

Minutes of the Meeting of the Academic Council  
Thursday, March 21, 2019

**Don Taylor (Chair, Academic Council / Sanford School of Public Policy):** Thank you, everyone, for coming. The ACC is 0-1 in the NCAA tournament, so a bad start for the Louisville Cardinals. Not that anyone here cares about such. [laughter]

A couple points: today is the Annual Faculty Meeting, so it coincides with the March Academic Council meeting. President Price is going to have an address and then we'll have a Q&A. We're going to approve the minutes in just a second and then we'll have a Q&A and that will go straight into a discussion of the light rail. When we circulated the agenda, it said that the light rail discussion will be held in executive session, but that is no longer the case, so no one will have to leave. It will be held in open session. After talking with faculty and talking with Vince, we decided this was the best way to do it. One item to keep in mind if you're an AC member: on Monday you should get an email that has a link to a password-protected site that has the materials for Honorary Degrees 2020 for consideration. You will have until April 11 to send us comments by email if you have questions or concerns about any of the nominees. Then we will discuss the nominees at the April AC meeting and with the traditional two-meeting rule, we will vote on them in May. I'll just remind everyone, those materials are very confidential. The

people who have been nominated don't know they have been nominated. So just hold those materials close to the vest.

***APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE FEBRUARY 21, 2019 ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING***

**Taylor:** The minutes of the last meeting were circulated with the agenda. Are there any comments or corrections?

*[Minutes approved by voice vote without dissent]*

***ADDRESS FROM PRESIDENT VINCE PRICE: A YEAR IN REVIEW AND A LOOK AHEAD***

**Taylor:** We will now have Vince's remarks, and then after that we will have a discussion and we can discuss the light rail and the remarks. We don't have a crowded agenda so we have time to talk together. Vince, thank you.

**Vince Price (President):** Good afternoon. Don, I just want to say, I am so grateful for your leadership over the course of the past two years, and deeply appreciate all that you have done to advance our academic community. I'd like to ask for a round of applause. [applause] I extend my thanks to all of you on the Council for everything you're doing to advance Duke University. I began my

preparations for today by dusting off my remarks from last March. And given that this is sometimes referred to as a State of the University address, I spent some time reflecting on all that has happened since I last spoke with you in the intervening months.

Last year, I was a freshman. This year, I'm a sophomore. [laughter] And while I can assure you that there hasn't been a sophomore slump, it is a time of great change at Duke. For one thing, we have an exceptional group of new leaders. Don is, as you know, handing over the reins to Kerry Haynie, who I know will do an outstanding job. Thank you very much for that. [applause] We have three new Deans this year, Toddi Steelman at the Nicholas School, Judith Kelley at Sanford, and Kerry Abrams at Duke Law; and one new-old Dean, Greg Jones, who has returned to Divinity. All four are doing a terrific job and leading the way toward an even more exciting future for our graduate and professional schools. We also have a new Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, Gary Bennett, who is making it his priority to renew our campus community and expand access to a Duke education. We have new Vice Presidents of Development and Alumni Affairs – Dave Kennedy, who joined us from Stanford – and of Durham Affairs – Stelfanie Williams, an alumna returning to Duke after serving as President of Vance-Granville Community College and being named the most outstanding Community College President in North Carolina. And, as you know, we have searches underway for the new Vice Presidents for Institutional Equity, and of Student Affairs. These leadership transitions have been very smooth, reflecting the quality of our institution. Most importantly, they each represent key

opportunities, allowing us to build strength on strength. We have energized leadership in place to truly realize Duke's great promise. And we are well on the way. As you know, Duke this year had three Rhodes Scholars – the most of any university in the country, matched but not exceeded. [laughter] We received a record number of applicants for the class of 2023, and the admissions process is shaping up to be our most competitive ever.

Speaking of new students, we welcomed a pioneering class of undergraduates to Duke Kunshan University last fall. This summer, DukeEngage will celebrate its 12th anniversary, thanks to Eric Mlyn's [Executive Director of DukeEngage and Assistant Vice Provost for Civic Engagement] leadership, we have now reached 1.6 million hours spent by students in service to communities in 81 countries on six continents.

Our faculty, of course, continue to do incredible things. This year, Diego Bohorquez discovered the connection between the nervous system and the gut, ending a decades-long search by scientists and clinicians and laying the groundwork for untold new treatments of disease and obesity. The State of North Carolina has adopted a new testing program for municipal water supplies thanks in large part to the guidance and expertise of Lee Ferguson in the Nicholas School. And for innumerable other contributions to our understanding of the world, we have welcomed an impressive new class of inductees into our prestigious National Academies. Duke even participated in two world records – some of you already know about the record-setting electrical vehicle developed by our engineering students,

who came together to produce the world's most fuel-efficient vehicle. Less well-known is the world-record size bowl of gumbo that we had the opportunity to, shall we say, sample at this year's Independence Bowl game in Shreveport. [laughter]

We are also making major new strategic decisions. Last year, I was in the midst of developing my strategic framework for the future of Duke, consulting with faculty, staff, students, and trustees about the challenges and great opportunities that lie ahead. You may recall from last year's address that we identified five main priorities for the future of Duke: empowering the brightest and boldest thinkers to solve our most pressing challenges; transforming teaching and learning; renewing our campus community; forging purposeful partnerships in our region; and engaging our global network.

This year, we're focused on advancing each plank of our framework. We are now beginning the work of shifting the focus from articulating our strategic vision to executing across the broader university. First, we are using the framework to inform the way we engage with our numerous and varied constituents about Duke's future. If you visit the President's website, you will see that I have highlighted framework, and illustrated our progress on each plank, across our schools. The message has been well-received in a wide range of settings, from meetings with Deans, to conversations with students and staff, to events with our alumni around the world.

Second, in tandem with these efforts, we are refining our long-term strategic vision, working closely with the Board of

Trustees. The Board last year voted to refine their governance structures, with the aim of freeing up more of their time to help engage in long-term institutional strategy. These changes in governance resulted in fewer standing committees of the trustees, allowing the flexibility to organize ad hoc task forces focused on critical priorities, informed by the strategic framework. Four such task forces are now at work, each bringing together trustees, administrative and staff liaisons, faculty members, and students. They are addressing four key priorities: strengthening the alumni network, advancing science and technology, determining the future of Central Campus, and building a next-generation residential learning community.

These four priorities reflect great opportunities. We have a chance, for instance, to better position Duke to leverage advances in data science, computing, our understanding of the human genome, and powerful new observational technologies by making targeted investments in science and technology; better aligning our efforts across Duke Health and the University, and coordinating across the schools to catalyze interdisciplinary faculty hiring. We have already started this signature initiative, supported by an initial gift of \$50 million from the Duke Endowment – a seed fund for faculty hiring that we aim to expand through development and build upon with new gifts to support endowed faculty chairs.

We have an opportunity to better engage Duke's worldwide alumni network, both by offering them new educational and professional-development resources – at whatever age and wherever they may be – and by leveraging their capacious

experience and knowledge as a resource for us and our students. As I've traveled around, I've seen a real hunger among our alumni to be guests in your classrooms and mentors to your students. One of our task forces is focused on utilizing that opportunity. The goal should be to give true substance to the concept of life-long learning, which at its best may permit our alumni network to feel something as an eleventh school -- fully developing, and harnessing, the wide expertise and deep commitment of this incredible group of people.

The work of our task forces also reflect significant challenges. Any of you who have visited Central Campus know that it's one thing we haven't gotten right. We have relied for far too long on Central Campus to house undergraduates, in buildings that were not originally constructed for that purpose and which have for some time now been decrepit. I'm pleased that our students will be living on Central Campus for only a few months longer, allowing us to begin using that valuable space more effectively, or, if we have no immediate pressing needs, to perhaps bank it as a future resource. And, with the Hollows dormitories nearing completion and renovations to the old quads on West Campus wrapping up, now is the time for us to rethink our residential living and learning model, seeking to build upon Duke's success in residential life and to better serve the intellectual and social growth of our students, leveraging our resources in the arts, our recreational resources, our student health resources, and our numerous community-building resources to ensure we define the very best in residential education of the whole student. I expect that the task force will put a particular emphasis on

strengthening the connection between faculty and the vibrant life of our students outside of the classroom. As we move forward on these fronts, we also do well to focus on grounding all of our work on the core values and ethics that define Duke University. Let me close my remarks this afternoon by spending a bit of time on those values, and the ways we might profitably recommit to them as an academic community. Over the course of the past two years, we have been buffeted by often deep divisions that test the strength of our community -- some of our own making, some brought upon us by outside forces. We have also confronted incidents of misconduct -- sometimes by students, other times by members of our staff or faculty -- that call into question the integrity of our educational work or our research, or the resolve of our community to live up to our highest ideals. As you know, this Council, under the leadership of Don and ECAC, has talked several times about how we as a faculty can step up to better confront, and ideally reduce, unprofessional conduct. As we worked to address each disturbing incident, I would often hear similar comments from faculty and staff alike: Wouldn't it be good if we had an explicit statement of our values? Wouldn't it be useful for us to share, to reflect upon, and to draw upon -- especially in difficult times -- a concise and highly visible statement of our core, guiding principles? To have a readily accessible touchpoint for the continuing discussions about challenging issues at all levels of the university community? In fact, at several points in our history we developed just such a statement of values -- as it turns out, one for the University and one for Duke Health. These two statements shared a great deal in common and were primarily distributed to new hires for employee orientation.

But we clearly have not done a good enough job of communicating the values they described to the community or, more important, ensuring that they inform all aspects of university life.

With this recognition in mind, we began discussing how we could renew these earlier statements, to combine and streamline the work of earlier presidents, faculty, students and staff, into a concise and easily accessible list of core values. Across the two lists, there were five core common values that came through clearly, which I have highlighted in conversations with ECAC, undergraduate, graduate, and professional students, and senior administrators. Those values are: respect, trust, inclusion, discovery, and excellence.

I will note that these values are by no means new – they have been essential to the success of Duke throughout our history and will remain so as we look ahead to the future. By respect, we mean that Duke affirms both freedom of expression and an abiding regard for others. By trust, we commit to being honorable, credible, and reliable scholars and members of the community. And we trust that others are as well. By inclusion, we seek to create a climate that is welcoming to all backgrounds, abilities, perspectives, and points of view. By discovery, we mean sharing and seeking knowledge together. And by excellence, we commit to the continuing improvement of our education, research, and patient care. Together, these abiding values form the basis of a strong statement of our values and culture, which has been endorsed by the Board of Trustees. Over the next few weeks, we will begin re-introducing this statement to students, faculty, staff, and

administrators. These values will still serve as a basis for orienting our new hires and for introducing new students to the Duke community. But we also hope to infuse them into the work that we do every day at Duke – our teaching, research, partnerships, service, and – most importantly – our interactions with each other. As members of the Duke community, we all have a responsibility to not only uphold these values but also to hold one another accountable to them. This is not so much a set of guidelines as it is the foundation for a far more vibrant Duke University of tomorrow. It is my hope that these values and the culture they inform will inspire bold aspirations for the future and help us come even closer to realizing our great potential. Thank you, and with that, I would be happy to take any questions or comments. Thank you. [applause] Advice? [laughter]

#### ***Q&A WITH PRESIDENT PRICE / DISCUSSION ABOUT LIGHT RAIL***

**Robin Kirk (Cultural Anthropology):** Thank you for those comments. I wonder if you could comment a little bit on Duke's relationship to Durham, especially in light of the light rail decision? Some of us are very concerned about that and I would like to hear you talk more about how you see the relationship with Durham developing now that we have a combative relationship between Duke, the City Council, the County Commissioners, and other political leaders in the region.

**Price:** Thanks for that question. This concerns me greatly as well. I came here driven by the prospect of working very closely with Durham. It's an exciting time in Durham's history, an exciting time in Duke's history, and I think we have an opportunity and a responsibility to

develop strong partnerships. This controversy over light rail, in my view, is unfortunate for all kinds of reasons, principally because it's being represented somehow as a withdrawal of Duke's support for Durham, which I believe is a mischaracterization of what is happening. It certainly does not reflect any diminution of my view that we need to double down and strengthen our partnerships over time. We can talk some more about light rail, there is a long history here, but the important point, with respect to our partnerships in the region, is that with Stelfanie Williams coming aboard, and if you haven't had a chance to meet Stelfanie, I encourage you to meet her, she is working very closely with me and the entire leadership team to think about how we can better catalyze all of our university resources to serve the needs of Durham at this point in time. This means reaching out, understanding the needs of the community, helping respond, whether it's affordable housing, education, or transportation, and working in close partnership. We have every intention of doing that. I have every intention of doing that. I think what's been very difficult is the representation of this particular issue, which is one that has a 20-year history. And a history of very consistent views being expressed by this university as somehow being a matter of last minute changes of points of view, as being a situation where Duke has somehow "killed" the project. The truth is that, unfortunately, several required cooperative agreements weren't signed, not just from Duke, but from the North Carolina Railroad, for example. The project faced very serious, and continues to face very serious funding challenges, probably irremediable, and there are a number of planning assumptions that prove to be problematic, requiring all

kinds of changes. I've only been here for the past year and a half or so. What I've seen, I will say, is an attempt, in very good faith, for Duke, notwithstanding its very consistently stated problems with the route, to do all we could to work closely with GoTriangle and other partners. We just couldn't get there. That is the story. I'd be happy to ask Tallman [Trask, Executive Vice President] or others to clarify. But I think it's very important not to let this interrupt what is a powerful trajectory of engagement for our university with the community. It's critical to our success.

**Mary Fulkerson (Divinity School):** Who were the other partners you've been in communication with?

**Price:** We've been working with GoTriangle, which is the transit body, with the County Board of Commissioners, and with the city. Those are the principal entities.

**Fulkerson:** I know Durham CAN [Congregations, Associations & Neighborhoods] is involved, but not at that level, it sounds like.

**Price:** Right. And if there are questions, again, all I can say is, I have worked very hard to build and maintain strong relationships. I don't think it's to anyone's advantage to turn this controversy into a Duke versus Durham issue. Everything that we have done has been studiously done to avoid just that. I think it's a shame that in the local media, that is precisely the way it's being portrayed. We'll just have to work through that because I want to be judged by deeds as well as words, and by what I hope is a very long and productive history of cooperation. I know

Stelfanie very much shares that point of view.

**Speaker:** This is along those lines. I think there was a recent article in the Duke Chronicle that mentioned or accused Duke of having negotiated in bad faith because it said Duke was the one who requested the stop and the route along Erwin Road first, and then said no because that would be a problem. So I was concerned about that. I would love to be able to defend Duke and say we want to work with the community, but I would appreciate clarification on that. Was that just inaccurate?

**Price:** Yes. I would ask Tallman to speak to that, because, while I've been involved for two years, Tallman has been involved for two decades. By the way, I will simply say that, when I came aboard, and first learned of this, every single senior leader of this university, current and past, represented the same precise concerns about this project. So the representation that there is somehow a sudden departure, it just doesn't square with my experience at all. But since Tallman has more information, I'll let him respond.

**Tallman Trask (Executive Vice President):** On the particular station in question, that was a discussion when the route was on the ground, before it got elevated. It was a question about where Duke would prefer to have the station. We were looking at pedestrian pathways, but then it didn't work on grade.

**Price:** As I understand it, this project, because it's been 20 years, it's gone through multiple iterations. I believe it was originally diesel.

**Trask:** It was originally diesel headed to Raleigh.

**Price:** And then it became an electric train, propelled by different designs, and then you can go back several years ago, you can read, I think the Chronicle actually covered this, stories recording Nan Keohane's [former President] objection, longer than ten years ago, to an elevated station in front of Duke Hospital. So these are not particularly new concerns. Dick [Brodhead, former President] served 13 years, so this would have been 15 or so years ago.

**Pat Halpin (Nicholas School of the Environment):** Just going back in time, I think I may have been at the original meeting, about 22 years ago [laughter] and this was a meeting with the Triangle Planners. They brought in environmental experts from Duke, UNC, and NC State to look at the first scoping. This was before it got down to individual routes. We actually found that the plan – first off, everyone loved light rail. They thought that transportation is a wonderful thing. But, that particular plan, we thought was fundamentally flawed because of actually the same reasons people are now fighting against it. The ability to lower our carbon footprint and public justice issues. Population communities that would be served. The consensus from that meeting was, we felt like they should be looking at public transportation to transport people to employment centers, not connecting to employment centers [to each other]. We could not for the life of us figure out why you would connect Duke Hospital and UNC Hospital as the main goal. That's what we said. And we thought it was night shift nurses and technicians that need to get to those hospitals who need public transportation, not people going

between the two hospitals. It just did not make sense. So the consensus from the experts brought in on the original version of that plan canned it. We were never invited back. [laughter]

**Price:** Let me just say, I would just encourage every person in this room to do research. Don't just read articles. Because I will tell you, having been interviewed for multiple articles, that they then never report on anything I said in those interviews. Or on the numerous people otherwise interviewed. I would say you just need to step back and learn as much as you can and make your own decisions. My responsibility is to make decisions for Duke University and Duke Health and to do them in a way that was grounded in appropriate consideration of the facts as I understand them and not to respond to pressure. This is not the way any organization makes good decisions. As the pressure mounted, I will be honest, it only steeled my resolve that we're on the right trajectory, not the wrong trajectory. Because there are good and sufficient reasons to argue a case. But this is one that, for me, has been most unfortunate because it has been portrayed, in my view, inaccurately, as a circumstance where Duke has "killed" a project, and that it's the product of last minute decision. I would just strongly encourage you – transit is central to our future, let us be clear. This is a growing region. Whether this is the right approach, how we should build out that system, how the three counties collaborate in this, because the original focus was on Durham and Wake Counties, and was only then redirected toward Orange County, these are critical issues. They're not going away. Duke will be a partner in those discussions, I hope a leader in those discussions. So no one

should read this particular decision as reflecting disinterest in collaboration with all of our partners in the region on transit or affordable housing.

**Roy Weintraub (former Academic Council Chair / Professor Emeritus, Economics):** This Council, over 20 years ago, asked the then-President's Advisory Committee on Resources of which I was chair, to examine the proposal and we rejected it. It was a very foolish one. We spent about six months on it. All of that information is in the Archives, it's in the files. None of that has appeared in any of the statements about how Duke has just pulled the rug out from under this project. This Council was on record with it through its own committee.

**Speaker:** Among those who are portraying Duke's actions in the way that you describe, are many public officials and community leaders. Can you talk some about what you are doing right now and plan to do in the future to help repair relations and to help chart a path forward for Duke to actively engage in issues of transit and housing in the region?

**Price:** Absolutely. The first thing is that, at least personally, I've tried to convey as accurately as possible the position of Duke. To be clear that these are very serious concerns and ever since I've been involved I've been doing that, while responding to requests that we continue to work with them. When it became clear that we could not sign various agreements – and by the way, this happened repetitively. Back in November, we were told by the end of the month, people needed to know. And I said, I'm sorry, no. The response at that time was, we'll give it a little more time. And it kept rolling forward. But in every one of those



encounters, I have made very clear that it's critical for us to work together, that I don't want this to damage our working relationship. Because these are, notwithstanding disagreements, these are people who care about their community, they are leaders of our community, and we must work with them. So I will continue to reach out to them. I'm looking for opportunities to pick up on some of the conversations that we were having, very productive conversations, for example, about affordable housing. We've committed \$10 million to support affordable housing in Durham, the product of work over the past 18 months, two years or so. I'd like to get back to those conversations. I intend to do so as soon as possible. The other thing I was planning to do all along but we'll do on a more accelerated basis is work with Stelfanie to get out into the communities myself, spend time with residents, so that they can learn to trust this institution. Because this is what pains me most. The fact that so many people were so ready and willing to distrust what the university was saying and continues to say to this day, is a problem. So the only way to build that trust back is to earn it. It starts with sitting down and having conversations. That will be my strategy going forward. Not just myself but members of the leadership team and Stelfanie will be absolutely central to that. By the way, we have a lot of partners: the school district, housing authority. We're already engaged with all of them and on all of these fronts we have enormous opportunities.

**Lee Baker (Cultural Anthropology):**

Some of our peers got caught up recently in a racketeering case around admissions. Have we looked at any of our soft spots, or have you done any risk mitigation in terms of making sure the coaches are

saying no to any approaches or any of that sort of stuff? How are we addressing this?

**Price:** Well, I'll tell you the way we're not addressing it, by putting our hands over our ears and saying "la la la." Absolutely, we are doing just what you described. Everything I've seen in my time at Duke gives me confidence that we're not engaging in the kinds of things that other institutions have been engaged in. but I don't let my trust replace the need to verify that. So what we're doing right now is the Office of General Counsel is working with Athletics, with Admissions, we're going back and we're auditing over previous years. I believe we've covered four years so far. We have not uncovered any instances that look to us like they would be especially troubling. So we'll continue to do that. If you read this case, the organization involved and principal player involved, they've been at work for about ten years. There's a lot of ground to cover here. Then prospectively, we're asking ourselves, are we vulnerable? Even if we're doing everything right, do we have the necessary safeguards in place? Let's learn from this incident. Of course, we always want to learn from our own mistakes. Goodness knows we have enough mistakes to help us learn. But we have to be smart enough to learn from other people's mistakes. I believe, in this case, it will be the latter circumstance. But if we do uncover something, my first goal is to know it before anybody else discovers it for us. [laughter] I mean this quite seriously, because that is our responsibility. A good institution does discover these things before other people point them out, because they have a routine review. I will say, among the most impressive things that I have witnessed, last year, you heard a report back from

the Academic Subcommittee of our Athletic Council. And the work that they did reviewing the work of student athletes, clustering in courses, they review admissions twice a year. We have very good protocols for faculty engagement in these issues. I think that is our strongest bulwark, to be honest, against these kinds of challenges. I'm feeling confident, but, as I said, that's no replacement for making sure that we dig into and learn every single thing we can.

**Nicole Larrier (School of Medicine):**

Back to the question of light rail: you said you recommended we look at sources or resources that might reflect more your and other folks' point of view. What might some of those be? Start with that.

**Price:** We have posted information ourselves. We've put it out there. Also, I think, for example, characterizations of other projects. I've been told repeatedly, well, this is just like what happened at University X or University Y or University Z. When I've gone and looked at University X, Y, or Z, it's not the case. Or it is the case, and University X ran into all kinds of problems because they weren't anticipating some of the issues and challenges we were concerned about. So it's both reviewing information that we're making available, but also not relying just on the news reports themselves. This is hard to do as a consuming citizen. It's hard work. I've been doing more of it, for obvious reasons, than most others. I think it's necessary to do that, just because a lot of representations made are not necessarily accurate representations. But we have a Q&A that we put up online. We're trying to release information. The other thing, to be honest, I don't want to generate controversy. We're in a moment where I'd like to turn down the heat, so

that, perhaps, has put us into a less vigorous posture with respect to defending our point of view, that might have resulted in more information being circulated. When the dust settles in this, it's not only a case for us to reach out and build a lot of strong ties to our community, it's an opportunity for us to step back and say, what did we learn from how we went about this? Maybe in the future, we do need to be more aggressive and proactive in making our views widely known as opposed to just working with leadership teams in the area.

**Larrier:** I guess part b is: I've been here for almost 20 years. There is a lot that has changed in the Health System and the School of Medicine. Some of the issues, at least out of the media, are related to money and that's one set of issues. Other issues are about safety of patients and whatnot. I'd like to be able to go home and think, this is not just Duke trying to get the soft spot. In my 20 years here, if the issues haven't really changed in 20 years, one of the issues I've heard about is the ICU. The ICUs have moved positions in the 20 years I've been here. They are not exposed to the street. What exactly is the issue? The next issue is the Eye Center. Okay, well, we had a choice as to where to build the Eye Center, and these issues we knew were going to be issues, so how did we take that into account as we were thinking about these things? Between the University and the Health System, I sense there are a whole lot of people who can explain these things, not just in a Q&A, general thing, to people who are trying to understand what exactly these issues are.

**Price:** That's a very good point. I think we can deal with some of those issues. Again, I came in late in this process. But we do have concerns, for example, about future

limitations. Let's take EMI [electromagnetic interference] for example. It not only creates a problem with existing infrastructure, but it limits what you can do with that infrastructure. Some universities, for example, when they learn that, let's say a research facility was adversely affected by a light rail, they had to vacate those buildings and relocate equipment. It's not impossible to do, but it adds a lot of cost, and in some cases, would affect clinical operations. So you're correct, we have made investments, large investments, billions of dollars of investments. Some of this was, again, we were all that time registering our strong opposition to this route. That's all I can say. It's not as though we said, great, that's where it's going to go, and we'll plan accordingly. We were very consistently representing that point of view. But I can't speak to the details because I really wasn't here when it was happening.

**Kathy Andolsek (School of Medicine):** I want to say that I'm really tremendously grateful that one of the strategies is really forging purposeful partnerships and I think that's really essential, particularly with a focus on Durham. I think this has continued to be needed over the 40 years I've been here. I think we can do better. In that spirit, I guess the question I've got is, given that the community and many people in the community represented to us that transit is a key need for them and that this may be a particular goal for them or a way for them to implement a need, I guess I'm curious: are there elements of this transit plan that Duke couldn't back-support, build trust back? And secondly, are there alternative plans that Duke has brought forward that could address the portions that it considers flawed now? I think part of the trust is maybe

compromise. Are there pieces where we can meet in the middle and effectively move forward? You mentioned Duke's leadership and I would like to suggest that sometimes in a partnership, one partner leads but also at other times, the other partner follows. So I think we can collaborate, we can follow, we can lead, but I think part of establishing trust may be demonstrating that we're equally willing to take each of those roles in forging these partnerships.

**Price:** Agreed. And as I said before, this is not the end of a conversation about our transit needs. It's a significant opportunity, in fact, responsibility, to restart those discussions and think about how we can get there. With respect to engagement and partnerships, nothing pains me more, not a single thing that has happened to me, even when we didn't make it as far in the tournament last year as I was hoping, nothing that has happened to me comes even close to this debate in terms of the difficulty it's placed me in. Because I am going to walk around for years with a bit of a leg cast until people become convinced that I'm sincere, that Duke is sincere. That's unfortunate. I don't believe I created that, and honestly I don't believe that Duke necessarily created that. But it's a reality and now we have to deal with that reality while we move forward. So this means just more resolve, harder work, being very clear about our commitment. We do have to be much better at listening, all of us, myself, certainly.

**Eric Postel (Ophthalmology):** I've been in Durham for 30 years so this is my home and I am a firm supporter of public transportation and community. I just wanted to give you information that you're looking for, at least to the extent

that I can. The Eye Center was built, the original building, where the ORs are, in about 1969. It was expanded in '89. The expansion was simply a clinical building, not the ORs. That was built more recently. So the operating rooms, which are right there on Erwin Road as well, have been present there for decades. They are very expensive operating rooms to duplicate anywhere else. We see about 100,000 patients a year at the Eye Center at that one location, many of which, as you might imagine, and despite our best efforts, can't see that well. So access is a tremendous issue both for parking for their families who come with them – so if we see 100,000 patients, that's 300,000 visitors – and for our patients themselves through a construction zone that could be present for many years. I'm not going to get into EMI and all that issue. Vibration is real. It's a problem for microsurgery, but I think the big issue is simply the physical access to the building and the clinics and the operating rooms, which are right on the street.

**Price:** Other comments?

**Josh Socolar (Physics):** Can I ask about another partnership that we have, and that's with DKU? Sorry I came in late, but I'm not sure how much you've talked about whether recent developments in China and US-China relations are filtering down to our interactions with the Ministry of Education or affecting in any way the programs that we have at DKU.

**Price:** Sally and her team would be in a better position to address the details, but the highlight would be that in this first year of operation, we have not really seen significant challenges along these lines. The challenges we've run into, to be honest, I think are more what you might

imagine startup challenges for a complicated new educational enterprise would be. It doesn't mean that we're not wary and that we're not concerned and that we're not monitoring the situation. But to date, we haven't had serious challenges. We are very concerned about the status of Sino-American relationships and we're concerned, for example, about restrictions on visas, potentially, and how that would affect not just our interactions with DKU but more broadly our interactions with China. So we're monitoring a lot of different issues. But I would say, and Sally, you can tell me if you would shade this somewhat differently, that to date, we've been pleased that we haven't seen on the ground, operationally, significant challenges. We did run in to one concern about potential adjustments to the board structure and we wrote back to say, this was the product of very extensive deliberation by our faculty, and were we to repeat this exercise, it's unclear that we would arrive at approval, so we do not want to reopen this. But I think outside of that, we haven't seen all that much.

**Sally Kornbluth (Provost):** Yes, we're extremely wary. And I have to say, when anything even starts to pop up its head even a little bit, we react pretty decisively on it. That doesn't mean things won't change, but so far it's been okay.

**Price:** I was proven correct in my prediction that the food in the cafeteria would loom as a big issue. [laughter] And it has. But this was not just because I have foresight. When we visited with NYU Shanghai when they were there, they reported that, I think in their first couple years, they went through four different suppliers and there were revolts. So that's why I say most of our immediate

challenges – and they’re very real – because the experience on the ground, the experience with the students and faculty, has to be Duke quality experience. It’s very different because the whole structure of the program is different. But we’re working through all of these things, I think, in incredible ways. For those of you who haven’t had the opportunity to visit DKU or who missed the exhibit that was in the library, which I thought was a phenomenal exhibit, it’s well worth a visit to see what’s going on, because it is an extraordinary accomplishment already in its young life.

Any other questions or concerns? Anyone want to give our basketball coach advice? [laughter] Which I do routinely. [laughter] I’m now approaching the end of my second year as President and as I said, no sophomore slump. It has been an exciting year in every meaning of the word ‘exciting.’ But it has been a great year. I wish that you had the opportunity that I have to travel around and visit our alumni around the world. The sense of deep gratitude for what they experienced while they were here, but even more so the sense of real excitement about how we’re leading the way going forward, it’s extraordinary and rejuvenating. If you’re ever feeling a little bit like you’ve got too large a stack of papers to grade, just go out. The other thing I will say, every small interaction I’ve had with a cluster of faculty or a cluster of students is just extraordinary. Perhaps we could be doing more of that. Constructing small conversations to work through these different issues. I come out of every single one of those conversations just feeling that the future could not be brighter. The future of this program could not be more pressing. I’ll turn the podium over to you. Thanks. [applause]

***MISCONDUCT IN RESEARCH POLICY  
REVISIONS: ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION  
FOLLOWING INITIAL PRESENTATION AT  
FEBRUARY 21 ACADEMIC COUNCIL  
MEETING***

**Taylor:** Thank you. So now onto the cheery topic of misconduct in research. [laughter] At our last meeting, Geeta Swamy, Vice Dean and Associate Vice Provost for Scientific Research came and talked about the revision to the Duke Misconduct in Research Policy and there was a good, robust discussion and some faculty went away thinking that we were in just “CYA” mode only, and actually, they really felt like that’s not at all what we wanted. Cam Harvey [Fuqua School of Business] reached out and had a very productive discussions and talked about some types of problems that might fall outside of what might be research misconduct but might still be behavior that’s beneath what we would expect of each other or expect of ourselves. So Geeta has agreed to come back and Leigh Goller, who is Chief Audit, Risk and Compliance Officer for Duke is here as well and they’re going to give a quick presentation and then we’ll have some time for discussion. Then after that, we’re going to have a nice reception, so please stay and we’ll tilt a glass together.

**Leigh Goller (Chief Audit, Risk, and Compliance Officer):** So I’ve been told that my bar was set way too low on the food for DKU. I thought it was edible. [laughter] Though I would say a Chick-Fil-A would probably do a great deal of good for their dining service. I’m Leigh Goller, Chief Audit, Risk, and Compliance Officer and I’m going to kick things off. So I can tell you that conduct is not always a cheery topic, but it can be really morbidly interesting. The kinds of things that come

through my office for investigation fall largely outside of research misconduct because I leave those to Geeta and her colleagues in the Research Integrity Office. I can tell you that we care about lots of different kinds of conduct. The idea that a Scientific Misconduct Policy was narrowing the field came as a bit of a surprise from a communication standpoint for me. So that's why I'm here, to basically broaden the field back out and to say that we – to use Cam's words – and we just can't say this enough or in enough ways – do the right thing. And if you're not sure what that is, there is always someone to call. I'm a good first stop if you think it might be something that's not research related or if it is and you just want one person to call. I'm a good place. I'm usually really friendly. I bite occasionally, only when deserved. [laughter]

I wanted to put forth just a couple of concepts, rules versus responsibilities, and there is an old joke about compliance being a four-letter word: 'rule.' The idea is, we have to put rules and boundaries on things because typically folks tend to meander around without them. But we also recognize that when we put too many rules, we start looking a little bit more like the IRS code, and that means that there are lots of loopholes. So we go back to talking about responsibilities. So if we look at the Scientific Misconduct Policy, that one was really a rule based on something fairly narrowly defined by our federal sponsors. So in order for us to be able to check the box as an institution and say that we've done what our sponsors expect of us, we wrote the rule. But the reality is, as an institution, we have much broader expectations of our responsibilities. Those are things that we put into context like, professional codes of

conduct, the institutional code of conduct, and general expectations of, what are good ways to treat one another? So there's a body of work that's out there that outlined those kinds of conduct expectations but more importantly, if you look at it and go, I don't want to read all of those – we were with a panel of folks this morning who told us, from their own institutions, they had never read their Faculty Handbook – I'm sure you all have read it, but just in case you haven't and you want some other reading that might be equally as interesting and yet differently codified, try our eight different codes of conduct. There is one for all kinds of flavors of things. In the Faculty Handbook, there is misconduct in research. [refers to slide] That is broadly stated as anything that is defined as official misconduct, but then in addition, other practices that seriously deviate from those that are commonly accepted within the community. In other words, you all are defining what's largely acceptable. So hold each other accountable. Raise your hand and say, I don't think that looks right and I want to talk to somebody about it. Or I want to talk to you about it. You can have those conversations with each other or bring those kinds of conversations to us. Now, at the institutional level, we have a code of conduct, which basically says, we expect you to do the right thing and if you're not sure what that is, ask someone. More importantly, it references back to the Faculty Handbook. So we connect those two things together. Then you heard just a few minutes ago from Vince that we have even more broad overarching principles of, what are our values? Those things, it gets really squishy when we talk about this, but basically, it comes back to "do the right thing," and if you're not sure that you're

doing the right thing or someone that you're watching isn't doing the right thing, it's always a good idea to ask us to help take a look or think through it with you.

So we have a couple of case examples that we're going to talk through. I'm going to let Geeta do hers first, because hers is going to revisit the scientific misconduct definitions and how we go a little bit outside that, even when it's research based. Then we're going to go to the bigger, squishier one and we'll look more at the values side of this.

**Geeta Swamy (Vice Dean and Associate Vice Provost for Scientific Integrity):**

Leigh said that some people think of compliance as a four letter word. I have to say, as a faculty member, I like Leigh and I like working with Leigh – I think it's really important to know that we have a multitude of offices, groups, efforts, initiatives at the institution, and one of the things that I've really strived to do is try to connect a lot of those folks and figure out how we can work together to come to the same thing and figure out how we can do this and keep messaging the same thing consistently to everyone, rather than getting a different message based on whoever you look to or ask. So just to say that as an intro.

So I want to talk about research misconduct again and the definition. The regulatory federal definition is that it has to meet the standards of falsification, fabrication, or plagiarism. Those sound very specific and they are. So we need to make sure that we are doing everything that we can, also, not to just find it and report it, but to do whatever we can to help people prevent those things too. I'll talk a little bit about some of the

initiatives, and there are a lot going on. A lot of those things, to be very clear, have been at this institution already. It isn't something that we suddenly figured out we weren't doing these. But I don't think that necessarily all of our faculty as well as our trainees, students, and whatnot, are aware of those things. I really hope that we can do better about making sure we're communicating and giving people access to all those resources easily. So I put together here several things as background elements that come from a multitude of cases and why I say this is, again, what was in the previous statement and is in the handbook already and has not changed, is that things that deviate from the community standard may constitute misconduct. [refers to slide] So it doesn't meet that regulatory definition, but that doesn't mean that someone in my office looks at it and goes, sorry, no, that's not our space, we're not going to help you, we're not going to look into it. To be very clear, we have complaints or issues related to access to data. For example, say that a PI or an investigator in a lab is working with students and then the graduate student says, oh, I'd like to get that data and write up that paper and they say, no, you worked on it but you can't have access to the data. That's my data, I'm the investigator. So we would all say, so, what was the role then? What was the role of the student and the investigator in the mentorship? Who should have access to data? Sure, the access should be done within the guise of what is allowable, where it's kept, what the standards are, what the standards should be about the communication that goes forth, whether it's been reproduced, vetted, and so forth. We can't suddenly just say, well, they didn't give access to the data, but that didn't meet the FFP (falsification, fabrication, or plagiarism).

Those are the kind of things that we look at. We have an Authorship Dispute Board. But a lot of people may or may not know about that. We get concerns or issues that come forth. So if you don't give someone access to the data, they see a paper come forth, their name is not included, what do they do? So does that constitute misconduct? It could, but it might be that we investigate that or assess that and figure out what the next steps would be. What about academic productivity? So if you follow the example of: someone limits access to data, they don't get their name on a paper, which they might have contributed significantly to and met the criteria, but now they don't actually have that on their CV. I know there are a lot of discussions about the processes that we go through for appointment, promotion, and tenure. But clearly, part of that, regardless of numbers, quantity, all of those things, is quality and demonstration of academic productivity. So we can't just think that if people don't meet these, then they're just sort of on their own. We have to have a resource for folks to know how to manage these processes. Folks in my office really take these things very seriously, whether they meet that definition or not. We assess them with the same rigor and the same intent, but then what happens is it may not meet that definition and so while it doesn't get called research misconduct, it still gets dealt with. It still gets recommendations for corrective actions. Those corrective actions might be the same that would have happened if you committed research misconduct. It's really still about going by the rules and the responsibilities of individuals. So we take the same approach. We take the same standards for assessing the outcomes and developing recommendations. So I'll just put that forth. Leigh is going to talk about a case

that we actually worked on together as well in research bias, which doesn't meet that definition, but is still significant.

**Goller:** This is going to be a rather specific example. If you happen to be able to guess who this is, keep it to yourself, just in case. I think it's helpful to talk about real world examples and to use those to learn from, particularly when there are varying points of view that can be equally truthful and valid. In this particular case, my office got a call from an outside reporter, so not a news article reporter, but an allegation reporter, so you'll hear me use that term throughout this. So the reporter says to me, I think there's been a case of research misconduct. I was at a public forum and I believed that conflicts of interest were not disclosed and those conflicts of interest materially affected the programming that was on for the day and potentially violated the sponsors' expectations. So I say, thank you very much for calling, how can I get back in touch with you? I look him up, he's a little bit of a wingnut, sometimes they are, but wingnuts can be just as right as anybody else.

**Taylor:** The faculty member or the reporter? [laughter]

**Goller:** You can choose. [laughter] I have the utmost respect for both.

**Speaker:** I've never heard that word. Is it a negative? [laughter]

**Goller:** The person who reported this to me is well known in certain circles in the community of the scholarship that this was being alleged against as being an activist who is not always well informed. "Wingnut." So I called Geeta and said, I



don't think we have a research misconduct case, but I do think we have the potential for a research bias. Let's do the work together, that way, if we do find that it's a research misconduct pathway, we've already gotten all the groundwork laid together. In my 12 years here, this was the first time my office did a research bias case. We were doing this in the context that it wasn't a highly scientific area, which is probably good for me. Those of you who have seen me talk about anything scientific, you understand that. But this was a really good way for us to really show we have an expectation of values and through conduct and the quality of the work that we do, no matter what kind of work it is, now let's assess, what went right about that work and where did we have opportunities to be able to educate the group that was executing all this work. How can they do it better? How can they have a different level of transparency with their constituents? So we looked through the research award. I reviewed and Geeta reviewed elements of video that was taken of the public forum event. We looked through the entire script that managed to be the body of work. We reviewed a number of communications between the sponsor and the investigators and the team of people that were working with them to put the forum on and came to these conclusions. It was this: they did exactly what the award said they would do. There were financial interests that were dual in nature between the investigators and some of the panelists. Those had not been very publically disclosed. They were available if one went looking for them, but they had not been made very public during that forum. And that was an opportunity. There were also opportunities for me to go back to the reporter and say, here's

how everything really worked. There was a great deal of communication between the sponsor and the investigators in the team that worked on this forum. There was a script. We verified that the script was followed. All of the people who intended to make a comment had the ability to do that and those comments were recorded in the video. The sponsor has received a copy of the video. It's eight hours long. You're welcome to watch it. It's posted online. So there were a lot of things that we really did right but the ones that we went back to the investigators and said, there are better ways to do these three things. One: be more transparent with the dual financial interests. Say it and say it again and then say it a third time to make sure everybody heard you. Two: there is a way to professionalize the communications that go out between the office that organized this public forum and the constituents that they hope to reach. And then finally, consider how to leverage your potentially disenfranchised or opposition part of the market so that you're bringing them into the conversation rather than trying to exclude them in order for expediency. So there were really good learnings from that kind of case and ones that Geeta and I had thoughtful conversation about how we communicate those with our investigators and with our reporter.

**Swamy:** I want to just wrap up a little bit by following President Price's words – he said we shouldn't be held only to our words but also viewed for our deeds that we put forth. I had this slide in my presentation last month about what we really look at as a culture. [refers to slide] A lot of what we look at in the world of integrity, scientific – regardless of what the areas we're talking about, it really is a culture. We have to follow the value

statement, the code of conduct and so forth. I'll just point you to the fact that this is a booming area of interest, not just here at Duke, but really worldwide. We really have to start holding not only our faculty, but also all the stakeholders, accountable to move in this area. Really beyond the idea that thinking that everyone here is here to do good. But let's make sure that we make it easy for them to do good. We really have come up with key principles from what I look at as our research integrity culture at Duke. And that it follows similar words that you see in codes of conduct and so forth. But we really need to think about being inclusive and getting all of our stakeholders to participate in this arena. How can we be comprehensive from the standpoint of education, oversight, and accountability? Not only for faculty, but also our trainees and our staff? How can we think about a holistic approach across all dimensions of research integrity? Not just, have we done everything right per regulations? Have we submitted our IACUC [Duke Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee] protocol and gotten approval? Have we submitted things to IBC [Institutional Biosafety Committee]? But how can we think about things like looking at data with our students? Are we looking at the primary data repeatedly, or are we just simply going by a summary they give us? How can we think about this pragmatically? We have accounted that we have almost 3,000 faculty across this university who participate or engage in research. So obviously I can't - I might be able to, but I don't think I can meet with every single one of those faculty anytime soon. So how can we figure out how to provide resources and tools that make it easy for everyone to do the right thing? And how can we empower individuals to come forward and speak up? You'll hear a lot

more about this in the coming months about the idea of a speak up culture. We have worked a lot, for those of you who are in the Health System, when I think back to when I was a trainee, we really didn't talk about safety reporting and quality. Now, you're rewarded for reporting something in the safety reporting system. We need to get to that from an academic standpoint as well.

I just throw this up here to say that we're doing a lot. [refers to slide] There are some other slides in here that are posted as well, but I don't need to present them to you. You're welcome to look at them. But the areas that our office is working in really are education and training, trying to promote best practices from a standpoint of accountability and culture, data management resources, and also reviews of how people are utilizing scientific resources and their data, accountability, and also how we're going to measure effectiveness. We can put forth lots of education, lots of talks, lots of things, but if we don't have any data to demonstrate that they're effective, I don't think we're really doing our due diligence. So I just put that out there to say that I'm happy to come, maybe not to 3,700 meetings, [laughter] but I'm happy to come and talk to folks at any of their faculty, division, or lab meetings. Staff from our office, we're doing a lot of outreach and we've had a tremendous uptake from that so I appreciate anyone who has met with our folks. But please feel free to reach out if there are things you'd like for us to do. I'll stop there and see if we have questions.

**Cam Harvey (Fuqua School of Business):** Can you go back to 5.2.2.7 [in the Faculty Handbook]? I guess the issue that I mentioned last time was removal of

the “in addition, other practices” sentence from Appendix P. The next sentence says “These practices are covered by the Duke University Policy and Procedures governing misconduct in research Appendix P.” Well, the examples were also purged from the new document.

**Swamy:** They were. Right.

**Harvey:** So this doesn’t make any sense right now. It refers to Appendix P for examples that are not there. I’m wondering if we could create something where the examples are resurrected somewhere. Indeed, I would hope that we could strengthen this to give examples in the handbook of procedures that are offside, and the best practices, also.

**Swamy:** I agree with all of that, short of putting it in the handbook. One of the issues is that I would like it to be much more nimble than that and we have put forth case discussions and after all of our town halls that we’re putting forth we have a blog post and then we have what we call “Ask DOSI” questions that come up. Cases that we put forth from our workshops. So are all live, going on and accumulating. So I think rather than put it into an official document where it’s always changing, where things are changing as we go, that it would be better to put it where people can access it more readily than in the handbook.

**Harvey:** So could we point to it, at least, in the handbook, with a link?

**Swamy:** We certainly could, somewhere in here, but I think, again, we struggle a little bit with – I will just say, weblinks are potentially an issue because weblinks are not always working. Sometimes when you change a website, you have to go back and

forth. We can talk about it. Probably not in the policy appendix, but in the section, if that’s the standard we have for the handbook, we can look at that and see. But I think that, again, what I really want to focus on is promoting the discussion and the cultural change. And if we think that that is how the cultural change looks in the handbook, then certainly we could put that forth. But I think it actually has to be much bigger than that.

**Harvey Cohen (Clinical Sciences):** To follow on that, it seems that at the very least, you ought to correct that sentence. You can’t have a sentence that refers to something that doesn’t exist. I guess you could, but it doesn’t make any sense. [laughter]

**Goller:** We can work on that.

**Cohen:** You just have to get rid of that part of the sentence.

**Swamy:** Sure. We can do that.

**Warren Grill (Biomedical Engineering):** I have a question about the training that is being required of all researchers. Can you share with us how that was established? Is it reflected with best practice, and what are the data that indicate that people going through that training change their practices?

**Swamy:** Responsible Conduct Research training, or RCR training, has actually been a requirement for anyone on training grants or individual or institutional K awards. So the NIH, at least, has required it for a number of years for early stage or trainee investigators. So there has been a recognized gap between early stage investigators and, let’s say, seasoned

investigators. Because that has not been required. I think that the issues from where RCR was developed have really focused for a long time on the biomedical sciences and not across the spectrum of academic research. So we are working to move that forward. As far as how we have put it together, we initially put forth several options for people to do. One is that they could do online modules, which I'm sure everybody would put forth in the same bucket as all the other online modules that we have to do. And then we put forth things of self-assessment that you could do as sort of demonstrating your existing knowledge. And then there are the interactive workshops. There is a whole science on Responsible Conduct of Research training as well as remediation in RCR conduct. The data that is out there that exist have demonstrated that the best programs that have demonstrated effectiveness have been ones that have been in depth and interactive, as opposed to online modules. That's why we've really tried to put forth practices where we can interact with folks. So I said I'll have these in the appendix, but I'll just demonstrate for you. So, for example, this was one that we had in January that was about authorship. [refers to slide] You can see that we had panelists from across the institution. We have had a little over 200 individuals attend each one and we do a post-event survey. At least from this one, from a little over 200 people who attended, 76 people responded – and we had many other data points that we asked – but you can see that the majority of people said that they did actually learn something that would help them with their research. That's just one example. Another one that we did was on plagiarism. So, again, these are topics that go somewhat into research misconduct, but they're broader. We're going to have

ones that are about mentorship. We have a colloquium planned in the fall that's going to be about bullying in academia. So we're really broadening it to the overall research integrity space. I think it's really important for us to make sure that we are bringing information forth to people that they find helpful and useful and not just really checking a box or clicking through modules and answering questions.

**Roxanne Springer (Physics):** One thing that I find interesting about this is that the standards at the moment seem to be rather different for people on the Medical side versus people on the University side.

**Swamy:** Which standards do you mean?

**Springer:** Whether or not you're actually required to take any of these RCR modules, for example.

**Swamy:** The standards actually are, as far as the requirement, I can tell you the algorithm that we went through was that if anyone is listed as a PI or key personnel on an IRB or IACUC protocol, if they are an investigator that holds a grant of any kind from an external sponsor, if their space where they have their office or lab is designated in the space management system as research-based, or if they actually have salary that comes from a fund code with an attribute for research. Those are the criteria that have been applied across the entire institution. That generated about 2,000 people in the School of Medicine who were engaged in research and about 700 people in the University who are engaged in research.

**Springer:** I would not be surprised if many people, as I am, are very surprised to hear this. Because I've never heard it before. Because I have a Department of

Energy grant and no one has ever mentioned that any of these are required.

**Kornbluth:** This is actually new. If I may jump in for a second. I think everyone is aware that we have been put under a series of obligations and strictures by the NIH. Although we like to see, we sometimes see this distinction between what's happening on the campus and what's happening in the School of Medicine, they don't view us as different entities. They view us as federal grant holders. This goes to Warren's question of well, it's not that it was a specific, exactly what the remediation of concerns about Duke's research operational culture were, it was that they asked us to propose a series of possible approaches to giving the federal sponsors confidence that we're trying to remedy issues in the research space. So one of the things that was put forward was RCR training across the board. Now, I'm not in favor of people sitting and doing a whole bunch of online modules either. I think the notion that there can be – and in fact, these discussions have been, the uptake on the Medical side has been excellent and they've gotten great reviews. To the extent that we can do programming that's actually value added, that helps bring in a more excellent research environment, I think it's a positive thing. You haven't heard about it yet because this has just rolled out.

**Swamy:** For example, Sally, the session that you are going to be holding, I think next week...

**Kornbluth:** Yeah, Mohamed Noor [Biology] and I are doing a session on lab management and that counts. So it's going to be pretty broad.

**Speaker:** There should have been a sunburst on the slide that said "coming soon!" [laughter]

**Springer:** That's huge. Thank you.

**Kornbluth:** I think it's going to be important and I don't want it to devolve into a check-the-box and we finish yet another "what percent formaldehyde are you allowed to use..." We do that every single year.

**Springer:** In practice, this is why this Theater Delta at Duke, people are not signing up for it.

**Kornbluth:** This is going to have to be a communications push as well as everything else. And you know, the uptake in the School of Medicine is now, one way or another, 100%. It's not that everyone has time to do these sessions, but these have been very popular. You can do it by an online training, but it's not something that I would choose to do, personally, as a way to solve the problem.

**Swamy:** We have done also sessions with individual labs or units or departments, focused on a thematic area for them as well. So we have almost set it up as a journal club type of session with an interactive discussion and put that forward. So really the goal here is to try to stimulate discussion and understanding of what it means to work in a culture of integrity in their research.

**Baker:** This seems very focused on the sort of Lab Science side. Are you making it a priority for the Humanities and Interpretive Social Sciences?

**Swamy:** Yes. So I just met with Gennifer Weisenfeld [Dean of Humanities] the day

before to have some of those conversations. So, yes. And that's what I sort of mentioned before. The RCR training, if you see it out there or look it up, outside of Duke, just existing, is very focused on Biomedical Sciences. We recognize that. That is a lot of why, rolling out, it's not going to be that we can just take what exists and use it. To be very clear, what exists is mostly online modules. So it doesn't really deliver. But I do think areas regarding mentorship, how to communicate and interact with trainees, things about authorship, those kinds of things resonate in the academic setting regardless. So I think when we talk about our authorship discussion, it really didn't have anything to do with the specific scientific area or the research area or the academic area. It's really broader than that. So, yes, we recognize that and we have folks in our team who have Social Science experience as well to help with developing programs. But we also are looking for faculty who are interested in doing that. We worked with faculty developing something for their unit to do and then also be a part of the discussion and presentation. Because I think that then resonates even further, rather than somebody like me walking in to your space and giving a talk. We hope to do it together and be present and deliberate in that way.

**Socular:** It seems to me that there is a tension here between wanting to put issues like this always in the hands of experts whose job it is to deal with this kind of thing and really making cultural changes at the department level, where people don't want to be told that if you have an issue, go to this link and talk to this person that you've never seen before. In the Physics department, we are attempting to write our own code of

conduct, which, of course, we want to be consistent, but I'm wondering whether you have any thoughts about how best to go about that and whether there are examples of smaller units where it's working well or whether it's just a bad idea or what?

**Swamy:** If you mean specifically focused in research, I can give you examples, but I think if we're going broader, then I think there are examples. At least from the academic perspective, we have talked about a development of what's called a culture and accountability plan. It is something that's kind of a live document. So it can be edited and updated and that sort of thing. We've focused that at least on the researcher sciences. I think when you're looking at it from a broader perspective, there are things that you can do. Leigh, I don't know if you want to speak to that code of conduct sort of thing.

**Goller:** I'm going to push just a little and say, I think what you're doing is important which is codifying what the expectations are within your department. I would hesitate to call it a code of conduct because we don't want conflict and competition amongst institutional expectations and departmental expectations. They should support one another. So if there is something that's missing in our institutional code of conduct, I'd like to know about that so that we can incorporate it so we better support what's important to you. Some interpretations of the code of conduct, as far as how you put these expectations into practice at a local level and taking that kind of initiative for the department to lead itself and to have local champions for culture, for accountability, for conduct, for behavior, for everything except

investigations. Again, coming back, bring investigations forward to the central offices, because then we get a degree of consistency and we understand where trends are. Because if we see something is happening in more than one place, we have an opportunity for the institution to be more nimble to react to those consistencies across departments.

**Taylor:** Claudia Gunsch, who is Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement has been thinking about some of this, about the language, about not having multiple codes of conduct but having the parts work together.

**Claudia Gunsch (Civil and Environmental Engineering / Associate Vice Provost, Faculty Advancement):**

I've been enjoying this conversation. I think it's interesting to hear from the research misconduct perspective and I think there's lots of overlap with some of the activities that are going on in Abbas' [Benmamoun] office [Faculty Advancement]. So I think this is a great time for us to have that conversation because I think some of the conversation about the value statement and the code of conduct, there is a lot of overlap, but trying to figure out the lane for each of these offices is important. I think there are a lot of conversations that are going on.

**Abbas Benmamoun (Vice Provost, Faculty Advancement):** If I can add, we have been talking with Schools to do what Josh is talking about. We have been meeting with Deans and their teams to hear about what they are doing, what their plans are, how we can be helpful to them. Because we want these efforts to be from the departments or units themselves, with support from us. So we

will be reporting back to the Deans Cabinet from our discussions with the Schools and then we will start meeting with some departments. We already have some meetings on the schedule to talk to departments about how we can work with them on these issues. For example, our office has been organizing some workshops for faculty but also for department chairs on these issues about climate, about conduct and how to deal with those issues.

**Taylor:** This type of conversation will continue, as I said in February. ECAC and the Counsel's Office have been talking about some revisions to the Faculty Hearing Committee. If they're ready, we will bring them in April to comply with the two-meeting rule and try to revise the Faculty Hearing Committee this semester. They may not be quite ready, but we will be working on that. We probably may address in the Council, have some discussion of our consulting allowances or the rules about faculty consulting in the Faculty Handbook this semester and talk about clarifying expectations around that a bit more. So we'll be talking about this in the last two meetings.

**Price:** If I could just make a brief comment to follow on to these conversations. So a lot of the work that's been done to improve research integrity at Duke has been going on for decades. It is building upon a series of events, in many cases, significant lawsuits that have caused us repeatedly to go back and revise and improve our policies. I just wanted to let you know that it was announced earlier in the year that we're approaching settlement of another major case and you will be hearing about that settlement. That settlement itself, I think, should give us, as a community - although

the events happened about ten years ago I think - should give us all, as a community, a real pause and think moment and reinforce how important this is for us to get right. This is something that should not just be about avoiding mistakes. It should be about doing the best we can to create the right kind of positive climate to produce the very best research we can. I just want to let you know because, in light of this conversation, when news comes forward, I didn't want you to think that you didn't have any sort of forewarning about this. As I say, it's percolating through and you will be hearing about it. It will underscore how a small number of people in one part of a very complex organization can do things that have very significant repercussions for the entire enterprise. When we talk about Duke values and Duke culture, we have to think of ourselves individually as carrying a fair amount of collective weight and make sure that we do this right.

**Taylor:** I think we need to adjourn and have a drink. [laughter] [applause]

*[Meeting adjourned and reception followed]*