually quite

new for me, is faculty governance. The rich tradition of faculty governance at Duke has been really interesting to learn about and important fundamentally to the success of this institution. While, obviously, I have spent a lot of time working closely with faculty leaders and faculty governance and advisory mechanisms, it's clear I will have a lot to learn how to best do that and to best inform your deliberations and your engagement with the administration. Bear with me as I get my legs under me. I recognize it as one of the distinctive features of Duke and I'm thrilled to be a part of it and to engage it as productively as possible. We will do our best to answer your questions, be responsive, and create transparency and understanding as to what it is we're navigating and managing. There is no question in my mind that I will not have the right answers all the time or the best answers. They will only come through a process of engagement with you and your colleagues, as well as trustees and other members of the leadership team. So, there is a lot to learn.

The final thing, and this is in the category of "needless to say," but I think it's always important to establish – and it relates to both of these points – that the institution is run by academic leaders. The administrative team's job is to leverage those leaders and inform those leaders to make the best decisions on behalf of our missions and our pursuit of excellence in those missions. I just want to assure you that I understand the job of administrative leadership and will work very hard to fulfill it and serve our academic leaders to the greatest extent possible.

So, thanks for having me and welcoming me to your community. With those

opening thoughts, I'll turn to a quick update on the financial side of things. First thing to say is, the institution made very hard decisions to navigate what was a very concerning crisis. Institutions that had very significant healthcare as a component of their mission faced an unusually challenging operating environment. In my twenty-plus years of doing this, I can tell you, last spring and summer were unlike any other crisis I had experienced with regards to navigating our fiduciary responsibilities on behalf of the board and on behalf of these institutions. As I've come into Duke and evaluated the decisions made by leadership and by this collective, they were smart and well thought through and most importantly, they were values-based and they had at the forefront to the greatest extent the protection of employment, the protection of salary support for our lowest salaried employees, and at the same time, always trying to find ways to allocate these precious resources to continue to further our mission in excellence. I believe that the institution had been well served in substance, but as much in process for how it went about a very difficult set of decisions. Those decisions involved significant sacrifice on your part and the part of your teams, households and families, et cetera. I'm deeply sensitive to that and appreciative of that. It's not only the hard decisions with regards to retirement contributions and salaries being held flat or in some cases reduced, it's also the fact that many of you have slowed activities in part because the environment has slowed them without our choice, per se, but also for the fact that there has been incredible discipline exercised throughout the system with regards to being careful with hiring, and in most cases not hiring, and careful with

any expenditure. Again, I would say, that has served Duke well, that incredible care and thoughtfulness with regards to the sustainability challenges that were put before us, or at least the sustainability challenges that we feared were being put before us. We now have the good fortune of being able to look back a little bit and have a little more clarity, having lived through the pandemic since March. We obviously still face uncertainty. There are a lot of people around me still urging me to be very cautious with regards to the broad economic environment, as well as its implications for our university and our financial position and trajectory. With that said, I would say, in terms of six months into this year, we're nowhere near as bad as we feared. It's a real tribute to all of you. The revenue declines that we had thought would hit and that we modeled for, a situation of great uncertainty and volatility, did not come to pass with anything like the intensity we worried about -- and the pace of expenses was dramatically slower than what we thought would be the case. The team did great modeling and informed decision making with outstanding analysis and the situation turns out to be, as a financial model, better than we had feared. Not to say it has been easy on any of us and not incredibly challenging on everyone. With that framework, we then look at FY22 and we say, okay, we feel better, we hopefully are starting to see the end of the COVID-imposed challenges, what we knew going into COVID and what is a fact of life in all of our academic, medicine, and university lives is that we will always face challenges in assuring resources for our mission. We still have that fact of life. We always navigate that. And then COVID obviously threw a big loop. The question before us was, what can we do for 2022? That will

turn to the last part of our comments before I turn it to you all for questions.

What happened in 2020-21, what we did was we took a lot of one-time expense savings and we knew that, in large part, those expenses need to be restored. 2021 looks better, but it's partially better, and a story that feels manageable, for the fact that we had a lot of one-time cost savings. In 2022, those cost savings largely go away. So, we have a more challenging year. The judgement of the leadership team, and now having tested it with the Deans and with ECAC and UPC, is, to the extent we made decisions that are COVID-specific reactions, let's try to figure out how we can reset those and then worry about our 2022 and beyond normal financial challenges, or at least get COVID a little bit more in the rearview mirror.

With that lens, what the leadership team is proposing talking about with regards to FY22 includes the following guidance. Bear with me as I talk you through this and then I'll step back. The first is, most importantly in terms of what's on people's minds, will we restore the retirement benefit? Will we restore it in full? There had been an assumption along the way that that restoration would definitely happen, but a question about whether it would get restored in full. That's the answer I gave at the town meeting, if any of you were watching that. After a lot of discussion and thought about how we position ourselves financially, we believe that the right thing to do will be to fully restore the 403B contribution back to pre-COVID levels. That's the first straw for your consideration and discussion. What we would like to do in doing that – and I believe this is quite important – is that we also take this opportunity, given what

financial uncertainty we will be facing moving forward, to do a comprehensive benefits review. In doing so, be guided by four principles that will make it a very tough exercise for us to do, but we'll engage it together and hopefully get some good outcomes for all of us. The first, of course, is assuring that our benefits continue to be competitive in our ability to attract talent to the institution. The second is that our values and our commitment to equity be manifest through the benefits program and testing whether or not we're achieving that. The third, of course, not surprising to hear from me, we look at opportunities for meaningful cost savings, given continued financial challenges ahead. The fourth, and important and a little harder to grasp on its face, is working on issues of liability management. We have long-lived programs that have actuarial dimensions to them, retiree health and our pension, and looking at ways in which we can manage liabilities and funding of those liabilities. Kyle Cavanaugh [Vice President, Administration] and I will work with academic leadership to try to create a process and a mode of engagement with our community around a benefits review. Point three is salary guidance. The straw that we want to put before you is the notion that we will restore salaries that were cut, and for the rest of the community, do a progressive move around salaries. The way I'm going to talk is on merit pools. It doesn't mean everyone gets these numbers, but on the average, this is what we're trying to achieve. For those making under \$75,000, the salary increase would be a 2.5 percent increase, in terms of merit pool available to that population. For those making over \$75,000, the merit pool that would be available is 1.5 percent. That's the guidance we're proposing and sharing

with the schools with regards to their building their budgets for next year.

Two more points: we do believe that the cost controls that have been put in place are still very important. The limitations on capital expenditure for infrastructure only or research-grant funded types of projects as opposed to broader, we think should stay in place, at least while we see how this year develops and how the FY22 planning comes together. Continued limitations on filling vacancies and posting new jobs. Outside of trying to restore and get salary increases in place and benefits to the retirement contribution restored, we would still very much like to work in a constrained environment while we get better information to understand our overall picture.

Final word, which is very important. Our benefits program is a university and health system benefits program. The move that we're making with regards to fully restoring the retirement contribution applies broadly across our community, which is obviously a really good thing, but the health system continues to face real financial pressure. Every move we make in the benefits review will have this character because it's a shared program. We need to look at the imperatives and the challenges in front of the health system and the university as we figure out the path forward together. In our making these decisions, we have to be informed and sensitive to their operating and financial challenges and the same in reverse. I just wanted to situate the fact that these are conversations that happen amongst the university community but also need to happen within the construct of our health system leadership and broader

community as well. With that, I'll stop talking. Thank you very much for the opportunity to be here with you today.

**Haynie:** Thank you, Daniel. I really appreciate that presentation. Before we open up for questions, let me also thank you for your engagement with the faculty. Daniel just started December 1, so he has hit the ground more than running in the middle of a pandemic. He has engaged ECAC, UPC, and other faculty bodies in making these determinations. We appreciate your engagement with us as you work your way through this decision making. Let me also put it into context. Our colleagues have had presentations about our financial situation over the past few months. This is a remarkable change, given where we were. I really appreciate how you worked that magic and am glad that you're here. I know it took some magic, given what we were facing, to get back to a point where those benefits have been restored at the pre-suspension level and to have salary increases at all. Whatever you did, keep doing it. Are there questions for Daniel? I received one question by email from a colleague. They wanted me to ask Daniel about capital expenditures. There is some delayed maintenance with buildings. This has to do with the new Physics building and the Lilly Library renovations. Any comments you have about when those might commence and get on the way?

**Ennis:** Entering into the picture as I look at the total capital plan and the history of capital expenditure at the institution, I would say that we need to be focused on renewal of our facilities, and so Lilly Library is a really important example of a building that needs renovation, as do several buildings on the quad. The trustees and the leadership team have

done really good work to quantify and start developing plans around renewal as opposed to new construction. My hope would be, if we look at our share of our capital plan moving forward, we would see more renewal getting built into it. As I said, in terms of lifting the freeze, while we feel confident making this really important step for our people, it would be nice and helpful to buy some more time, fundamentally, just to get more clarity with regards to our financial picture. The guidance is that we're still going to hold those projects until we have a better sense of the overall trajectory financially.

I would just make a final point, which is, one thing that I think we need to work on as an administrative enterprise is to better account for the operating costs that the university absorbs when a major capital project is done. When that building comes online, a lot of expense comes with it to advance what we're trying to do. That includes the operations and maintenance expense, the new programs that we're trying to deliver there, and other support costs that get stepped up in relation to supporting a building like that. Then we have depreciation and renewal. As soon as that building comes on, if we're being disciplined about this, we should already be accounting for the fact that we need to fund renewal on an ongoing basis. Once you really look at that and build that into a five-year plan, it more than likely will suggest you probably need to pace your rate of capital expenditure in an even more careful way than we've done historically.

**Katherine Schipper (Fuqua School of Business):** Thank you for the presentation in which you focused on, among other things, a better than

expected financial situation for the university and the importance of being competitive in the comprehensive benefits review. My question is as follows. In light of actions of certain other universities, including, for example, the Johns Hopkins University, to restore employer retirement contributions effective January 1, 2021, why can we not also expect a similar restoration here at Duke University, effective January 1, 2021?

**Ennis:** Thanks for the question. Our assessment of the financial situation for the institution and the risk we face as a collective is that we're not in a position to make that move. This is where it's important that we look at the total enterprise, university and health system combined. We wanted to be focused and assured that we could make the commitment to fully restore the retirement contribution, which, as I noted, was an open question. I appreciate that Hopkins has done that. I obviously have some inside knowledge to why that might be the case and why it may be more appropriate in that context than ours, but that's the path we're on in the moment and we are obviously watching our financial situation carefully and closely.

**Lee Baker (Cultural Anthropology):** Thanks, and welcome. You spoke eloquently about our missions. What role does diversity and inclusion play, from your perspective, in our shared commitment to excellence?

**Ennis:** I think whenever this question comes up, the first place I'd start with is my leadership in relation to supporting diversity and inclusion. This is an area in which I've invested a lot of time to understand my own blind spots or

weaknesses or lack of sophistication or fluency as it relates to advancing diversity and inclusion as we advance excellence. I feel proud of that work. What I would say is that it situates me better and better. As we all know, this is fundamentally a journey for ourselves as people and as a community. That investment of time puts me in a place to have led in my past life really interesting and important programs and I hope puts me in a situation where I'll be a big part of advancing the agenda that President Price and the Deans have put forward and to make it real. At the end of the day, all that matters, in truth, is the actions and the outcomes in terms of actually achieving our shared aspirations. An example of that, something I feel incredibly strongly about, is economic inclusion and creation of economic opportunity and wealth building for all members of our community. An institution like Duke has this extraordinary influence and purchasing power to mobilize entrepreneurs, make hires, invest in construction companies that will be diverse, will create opportunities for members of our community that would not necessarily have those opportunities if it weren't for a place like Duke saying, this is how you're going to work with us, or this is where we're going to focus our hiring, or this is how we're going to develop our talent, or this is when we're going to make a purchasing decision. We're going to make it on the basis of your commitment to diversity and inclusion. At Hopkins I led this effort with the university and the health system. Every year we had stated objectives with regards to how we could move the needle on hiring, purchasing and construction. I have enormous pride for the transformation that was associated with that effort with regards to a clear and

demonstrable commitment to equity and inclusion. There are many more examples and ways in which, I hope, together, we'll address the very serious and longstanding issues of social justice and racial justice. They're so daunting that my goal will be to define ways in which we can make progress, hold ourselves accountable, take steps, and not be overwhelmed by the weight of history, the weight of institutions like ours, the mistakes we've made over time, and leaders like me who have made mistakes over time with regards to this commitment and shared set of values.

**Cam Harvey (Fuqua School of Business):** I'd like to follow up on Katherine Schipper's question. My understanding is that all of our peers, as of January 1, have restored benefits. My question is whether your office has tried to assess the cost of putting Duke at a competitive disadvantage like this. Maybe this question is also for the Provost. Surely, there is some data on this in terms of us missing out on opportunities or losing valuable faculty members.

**Ennis:** The first thing I would say is that I honestly don't have the data. I heard about Hopkins and Rochester, but I'll take your benchmarking for what it is. I haven't gone through that with my peer colleagues, et cetera. I think our view is that the sooner we can put ourselves in a position to create assurance with regards to restoration of benefits and salary, the faster we can get there, the better, with regards to our commitment to our people. Not to mention the competitive dynamics within which we operate. This is our considered and best judgement at this moment. We feel very good and are very grateful for the fact that we can make this commitment to you. As I said, we will

carefully evaluate new financial information to determine whether other steps can be taken. Sally, do you want to add anything?

**Sally Kornbluth (Provost):** All I would say, Cam, is it's very difficult to deconvolute all the elements that go into a faculty member choosing to come to Duke versus somewhere else or the dynamics that lead to retention. It would be hard for me to say there is some element of the benefits package, aside from, honestly, sometimes the tuition benefit, that becomes an overt element of discussion. Obviously, we don't have insight into the calculus that our peers have made in this restoration. I do think that we have to keep our eye on the competitive market when it comes to compensation and the whole benefits package as part of the evaluation, as Daniel was saying. So, your point is well taken but it's very difficult to say right now how that has influenced any kind of proximal decisions of individuals.

**Earl Dowell (Pratt School of Engineering):** Daniel, welcome to Duke. You're already on the hot seat and you're following a legend in your job, as you probably know, so it's not the easiest time to be doing what you're doing. I have two big-picture questions. One is, Duke is much like Hopkins in that it has a very large medical center and a very small university attached to it. We like to think the university is of high quality, but the long pole in the financial tent is clearly the medical center, which often drives policy at Duke, and probably did at Hopkins as well. When you sit with the Chancellor for Health Affairs and the Provost at the start of a new budget cycle, how do you decide whether you're drawing a firm line, financially, among

those three units? Or are you and Sally and our friend in the medical center making a strategic decision about wanting to have a little more on the academic side or a little more on the health center, for that matter? I hope not. How do you make those decisions?

**Ennis:** Great question. We could spend a lot of time working that through. Let me just say the factual matter that's really important to understand is that the health system, in my experience to date at Duke, and certainly in other experiences, has a profound commitment to support the research and teaching mission. In many respects, you work to fulfill our clinical mission and excellence in our clinical mission, but also to find ways to create funding support for missions that don't have that prospect of generating extra funds. Over time, the health system has made substantial investments in the university, specifically, obviously the School of Medicine in advancing its mission. So, the lens that I take coming into this job and the way in which we navigate the other is, how can we work together to set up the health system for optimal success, in terms of achieving clinical excellence but also as a commercial matter? Because the health of the health system will distinguish and differentiate the success of our research and teaching enterprise in the School of Medicine and well past the School of Medicine in terms of how many other parts of the university interact with the Medical School and the research and teaching opportunities on which we collaborate. With that first, the second statement is that the Medical School, in universities like ours and Hopkins, is a very large enterprise and will typically face ongoing challenges just because the expense of wet-bench science is such and

the reimbursement mechanisms are such that they will always require significant support and subsidy. So, you always have this trajectory of the health system and its ability to hopefully contribute to the core mission. The health of the Medical School is another core question and then it's adding a place between those two where there's mutual support and reinforcement and the university is served well and the health system is served well. Then you overlay the rest of the university and its activities, each school, where it's positioned, what challenges it's facing, and you then begin to understand the aggregate financial picture. What I'll say, is that at the end of the day what we all have been and will aspire to, the thing that I'll be focusing on is operating performance. What does revenue minus expense look like and are we generating surpluses that allow us to reinvest in mission and to safeguard our assets, invest in renewal of our assets, things like that? What does that mean? Sure, we need to focus on expenses, but we just as much, and in all respects, as importantly, focus on revenue. What everyone has lived through for the past year is cost, cost, cost. I would hope that you would hear from this meeting that we should be unleashing our entrepreneurial energy and focus on smart revenue opportunities as well as attention to the cost disciplines we've all so carefully paid attention to.

**Haynie:** Thank you. Earl, let me ask you to submit your second question via email and we'll get that to Daniel to get your answer. Daniel, thank you so much for taking the time to be with us and for that presentation. Again, you just started December 1. It's hard to believe you have such command of all of this. So, thank you for being here and presenting. We look forward to a healthy working relationship

between the faculty and your office. Again, if you have additional questions for Daniel, please send them to the Academic Council's email address and we'll get those to Daniel and get answers to you.

### ***2030 STRATEGY TEAM UPDATE***

**Haynie:** The next item on the agenda is Provost Kornbluth and Professor Peter Feaver to discuss the 2030 Working Group progress to date. As you know, President Price charged this group, about a year ago, to take a look at Duke's present situation and to project out into the future what Duke might be and how we might position ourselves to be better in 2030. At this time, I'll turn it over to Provost Kornbluth and Peter Feaver of the department of Political Science.

**Kornbluth:** Thanks a lot, Kerry. Today we're going to tell you some about the work of the 2030 Group. As Kerry said, Vince charged us in the summer of last year and it was really a two-fold charge. One was to identify opportunities for cost savings in order to weather the financial impacts of the pandemic and address longstanding financial difficulties. The other was to identify big bets that would differentiate Duke from its peers over the course of the next decade and beyond. Not to disappoint anyone today, but you're not going to hear the big exciting things in bullet point two. [refers to slide]

There have actually been two committees, one consisting of the Deans and some administrators and that Kerry and Peter Feaver sit on it, and a parallel faculty committee that Peter has chaired and actually acts as a liaison. The first phase of our work really focused on the first bullet point, which was reducing costs. As Daniel said, we've navigated the

pandemic piece, but we still face headwinds in FY22 and we really need to think about long-term financial stability. All this being said, I will also comment that the orientation of this group was really on cost savings. But as Daniel pointed out, philosophically we really need to be talking about operating margin, in other words, revenue and costs. When we come to a stable situation, it's going to be a balance between the two. Again, we want to think about smart revenue opportunities because, like many of you, I've heard of revenue ideas that actually wound up costing us money. I think that is also part of the thinking as we go forward. Today, I'm going to talk just a little bit about some of the cost saving maneuvers, understanding that we will be coming back to Academic Council with some of the big bets and ideas that we want to think about going forward to 2030. Today's presentation is really 2022-23, and we'll be coming back with more comments.

First, I wanted for you to get a little bit of the flavor of what the faculty committee discussed, because those ideas really fed into a lot of the discussions that we had with the Deans group, and also opened our minds to some of the ideas that were out there among the broader faculty. I'm going to turn this over to Peter for a couple slides to comment, and then I'll make some additional comments.

**Peter Feaver (Political Science):** Thank you. As Sally said, I chaired the ad hoc faculty task force that was assembled because of conversations we had with Kerry Haynie, who wanted to increase the aperture for faculty input as the Duke leaders were having to make really huge decisions. As it was, the university had to make very big and dramatic and unusual

decisions in a hurry, and Daniel explained some of them: suspending the 403B, freezing hires, freezing spending, and those decisions were taken very quickly with a minimal amount of faculty input, primarily through ECAC. But, at the time, in March and April, the senior leaders believed that, depending on the course of the pandemic, we might have to take another set of serious decisions for longer-term moves, some of them perhaps just as dramatic, and that we needed more faculty input in the development of some of these ideas, so that when they reached the regular order of faculty governance for the policy approval and/or rejection of those ideas, that they had appropriately brought in as much faculty input as possible. This wasn't a substitute for faculty governance, this was a way to have the faculty perspective inform the policy development process earlier and faster than is customary and it needed an unusual ad hoc arrangement because the challenges were unusual and the university would have to make these steps perhaps in an unusually quick manner. So, for my sins, I got tapped by Kerry and Sally to convene a faculty group who were diverse across the various constituencies of the university but shared one thing in common, which was that everyone on that committee had had a fair bit of experience in university governance and a lot of the folks had served on UPC so were up to speed on fiscal matters, so they could quickly render informed opinions or strong-held views. We were pretty strong in our representation across the campus side. We had one member who was also in the Medical School, but we were not constituted to be able to speak very much on the medical side of business. So, we focused on campus operations. We were

separate from and parallel to the Deans committee. The idea was a separate set of eyes to look at some of the same questions that the Deans were going to be looking at, but without our views being “contaminated” by theirs, without being pre-shaped by them. We had a blank slate and could do anything. We did an independent fact-finding effort and we had three primary products. The first was a long brainstorming list of possible fiscal moves that Duke might consider, that we injected into the Deans meeting, and a murder board reaction to the ideas as Sally’s committee became more and more focused on what they were going to do, and then, now, as Sally indicated, a set of thought pieces on the ways to secure sustainable excellence towards 2030.

Our committee had two metrics of success. One was, could we get the Provost’s committee to consider and debate ideas that they otherwise would not come up with on their own? The second metric of success was, when it came time for Sally and Vince and Daniel to get formal faculty buy-in, would they be blindsided by the faculty reaction? As you’ll see from the next slide, I’m pretty confident that we met our first metric of success, because we had some crazy ideas that we injected into their proposal and we’ll find out today whether I may hit the second metric. Here is a list of some. [refers to slide] We had some forty-two ideas. Some of them were quite outside the box and bold. My personal favorite outside the box idea was to sell the medical complex, and/or sell Duke Forest, and/or sell Central Campus. We discussed the pros and cons of that and some of these ideas, frankly, did not have a lot of support on our committee, but we thought, whatever Duke does, we have to say that we considered a wide range of

options. So, we injected those in. My personal favorite moment of this entire operation was telling the Chancellor [of the Health System] that one of our ideas was to sell his hospital, and looking at his reaction to that. We had other ideas that had more support, and some of them have ended up migrating in, as you’ll see, into the decisions that Sally and Vince are proposing. Some of these ideas, I think, are still worth considering as we go further, especially if we hit more fiscal bumps. The bottom line was trying to frame the issues for the Deans so they could anticipate the way the faculty would be likely to think through these issues. With that, I’ll pass it back to you, Sally.

**Kornbluth:** Thanks very much, Peter. I really appreciate the work of the faculty committee. As Peter said, there are some white papers that have been passed down to the committee to start thinking about the exciting maneuvers we might make in 2030. I quite enjoyed reading through those and we will be incorporating those into discussions. In terms of opportunities to cut costs, I would separate them into three large bins. One is reducing school expenditures, one is reducing central expenditures, both the PAMC and CAMC, and then the possibility of cost efficiencies from coordinating and consolidating university-wide services. The last point, which I’ll return to at the end, also has the goal of providing better service to everyone, not just finding ways to cut costs. The majority of the maneuvers that are actually being carried out that many of you are already familiar with reside within the schools. That’s where the majority of our budget is expended and we wanted to give a lot of latitude to the schools because every school has a slightly different mission, a

different composition of faculty and staff, a different way of operating, and we wanted to offer autonomy to the schools in making these decisions. What we did was withhold some of the central support from the schools and ask them to undertake the cuts to cover these costs. We left it up to each school, as I said, but there's a range of possible actions that the schools have been considering: reductions in staff numbers, staffing review, consolidation of services across small units, and incentivized retirement. We are seeing an uptick across the schools in incentivized retirement. A lot of the staffing reduction is coming from a very active vacancy management, when people leave positions, not refilling them. We're looking very carefully at each request. It's not "no" across the board, but we want the schools to reflect very intentionally on staffing requests. We're also incentivizing faculty retirement, as some of you are probably aware, who may be interested in taking this up or not. Another part of the discussion was very interesting: we talked about a possible post-tenure review system that might feed into thinking about retirement decisions. This was a little bit contentious. I know that the faculty committee took this up. It waxed and waned in popularity through the time of the pandemic. I think it's something that, again, would have to come at the level of faculty governance discussion to think about whether there is an appetite for this.

Curricular modifications: a good example is that our undergraduate curriculum has 6,000 courses on the books, some of which have very few students in them. Thinking about our optimal configuration for teaching, in particular, because of the expansion of the adjunct working force to cover this growing curriculum. This is

obviously a cost carried by schools, particularly Arts and Sciences. The other thing that has come up is reduction in the size of PhD programs, because, unlike all of our other educational programs that generate revenue, the PhD programs are an ongoing expense. They're an important expense. They're very central and core to our mission. I don't suggest across-the-board cuts. We have to be thoughtful about how we might consolidate programs, deal with total size of the program or individual cohort sizes, there are a lot of discussions going on, alternative models of collaborative research in some units, having more postdocs might make sense, or more undergraduate research. Again, while this resides in the schools, what I want the schools to do is have thoughtful discussions about this. That discussion started at the level of this Deans committee, but in many, if not all the schools, the Deans have taken these discussions to the faculty to try to figure out how to best configure this.

We're also going to be doing a review of Graduate School functions. We review all of the other schools and programs all the time. At least in my current memory, we've never done a review of the Graduate School. The point here is to try to figure out where there might be redundancies between what the schools are doing to try to figure out how programs are best serving the schools and to take a good, close look at all the functions there.

One more comment on the reduction of the school budgets: we have not set a firm time period over which these cuts will be made. They're going to vary from school to school based on the current financial status of each school. We have a wide

range in terms of sustainability and the financial balance in the schools. One thing we're asking is, by withholding funds and talking with the schools about how they'll need it, we don't want a lot of ad hoc requests. Usually during the year there are a lot of ad hoc requests for additional funding. We'd like to think carefully upfront about what these requests might be. Although, we've announced programmatic and hiring initiatives, these are often based on external funding or the investment of strategic funds in shared priorities. You're probably aware of things like the Science and Technology Initiative or the Global Asia Initiative and other hiring initiatives or programmatic initiatives that we will continue to invest in outside of this upfront, agreed upon budget.

Now, it's only fair to say how we're reducing expenditures centrally. We're trying to reduce the expenses from SIP, our Strategic Investment Plan funds. One of the things we're doing that has been going on for a number of months is a very careful look at the budgets of the University Institutes and Centers [UICs]. We are making a truly comprehensive analysis. There's been a terrific faculty committee working on that very hard. Someone said they thought it was the hardest work they've seen a faculty committee do because there has to be a deep dive into each of these Institutes and Centers with the notion that we may change budgets, we may change configurations, we may merge or consolidate UICs, et cetera. We really have to look at those carefully with a goal of reducing a total budget from \$17 million to about \$10 million a year on the central budget through further alignment with schools, consolidation, and possible sunseting. This is a subvention. Many of

our UICs bring in money through grants and philanthropy, et cetera. So, this is not necessarily the total budget. We want to reduce the signature programs to the size that their endowments can support. Obviously, DukeEngage, Bass Connections and others have become a hallmark of Duke, but some of these programs, these two in particular, have endowments. We hope to raise the endowments through philanthropy but live within the money that these endowments throw off. This has become more tenable as we have had an increase in the number of programs in which our students participate co-curricularly. There are a lot of opportunities and we have to figure out what a manageable envelope is financially to support those opportunities. Mary Pat [McMahon, Vice President / Vice Provost, Student Affairs] has been very active in reorganizing and increasing the efficiency of Student Affairs. Obviously, Student Affairs is the unit that took one of the biggest hits from COVID because of lost housing and dining revenue. But I'm thinking, aside from that, how we maintain Student Affairs. There are a large number of vacancies there that Mary Pat and colleagues have been managing, and they've been thinking very thoughtfully about how to best manage that unit financially. We've already taken cuts of \$17 million in SIP expenses over the next three years. This is largely from thinking carefully about what we can and cannot do from the original strategic plan back in 2017. In some cases, that's not a cost-cutting exercise, it's a re-consideration in the light of the current situation. What are the best things to move forward on? What things might we rethink and reconfigure? We continue to focus on vacancy management opportunities across the whole Provost area and consolidation of Vice Provost

roles. I joke, you know, Jennifer [Francis] is already the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs and the old finance piece, so I'm not going to add another role to her plate. But we are looking – for instance, you might remember that Mike Merson had a Vice Provost role. We're thinking about how to move, for instance, the international mission over, without having to name another Vice Provost. So, all told, we have one-time savings of about \$20 million, and we're trying to get to \$34 million a year, including the savings in the schools.

This came up, Lee Baker's question about our commitment to diversity and inclusion, there are core commitments and strategic priorities that we have got to move forward. Part of this goal to save SIP funds, for example, or to increase our efficiencies, to make sure we have funds going forward to move forward our strategic priorities like anti-racism and the Science and Technology Initiative. There has been a large group of faculty working with Toddi Steelman [Dean, Nicholas School of the Environment] and Brian Murray [Director, Energy Initiative] and Tim Profeta [Director, Nicholas Institute for Environmental Policy Solutions] on a Climate Change Initiative. There's the Next Generation Living and Learning that Mary Pat McMahan and Gary Bennett [Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education] have been looking at with faculty and the trustees, and lifelong learning and continuing studies. The last bullet point presents a lot of opportunities for revenue generation that we have not realized in the past. We need to continue to move these things forward. In the CAMC there have been cost reductions. This began even before Daniel arrived with changes in things like vacancy management, work

schedules, non-salary savings. Again, there was a one-time savings of about \$18.9 million, but, again, permanent reductions going forward in the operating budget of the CAMC.

Finally, we're looking hard at consolidation and coordination of university-wide services. This is in a number of areas, for example, Development, to centralized shared services such as data management. Dave Kennedy [Vice President, Alumni Affairs and Development] is talking intensively with the Deans about how to most efficiently link Development out in the schools with Central Development. IT is a large expense and an important one. Those of you in Arts and Sciences are probably aware of the consolidation of Trinity Technology Solutions under OIT that's already underway. They are working through service models but, again, it's not just cost-cutting there, it's thinking about how to best deliver services. Shared cost savings will be between the schools and OIT. Tracy Futhey [Vice President, Information Technology / Chief Information Officer] has set a number of targets that the schools might save in order to meet their service demands. Mike Schoenfeld and colleagues are looking at Communications. There are a lot of Communications people throughout the university. We all get a lot of glossy publications from lots of different units. A re-think on how Communications works at the unit levels, how that's integrated with Central Communications, is going to yield both savings and efficiencies, and, again, further centralization of services such as website development, video production, et cetera. It's very important that we focus on quality of service and make sure when we take away services

peripherally, they're being offered at a high level centrally. I think those are my prepared comments. Daniel, do you want to make a comment about this coordination and centralization of university-wide services to add to this?

**Ennis:** Yes, thanks, Sally. My view on this, first and foremost, should be that we work from a shared understanding of service levels. In truth, we should formalize service level agreements and expectations, because faculty, trainees, and students need to have confidence, fundamentally, that their needs are met as we make these organizational realignments. That's point one. Point two is that we tend to look at this narrowly as a budgetary matter when we take these steps. The reality is the total cost of ownership or total cost of an activity is far greater than a department might see or a school might see. An example of that is in IT. The cybersecurity issues for the institution are profound and incredibly important and expensive to navigate, and takes a certain skillset and talent level. If we don't move in a direction where we're able to better manage that risk and take advantage of the institution's investments and talent, there is a cost to us that you don't see in your budget that we need to account for. What I say to the team is, it isn't a short-term budgetary move. It has to be assurance of service levels and, ideally, significant improvement in service levels. The second is, it's really about the total cost analysis, and the third and final point is, it should be about a development opportunity for those staff who are implicated. Will there be staff who may get dislocated in a moment like this for any number of reasons? I think that's a reality, unfortunately. At the same time, the intention going into it should be about creating new opportunities as a

Development matter and new colleagues, new ways of thinking about their careers in the construct of being part of a larger functional organization. Just some thoughts on how I advise we approach moving forward with these very important moves.

**Haynie:** Thank you, Sally, Peter, and Daniel. I should say, thank you, Peter. Peter is coming to us from Oxford, allegedly on a research sabbatical. But thank you for staying engaged and attending from afar. Sally, before we do a Q&A, can you explain CAMC and PAMC?

**Kornbluth:** PAMC is the Provost Area Management Center, so it's the schools, it's what you think of the auxiliary services with academics, the Library, et cetera. CAMC is the Central Area Management Center, so that's all the administrative services under Daniel.

**Haynie:** Thank you. Let me reiterate again, there have been quite a few faculty eyes and ears involved in this process, thanks to Peter and that committee. Sally has also brought this discussion to portions of the Academic Programs Committee and the University Priorities Committee has seen bits and pieces of this. That process will continue. As concrete proposals come forward, they will work their way through our governance process and perhaps will end up in front of this body as necessary for deliberation and approval or not. Any questions for Sally and Peter?

**Dowell:** Sally, at one time the schools were "tubs on their own bottom," it was said, that is, they had an individual profit loss goal to meet. In fact, one time, the schools were not allowed to run a deficit

in any one fiscal year. Is that system still in place?

**Kornbluth:** I would say we have more of a modified responsibility center management, where, in theory, we do want schools to manage within their own envelopes. We try to press it, but there is a lot of coming to the rescue or subsidizing or working around it. We're definitely not an "every tub on its own bottom" model at the moment. Part of the reason of holding back some money and having the schools work it internally is because the opportunity for revenue generation and for handling cost really does lie within schools. But we have not been strict about that. Daniel, do you want to make any comment about that?

**Ennis:** Great question. The view in general is, to an extent, we are going to have schools where the expense exceeds the revenue. The question is, of course, is this planned? Is it a strategic direction that we can see where it will come out and ideally those deficits get funded over time? I think it's important we have as a year-end matter the closing of the books and the funding of deficit accounts, but I also can see an understanding around it being in a school's strategic plan. That would show deficits that you might actually accept and they recognize, fundamentally, investments that are getting made for future funding. So, I think we should be open to realistic and smart plans like that. Sally always reminds us that we can't be fooling ourselves. There are moments in time where those kinds of investment decisions and delays with regards to balancing the books are the right call for a school and its future direction.

**Haynie:** President Price, would you like to comment at all?

**Vince Price [President]:** Just to underscore what Sally said earlier. We've talked a lot about cuts. We should recognize that this is trying to identify areas where the value proposition is such that we're spending more than we ought to in terms of delivery of value so that we can redirect those resources to strategic matters where we think that there is significant opportunity. That might be an opportunity to move in a new direction, realize new revenues, but to elevate excellence across the institution. There's no way, over the long haul, that we're going to cut our way to success. So, I just want to caution everyone. Sally said this, but this is a two-part exercise. The thinking is to imagine how we can re-deploy our resources more efficiently. That's what we're talking about here. But also, again, how we can grow those resources. There is a lot of entrepreneurial energy in the system. We have to do this in a smart way. But we're also gearing up for a major philanthropic campaign. The generation of the strategic goals that will undergird that campaign are also a parallel process of planning that we're undertaking right now. Ultimately, as I say, the way to greatness is not through a cutting exercise. This is a strategic pruning with a full intention of growing a larger and better garden. So, we're getting perhaps an incomplete picture by just focusing on some of the pruning at the moment.

**Haynie:** Thank you, Vince.

**Baker:** That all sounds very creative. Peter, the list of things that you came up with was interesting. There has been a tradition where schools have their own

fundraising, communications, IT support. Has this been a more strategic strategy to centralize a lot of the services? If it is, is there any mechanism to tamp down the allocated cost? It might seem like if you centralize a lot of these services, then the schools are going to get hammered with increased allocated costs to support the centralization. Have you thought about those different tradeoffs? The second question is to Peter. Peter, did you ever consider defunding the police? [laughter]

**Kornbluth:** I'll make a comment quickly and then Daniel may have more comments about allocated costs. Obviously, Lee, it has to be paid for somewhere. But the notion would be to deliver high quality services, hopefully at less overall cost. The question is, is the school going to pay less in supporting a full function in their own school, versus having to pay towards the central services through the allocation of costs that are necessary to support those services? I would argue that if we do this right and we have a collective, it's going to cost the schools less in the long run than supporting one of their own for everything. We've seen this from when I was in Medicine, a lot of the consolidation of grant management, for instance. There were rough times originally in getting people to agree to that and also getting the services smooth, but I think over time, the services have gotten really great. There, it's the departmental level rather than the school level. The other thing I'll say about this that Daniel alluded to, within a school, particularly if you have a small group of people, there is no ladder for staff advancement. There are no colleagues for people to learn and develop their skills. Whereas, if you have people that are part of a unit, even if they are assigned to other schools in terms of their

primary service, there is actually cross-training and advancement opportunities. I think the benefits of that and the notion that, even if we're billing schools, we're going to bill the schools less than what they have to support, that would be the long-range goal.

**Baker:** So, it is an explicit shift in strategy, though?

**Kornbluth:** Yeah, for some things. Not across the board, certainly, but yes. This is very intentional. Communications is a good example. Do we need to have as many people doing things everywhere? That said, a lot of these things do require some local knowledge. We have to be careful. We're not going to do a broad swap and centralize everything. I recognize the localized expertise that is required in some functions. And, again, you can have a situation where you have a centralized function where people have beats, if you will, where they really cover a particular area and still maintain some of that localized function while conserving costs but also giving them career ladders and everything else.

**Feaver:** Lee, I'll just say, in answer to your question, clearly, I failed on the second metric, because, no, we did not look at defunding the police. Though we had forty-two other ideas that we looked at of revenue generation and/or cuts. I will say, as we looked at the campus side of the operation, the two major cost drivers that were major for the budget: one was payroll, which we've been talking a lot about, and the other is financial aid, which we have not been talking much about today. But it is a major driver of expense. It's an important university priority. Our faculty committee looked at that and pointed to that as getting that

cost under control so that it can be better planned as a priority going forward.

**Thea Portier-Young (Divinity School):**

My question has to do with the centralizing and questions around access and input. Maybe it's not a question, but I want to voice a concern that programs with more money might have more access. Currently, with localized instructional technology support, for example, it's easy for faculty to give input in terms of the kinds of services they need and to get access to those services and to build the relationships for that two-way communication. I worry that with a centralized system it will be much harder for faculty to give that kind of input and for equitable access across all units.

**Kornbluth:** I think that is an excellent point. I think a key part of any centralization has to be constant sampling and surveying of the users. I don't mean actual surveys, necessarily, but assessment of whether the users feel like they are receiving good services. For what it's worth, in the grant management space, that was also a concern. Again, you have to have the individuals who are in essence assigned to your area that you can interact with. So, it's not some unrelated group of people that you have no personal relationship with. I think there's a way to do it to maintain the personal connections that you talk about, while realizing some of the efficiencies. The other thing is that sometimes we have the ability to standardize and streamline backroom functions through shared services that are not things that contact the staff or the faculty in any real way that are duplicative. One of the ones I referred to, for instance, was data management in Development. How many databases do you need of possible donors,

et cetera? There are ways to do this that I think we can do smartly. But, look, I think none of us are going to be happy at the end of the day if our complaint inbox goes way up because people are not getting the services that they were used to, frankly. It does take a period of adjustment. It's not the same thing, necessarily, as having the person be in the office next door to you. But we have to think about channels of communication and how best to do this to maintain service levels. What I don't want is "have" and "have-not" schools. To tell you the truth, there is actually a little bit more of that in the decentralized model than the centralized model, because sometimes it's like going to a doctor that only does two heart surgeries a year. You want to go to a unit that does high volume. So, if your school does very few international grants, for example, you want to have somebody who really knows how to navigate that, not a low-level shop where everyone is trying to cover every area of expertise. I think there are ways we can do this better that can serve everyone and save in costs.

**Ennis:** One size does not fit all in any respect. What we're trying to achieve is taking advantage of scale. There are certain activities where scale means you might be able to procure things at a lower cost because you bring together the contracting moment for service, but also hopefully that means access to talent in a way you wouldn't have access at a local level due to the salary and the ability to support. It has to be a coordinated and iterative process with the client, so to speak. Every school and every function, whether it be communications or technology have specific needs that have to be thought through to get this right.

**Haynie:** Josh Sosin? You're muted, Josh.

**Josh Sosin (Classical Studies / Libraries):** You wish. [laughter] The complexity of this is really dizzying, which I'm going to assume is why, when I tried to raise my hand, I actually hit the applause button instead. [laughter]

**Kornbluth:** We're good with that!

**Sosin:** I offer this sort of as a prompt, not like a narrow or well-formed question. I might be wrong, but I'm going to guess that a good many of the areas where we currently see an opportunity for squashing redundancies or making smart savings – whether or not they require fundamental alterations to responsibility centered management or whatever – probably arose in service of the promotion of excellence, many of them probably in service of an idea that we were saving, even if we've later learned that that might not be the case. When I first see in the PowerPoint the exciting revenue opportunities around innovation in lifelong learning and continuing education, that sounds really great. And then I think, it probably also sounds like the way we thought about paying Master's programs as we started to ramp them up. Now, for all of the considerable virtue, there's also a fragility associated with that ramp-up. I wonder if you'd expand for just a minute on how you're working through the institutional memory of, in these targeted areas, how we got there in the first place, and how we do our best, even if it's not really possible, to not just recreate those unintended consequences. Sorry if that was muddled.

**Kornbluth:** I know exactly what you're saying. Two different comments about that, Josh, and I think this is well taken and maybe rolled up into the concept of

smart revenue generation, which is all of the things that we might now reflect on. This is some of the Master's programs you referred to, and this is pre-COVID, because obviously the dimension of effects on international students, et cetera have been way more than we anticipated. These were money makers for individual units but not necessarily, if we thought about the university holistically, I think we've learned a lot about that. An increase in Master's students in one area, for instance, strains the Library, CAPS, a whole host of services. I think we have to think about all-in costs when we think about revenue-generating opportunities. That's one thing. The second thing is, the world moves along. So, what looks like a great revenue-generating opportunity earlier on may be different now. But also, there are new opportunities that we're seeing, a lot of the remote learning pieces, et cetera, that we may not have capitalized on as much as we could, and we would have had no view into in the past. The final thing I'll say is that universities, we included, are very good at blooming a thousand flowers and not sunseting anything. Part of thinking strategically about this is, we have to give ourselves the latitude to capitalize on the kind of interesting and exciting ideas that faculty have all the time, that we're trying to come up with for the next phase of this 2030 work, and there's no way to do that unless we rein in the things that either aren't working or not adding sufficient value or really are redundant with things going on elsewhere. I don't think your question was muddled; maybe my answer was muddled. I kind of grouped a bunch of things together, but I think you see what I'm getting at.

**Ennis:** Revenue opportunities, new ideas, they may not work in the end or they may

create new challenges and problems, but I think if we suffocate that because we know from past experience they will, that would also be a bad outcome. I think the question is, are we learning? Are we getting better? Are we getting more agile? Are we asking better questions about the opportunities and continuing to move? The generation of resources to be able to invest in our missions is a vital part of what we need to do. If you look at the growth rate of revenue versus the growth rate of expense over a long period of time, that revenue line, that growth rate is not what it needs to be to support what we all want, which is investment in mission. We're going to learn and we're hopefully going to get more right than wrong.

**Haynie:** Great. We're coming close to the end of the hour. Let me thank Sally, Daniel, and Peter again for the presentations, and all of you for the questions. I especially thank colleagues who have engaged this process along the way and continue to engage the process. It's critical that we stay involved. I like Daniel's approach to this comprehensive benefits review, but we need to keep our faculty eyes and ears on that review as well. So, we need to engage in conversation early on so we're not blindsided or taken by surprise at what will come out of that review. Do please stay engaged and encourage your colleagues to accept the honor if they are elected to join this Council. Again, I will continue to work on looking at the Virgin Islands as a place for the next February meeting. Until then, we are adjourned. Our next meeting is March 18. Same place, same channel. As we were meeting today, Sally, we got the email that we're on regular schedule tomorrow.

**Kornbluth:** Yes.

**Haynie:** So, do your homework, go to bed. We'll be starting school at our regular time tomorrow. Bye, everybody.