



Minutes of the Meeting of the Academic Council
Thursday, April 20, 2017

Nan Jokerst (Chair, Academic Council / Electrical and Computer Engineering):

Welcome, everyone. Thank you for coming to our Council meeting today. If I'm sounding like I have a rather deep voice, I'm a little sick today, I'm afraid, and have a sore throat. Hopefully I'll make it to the end without losing my voice. We have a lot of people presenting today so I won't have to talk too much. We do have a very busy agenda.

FACULTY SCHOLAR AWARDS & HONORABLE MENTIONS

Jokerst: I'd like to begin with the announcement of the Academic Council's Faculty Scholar Awards. It is my distinct pleasure to recognize the stellar undergraduates who were recently selected for the Academic Council's Faculty Scholar Award or Honorable Mention.

The Faculty Scholar Award was established by the faculty at Duke in 1974. It is the only Duke award bestowed by the faculty on our undergraduates. Receiving the Faculty Scholar Award has had a positive impact on students who apply for graduate fellowships and other awards such as the Fulbright, Marshall, Truman and the Rhodes Scholars.

This year, our Faculty Scholars Award Committee received 19 nominations and has selected three winners and two candidates deserving honorable mention.

I would first like to thank the members of the Faculty Scholars Award Committee for their time and care in reviewing the dossiers and interviewing the students personally in order to make their selections. Our Faculty Scholars Award Committee members are:

Carlos Rojas (Asian & Middle Eastern Studies) and who is also a member of the Academic Council; he was the Chair of the committee; Anne-Maria Makhulu (Cultural Anthropology and African and African American Studies), Kathy Nightingale (Biomedical Engineering), Nathaniel Mackey (English), and Cindy Kuhn (Pharmacology and Cancer Biology) and also a member of the Academic Council and former ECAC member as well.

The following students were selected and will be honored at a reception with their mentors and the members of the selection committee next week -- they will also receive a monetary award.

Winners of a Faculty Scholar Award are:

Lauren Bunce is a double major in English and Gender, Sexuality, and Feminist Studies and her independent study scholarship was *Student difference in the Writing Center*; *Female exceptionality in Henry James's Work*; Lauren intends to pursue graduate work in literary and gender studies.

John Lu is a double major in Chemistry and

Mathematics and his independent study scholarship focused on neglected tropical diseases and structural biology. John intends to pursue a MD/PhD program to study the fusion mechanism that viral neglected tropical diseases like the Dengue virus use to enter host cells.

Gabrielle Stewart is a Classical Languages major, nominated by one of our Council colleagues. Gabrielle's independent scholarship was entitled *Autograph Albums in Harold Jantz Collection of Early Manuscripts*. Gabrielle intends to pursue a PhD in History, specializing in 21st century United States history.

And Honorable Mentions were awarded to:

Caroline Fernelius is an English major and whose independent study scholarship was entitled *The female convent in American literature and society*; Caroline intends to pursue a PhD-JD.

Karen Xu is a Biomedical Engineer major whose independent study scholarship was *Cell Response to Force (Mechanotransduction)*. Karen plans to pursue a MD/PhD.

I'd like to offer our warmest congratulations as a faculty to these outstanding Duke undergraduates and, many of them, future members of academia (applause). As Chair, I attend the reception every year for these students and I must say, these students are absolutely astonishing members of our community.

APPROVAL OF THE MARCH MEETING MINUTES

Jokerst: Next is the approval of the March 23 meeting minutes.

(Minutes approved by voice vote without dissent)

CONSENT ITEM – REPORTS FROM APC, UPC, GPC AND THE ATHLETIC COUNCIL

Jokerst: Our next agenda topic is a consent item. The annual reports from the following committees are on our consent agenda today: Academic Programs Committee (APC), University Priorities Committee (UPC), Global Priorities Committee (GPC) and the Athletic Council. We received a few requests from colleagues to have some discussion of the reports, based on the email that I sent out to all of you late last week, particularly for the UPC and GPC reports. I would like to welcome to the podium Professor Don Taylor, who has been the UPC chair since 2015, to speak to the UPC report.

Don Taylor (Chair, UPC / Sanford School of Public Policy): Just some quick comments and then I'll be happy to take questions. The report this year in many ways is very similar to last year. There are two perpetual topics that have been key topics all five years I've been on the committee and those are the financing of need-based financial aid and the economics of research--the broad research enterprise with which we're engaged at Duke. A few comments on Duke's need based financial aid program to provide some context. In this past school year, Duke has provided about \$115 million in need-based financial aid. Only 30% of this is endowed. What that means is that we have to use some of our most flexible, fungible monies, namely, tuition, and return it immediately to undergraduate students to finance our need based financial aid commitment that enables us to get the pool of students that we want. Duke has been returning on the order of 23-25% of the tuition we take in for undergrads directly to the class to live into our need-based financial aid commitment that we have

made. To give you a sense of how that compares to other institutions, some of our peers are returning even more of their tuition monies directly to finance need based financial aid. Cornell, Dartmouth, return on the order of 30%. I think it's instructive that there's not a single university that has their need-based financial aid fully endowed. The only two that are returning less than 10% of their tuition received are MIT and Stanford. I think what that speaks to is both the escalation of tuition costs over time, as well as expansion of need based financial aid policies necessary for highly-ranked universities to live up to their need-based financial aid commitments. The amount of tuition directly used for financial aid at Harvard and Yale are in the teens of percentages. The point here is, the tuition money that we receive is the most flexible, fungible monies available to Duke. And when we have to return 1 in 4 dollars of it for need-based financial aid, we can't spend it on something else. So that produces a pressure on the overall financial picture of the University. Often in UPC we say things like: we can't afford our need-based financial aid program, and we also can't afford not to have it, if we want to keep the types of students that we have. So, that means that we do afford it in that we figure out how to live up to our financial aid commitment in the midst of everything else we do. This topic will never go away as long as any of us are in this room. It will be something that we will have to struggle after and live up to the commitment that we have made. I don't personally see any way that we can really go back from our financial aid commitment. It is a true struggle.

On the economics of research, this has been a really interesting year. Duke had an uptick in awards won, especially federal research grants in the first two quarters of the fiscal year, so that's really good news. Normally we would be very happy, but there have been so many discussions in Washington about

changes, both to the direct funding budget of the NIH -- suggestions of quarter or one-third cuts to NIH direct funding budgets -- which would be devastating for a place like Duke. There have been discussions of great decreases in the indirect cost recovery structure of NIH funding. It doesn't look like any of those things will actually come to pass, but if they did, it would be a profound negative for Duke and so we hope that's not going to happen. But the level of uncertainty is heightened. At the same time, Duke is continuing to excel, both in the receipt of NIH funding but also in the diversification of research funding sources. If we look at our peers, we're actually doing better than most at finding new sources of research revenue. I think we're going to have to keep doing that.

The newest, most important thing noted in the UPC report is that DUMAC, which is Duke's investment arm, told the Board of Trustees last summer that they were worried that they were not going to be able to hit their planned returns of 5% real return on investments over the next five years. One of the things that a lot of faculty probably don't understand is how important the returns of our endowment are to the functioning of the university. If we took a mid-'80s to this year perspective, a 30-year perspective, the returns of Duke's investments have been on the order of 10% or even more. This aggregate performance is an 80th or 90th percentile performance, and these great investment returns that DUMAC has achieved have helped to fund the rise of Duke. It has helped build the Duke that we know. Because it happened very quietly and very consistently, I think a lot of the faculty just don't understand how important the investment returns are to the normal functioning of the University. If it's true that over the next five years, for example, if we had returns lower than 5%, that means something has to give. We have to find new sources of revenue, we've got to cut costs, we've got to

borrow more money, or we've got to dissave our investments just to meet our spending model (which assumes 5% real return from endowment over long periods of time). All of those options present their own problems. The nine months since DUMAC officially warned us of this, they've actually done better than they expected. It looks like, if things hold up the next couple of months of this fiscal year, the first year after DUMAC has said they were worried, they are going to do better than they thought, which would be good news for us. However, this is a caution to be understood by the faculty, and this provides increased sources of uncertainty for our overall financial picture. I think a few people read my report as me being overly alarmist. I didn't mean to do that. I'm just trying to communicate what I and we on UPC understand to be the realities of our finances. If anybody has any questions or comments, I'd be happy to try to answer them.

Jokerst: We have time for a couple of questions.

Lee Baker (Cultural Anthropology): Thanks so much for sharing this perspective on financial aid. I recognize that it's a university priority for undergraduate financial aid. When you said that 23% goes back, how does that sort of calculate? Is that all Trinity and Pratt tuition? Does that reflect the allocated costs that the Schools take on through the distribution of unassigned income or the lack of the distribution of unassigned income? So the Schools are contributing to undergraduate financial aid? How does that 23% factor into the other Schools' contribution to undergraduate financial aid?

Taylor: It's possible that I don't know exactly what you mean Lee. Let me tell you about how I think about this. If you think of it as Big Duke, and tuition money comes in for undergrads, we're giving one in four dollars

back. The allocated costs are another university wide issue, and both the services and the costs affect Duke across all the units. But if we thought of a Big Duke perspective, that's how I think about the 25% number.

Baker: But the Schools should know that they're contributing to a university priority.

Sally Kornbluth (Provost): Jim better clarify this.

Jim Roberts (Executive Vice Provost, Finance and Administration): The reference to other Schools might be a little bit misleading but in the downturn, the university reallocated some of the unassigned income to undergraduate financial aid. Eventually, this is income that comes from the Duke endowment but it's expendable every year. We just remapped it onto this need. To that extent, each School contributed to the solution, but there's no ongoing contribution from any other School to this financial aid.

Jokerst: I think we're going to have to end it there.

Taylor: I'm happy to talk after if you have questions.

Jokerst: Thank you, Don, for your service as Chair of UPC. We can continue afterwards, and also, what we have done in the past is that the Chair of UPC, for example, comes to the first or second meeting in the fall to discuss in more detail questions that we might have about university finances.

Based on another question from members, I would like to welcome to the podium Vice Provost for Academic Affairs Jennifer Francis, who will address the question about the GPC report regarding the current status of faculty hiring at DKU.

Jennifer Francis (Vice Provost, Academic Affairs): I too have a cold (laughter). I wanted to update people on what we're doing with regard to the faculty recruiting for DKU. The first thing is, we've done a good bit of outreach and we've put advertisements in academic jobs online. We've sent targeted emails. We've received over 1200 applications. That's probably double what we expected. Those applications are roughly split across the three areas. A little bit more in the Arts and Humanities than the other two. I'll come back to what we're doing with those shortly. We've also prepared two websites. One is still under construction, one is up. The one that is up is DKU's website and it explains the curriculum to prospective faculty who are interested in this. The second website that is under construction is going to be built here at Duke. It's going to try to provide relevant information, not only to all of you and other Duke faculty about what we're doing at DKU and potential opportunities you may want to take advantage of, but also some frequently asked questions that we are already hearing from the DKU candidates that we can answer. We have comprised three faculty search committees, one each for Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, and Arts and Humanities. Each committee has about six to eight Duke faculty on those committees, representing a wide range within each of those divisions. In addition to those faculty, we have a faculty member from Davidson and Elon on each committee to keep us honest and also to keep us understanding what a liberal arts college is like and make sure we reflect that in thinking about the candidates. In terms of what we're looking for, we're looking for a person who has, ideally, lots of these attributes, but we likely won't find them in all of them. I will say that what we have seen so far is, we have seen some really outstanding candidates. The first thing that we did is that we did some triage on the applications of 1200 and reduced those by about one third of candidates that we really

didn't think were going to meet the bar. The rest of those applications were then sent to the search committees who reviewed all of those applications and reduced the set to approximately 125. Three of us this week, myself, Noah Pickus, and Jim Dobbins, are having Skype interviews with all of those candidates. Hence, my voice is really about to go out. I have to tell you, it's been amazing, the conversations we've been having. There are some truly outstanding candidates out there. I couldn't be more thrilled about what we're seeing. Our plan is that we will be providing our feedback on those Skype interviews to the search committees, who are going to be convening in late April and early May to make a decision about the set of candidates that they want to bring here to the Duke campus. What we intend to do is try to do some of what we're calling cohort hiring models. So bringing in potentially 10 or 20 candidates at a time and be able to have them participate, not only interacting with the search committee, but helping us to understand how truly collaborative they are and how interdisciplinary they are. That's going to be an important feature at DKU. We're also looking at, should the need arise, any individual hiring. And I would also say we're very open to any sort of cluster hires. So if we identify a very strong candidate who would like to come and develop a group around him, that's absolutely something we'll consider. Lastly, we're in the process of figuring out what we're calling at this point a DKU Fellowship program. Ideally it would be available for some of our Duke graduates finishing up PhDs who may want or would like to have an opportunity to have something like, I don't want to call it a post-doc, which would imply it would be more research-based, but something that had both a teaching and research element to it. We're working on that. I've been talking with the divisional deans as well as some of the graduates about what that might look like. We're planning to

try to roll something like that out in the fall. I also want to note that, besides the Social Sciences, Arts and Humanities, and Natural Sciences, we're also recruiting right now for the Language and Writing faculty. Basically the process that we're using is very similar. The only difference is it's being headquartered at DKU and the faculty there, simply because there are quite a good number of really excellent bilingual language faculty in China. As a result, that's a little bit more efficient of a process. Should a language and writing instructor turn up that would not be there, we will take care of the interview process for those individuals here in Durham. That is a quick summary. As I said, we're hoping at this point to bring about 60 candidates or so to Duke's campus. Ultimately, then, bring some of those to DKU and to, hopefully, hire about 20-25 faculty for early fall. That would be the first stage of this.

Jokerst: We have time for one question, if anyone has a question?

Francis: Oh, thank you (applause).

Jokerst: Thank you, Jennifer. I will now acknowledge for the record the receipt of the reports and would like to warmly thank the respective chairs for their leadership and service this past year. They are:

Emily Bernhardt, chair of APC, Don Taylor, chair of UPC, and your next Chair of the Academic Council, Erika Weinthal, chair of GPC and also a member of the Council, and Jim Coleman, chair of the Athletic Council (applause). Before I leave this agenda item, if any of you have any further questions about these reports, please email them to me and I will pass them on to Don Taylor and he can consider having a longer session for discussion next year.

APPENDIX N REVISION TO THE FACULTY HANDBOOK

Jokerst: Our next agenda item is an action item that stems from a recommendation of the Academic Council Faculty Diversity Task Force, namely, to revise the Faculty Handbook language associated with the Faculty Ombuds position. After a great deal of study, analysis, and editing, I am very pleased to introduce to you Professors Trina Jones and Emily Klein, both members of ECAC, who will present the proposed changes to Appendix N to you today. Trina was also the Co-Chair of the Diversity Task Force with me, and Emily was on the Steering Committee of the Diversity Task Force, and Chaired the Provost's Diversity Task Force Implementation Committee. Today, Trina and Emily will present to you the motivation and changes proposed for Appendix N of the Faculty Handbook for our discussion. The supporting documents were posted with your agenda and we will vote on this item at our May meeting. With that, I'd like to turn it over to Trina and Emily.

Trina Jones (Law School / Member of ECAC): Good afternoon. What we'll do is I'll speak for about ten minutes and then we'll open the floor for Q&A. So in its spring 2014 meeting, members of Academic Council expressed concerns about both the role and the function of the Ombuds position. In the fall of 2014, in response to these concerns, ECAC formed the Ombuds Review Committee, which was chaired by Kathleen Smith. Tom Metzloff and Rich Burton also served on this committee. They spent about a year looking at the Ombuds position at Duke and elsewhere at our peer institutions. They solicited feedback from the faculty and in spring of 2015, they issued a report with recommendations. Now, at the time, when the Ombuds Review Committee was doing its work, the DTF was also collecting data about various entities at Duke and the Ombuds

position was one of those entities. In its May 2015 report, the DTF made similar recommendations to those of the Ombuds Review Committee. ECAC began revising Appendix N in fall of 2015, meaning that this has been a very long process and Emily and I are very glad to be here today to share the recommendations and revisions (laughter). With regards to the recommendations from both the DTF and the Ombuds Review Committee, there are five areas of concern: the role and function of the Ombuds, independence, training, confidentiality, record-keeping, and annual reporting. I'll come back and talk about each of these areas briefly in a few minutes. With regards to the revision process, which was led by ECAC, we consulted with a variety of people on campus, including the Office of the President, the Provost, the Office of General Counsel, the Chair of the Faculty Hearing Committee, who is Tom Metzloff, and Jeff Dawson, our current Ombuds, was hugely helpful in his frank assessment of the Ombuds position as it presently exists. So back to the recommendations. With regards to the role and the functions of the Ombuds position, the revisions state quite clearly that the role of the Ombuds is as a neutral arbiter. The Ombuds is an impartial resource for faculty and instructional staff. The person advocates for fair processes and does not advocate on behalf of any individual. So that's explicitly stated in the revisions. With regards to the functions, we kept the existing jurisdictional categories that are already in Appendix N which speak to violations of academic freedom, violations of academic tenure, legal infractions, that sort of thing. But we recognize that there are a number of areas that may not rise to the level of a legal violation or a violation of policy, where the Ombuds may be helpful. Therefore we included language that would speak more broadly to the Ombuds' duties. If you haven't had a chance to look at the revisions, it's

fascinating reading (laughter), I invite you to look at Section 2C of the revisions, which includes a detailed list of the functions and expectations of the Ombuds going forward, in terms of how the Ombuds carries forth her duties. With regards to independence and training, we have completely separated the Ombuds from the Faculty Hearing Committee and other university grievance structures. That's explicitly stated in the revisions. This is consistent with the International Ombuds Association's principles and values. You will see that there's a separate section within Appendix N that speaks to the Ombuds and then a separate section for the Faculty Hearing Committee. I should state that we did not make any substantive changes to the Faculty Hearing Committee other than to correct cross-references and that sort of thing. Training: the revisions explicitly say that upon appointment, the Ombuds shall be an active member of the International Ombuds Association and will follow best practices of the profession. The revisions also state that the Ombuds will engage in ongoing training and counseling with regards to implicit bias and explicit bias and negotiation mediation. The Ombuds, in order to carry forth her duties well, also needs to be aware of Duke structures and policies and relevant legal requirements. Confidentiality: in order for the Ombuds position to function well, it needs to be a safe space where aggrieved faculty feel comfortable seeking advice and information. We've tried to protect that to the extent that we can, the confidentiality of communications between faculty members and the Ombuds. This is actually a complex issue, however, because Duke, as an institution, has a legal obligation to prevent and correct unlawful conduct. So we engaged in extensive communications with the Office of Counsel to try to protect confidentiality to the extent that we can. In the revisions, you'll see a new section, 2D, which Pam Bernard, the Counsel for the University, helped us draft, which

basically says that the Ombuds shall not disclose information of a private or confidential nature, except with the express permission of the faculty member seeking the Ombuds' attention, or as required by law, or if the Ombuds determines there is an imminent risk of serious harm. This means that when faculty communicate with the Ombuds, the university will not necessarily be on notice of underlying problems that it may have a legal duty to correct. In order for the university to be placed on notice, faculty members will need to go to OIE or Human Resources or a compliance entity within the university. Isn't it fascinating? (Laughter). It's an important position. Duke also agreed in the revisions that it will protect the confidentiality of communications made to the Ombuds to the extent allowed by law. Record-keeping and reporting: there is a new provision in the revisions which basically states that the Ombuds will collect data, including the number of contacts, the types of concerns, and the unit within the university where the concern emanated in order to identify cluster problems, patterns, practices, areas where we might want to make policy changes or other improvements. And there is now a yearly report requirement in the Appendix, meaning that the Ombuds should prepare a report including all this information and submit it to the President and ECAC each year and a summary of the report will be available to the Council. We've spent two years on these revisions. There are still some things to be addressed, but they're not pertinent to the substantive parameters of the Ombuds position, which is what you have before you in the revisions. ECAC would like to review the functioning of the Ombuds position within the next two years to make sure that we are, in fact, on a path towards achieving the objectives that animated the revisions to Appendix N. ECAC will also draft a policy, which I expect will be shared with Council, with regards to the selection of the Ombuds,

to make sure that we've thought that through as carefully as possible. In the spring 2014 Council meeting, there was some concern about the visibility of the Ombuds. For example, I've been at Duke for a very long time now, and I did not know that there was an Ombuds until we started this process. Thankfully I did not have a need for the Ombuds. So what we're going to do is have ECAC work with the President and the Provost and the new Ombuds to make sure that faculty have information concerning the Ombuds and the services that are available. There is a question about whether Duke should have a central Ombuds office because there are a number of Ombuds on campus. There's one in OIE, there's another in the Medical Center, there's a faculty Ombuds that reports to the President. It might be advisable to have an office, as UNC does, where these individuals can share and coordinate activities. That's part of an ongoing conversation. Finally, there's a question about, should we have a number of faculty Ombuds, at least two? This would be to reflect the diversity of the university, both in terms of differences within schools. So the School of Nursing and the School of Medicine may be different from the other Schools within the university and we may need different Ombuds to service those constituent groups. In addition to that, one could imagine a need for multiple Ombuds with different demographic characteristics, which will facilitate communications between various constituent groups in our community. So that's a part of an ongoing conversation as well. With that, do you have any comments or questions?

Roxanne Springer (Physics): Thank you so much for this. It is really a pleasure to see that these issues that have come up over several years are being addressed. Because I expect that there will be increased visibility of the office and it will be viewed with greater respect, now that it's not just serving as a

gatekeeper, I hope you'll see a lot more traffic. So I want to speak to that last bullet item. That was mentioned not only in the review of the Ombuds office, but also in the Diversity Task Force for precisely the reason you mentioned. The demographics, the broadness of experiences, I think we really do need more than one portal into this office. They can be organized in such a way that the data is not lost. They keep this as de-identified data. I think that would serve the community better.

Jones: You're exactly correct. The DTF recommended that we have multiple Ombuds. The Ombuds Review Committee actually didn't take a position on that issue because it wasn't required that we resolve the issue in order to shape the functions of the position with greater accuracy, we didn't take a position on it. But it is certainly an issue of ongoing communication. We're having ongoing conversations about this. I think that it will continue to be under ECAC's awareness.

Emily Klein (Nicholas School of the Environment / Member of ECAC): I think you're right. If there is, with these changes, an increased visibility, there's a huge uptick, I hope the Ombuds will come to ECAC and say, I can't handle the amount of traffic. We need to rethink this right away.

Warren Grill (Biomedical Engineering): I'm wondering if we have an Ombuds available to staff? And similarly, is there an Ombuds available for graduate students? And if so, is there a plan to take the revisions that you all have developed here very thoughtfully and apply them to those individuals and positions as well?

Jones: I think that's an excellent question and one of the reasons why there's a conversation about whether we should have a central Ombuds office is because if you look at the various Ombuds on campus, there is a gap. I'm

not aware of any Ombuds that actually addresses staff issues. The Ombuds within OIE addresses student issues, undergrads, professional and graduate students. The one in the Medical Center is a little hard to figure out exactly what the jurisdiction is there, because in various places, it talks about the Ombuds there having jurisdiction over different various constituent groups, including students and maybe some faculty in the Medical School. Then we have the faculty Ombuds here. So note the gap. If one were to form a central Ombuds office, one would imagine that you'd have a person in that office that would be of assistance to staff. When we looked at Appendix N, we were focused on the faculty and the faculty's expressions of concern and making sure that those concerns were addressed to the extent that this could be helpful in conceptualizing or imagining a broader Ombuds position for staff or an office, I don't think anyone would object to that.

Klein: Just so it doesn't get lost, the Ombuds within OIE is for students, both graduate and undergraduate. I believe it's Ada Gregory, if I'm not mistaken.

Jokerst: There are two mediators in HR that are specifically aimed at staff. About 2% of their business is faculty across the university, but the rest of their business is for staff. But they're not Ombuds, they're mediators.

Richard Riddell (Vice President and University Secretary): Warren, the question came up last spring. There were some questions about staff grievance procedures and some of you may recall that Dick (Brodhead) had a consultant come in from Johns Hopkins, Charlene Hayes, to take a look at our current set up for staff grievance procedures and ask specifically that question. Should we institute a staff Ombuds? The consultant said, first of all, that our grievance procedures, and you might want to have Kyle

Cavanaugh (Vice President, Administration) come and talk about that some time, were quite extensive. There are many steps where the individual gets to pick the mediator and the arbitrator. She thought those were in very good shape. She didn't think that we needed to institute an Ombuds position so there is a little history on that one. If you want it fully up to date, probably Kyle Cavanaugh is the person.

Klein: I would say, though, that grievance procedures sound like you're sort of formally going forward with filing a grievance. Part of the Ombuds role, as you now know, as we've envisioned it, is not part of the formal grievance mechanism, but to be...

Jones: An informal dispute resolution site.

Riddell: There are those resources, also, in Human Resources. It's a little out of my area but I think it would be useful to get the data on that. Because she thought it was pretty much best practice around the country the way Duke is set up right now.

Pat Halpin (Nicholas School of the Environment): Just one comment on the reporting. You were mentioning annual reporting to look for clusters of incidents and I'm just curious about the granularity of that. I would be concerned if smaller units could be identifiable, issues in clusters of things. So I just want to know if there's a way you've already thought of that was put into how to protect that. It could be a cooling issue if people are concerned that their issues could be identified because they're a small unit and it's reported at the unit level.

Jones: A lot of thought was actually put into that.

Klein: First of all, it's de-identified data. The idea we thought a lot about, obviously there's

sort of public reporting in Academic Council and we want to make sure that that granularity of the data, that confidentiality is protected. Nevertheless, we do need to have the President and ECAC be able to know and see that there may be clusters of problems that need to be followed up on. And the Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement, et cetera.

Halpin: I'm not sure that entirely answered it.

Jones: Do you want to ask again? I just want to tell you that we spent a lot of time thinking about confidentiality and protecting the identity of people who seek the Ombuds' assistance, which is why you have that new section, 2D. But we also, in the description of the functions of the Ombuds, talked a lot about the fact that we need to be able to keep people's identities confidential. But also there is the need to track how many contacts are being made, what types of concerns, is the Ombuds seeing a number of age-related complaints, or sexual harassment complaints? So that we'll have a sense of what's going on within our community. And then what we want is to see the aggregate data at the end of the year concerning types of contacts, number of contacts, and whether there are particular units where the university might want to look more carefully at the policies and procedures. That doesn't require that the individuals who have met with the Ombuds be identified. If it's only one or two people within a unit, we expect that the Ombuds would exercise a lot of care in terms of how the problems are described to both the President and the Council to protect the person's identity. Confidentiality is a huge value in these revisions. If it's not appropriately addressed, we hope that you will look at the revisions between now and May when the Council will be asked to approve them and let us know so that we can make some adjustments. Did that get at your question at all?

Halpin: Yeah, it was just applying a one-size-fits-all solution where a different sized unit, it could be a more sensitive issue than a large unit where it would be very appropriate. So the implementation is what I was concerned about.

Thea Portier-Young (Divinity School): I was just going to add that the training that comes about through the professional development in the International Ombuds Association, this is part of the best practices with the recognition that Ombuds are in a unique position within an institution to be able to make certain recommendations because they're privy to knowledge of where systems are breaking down and you lose an opportunity to operationalize how that feedback is going to be passed on to units that can use it to upper level administration. But they do receive training in how to do that responsibly and so I think that would be something that would be a key part of developing the skillset for that role.

Jokerst: Thank you very much, Emily and Trina. I want to also warmly thank President Brodhead, who is traveling on Duke business today, Provost Kornbluth, University Secretary & Vice President Richard Riddell and General Counsel Pam Bernard for working with ECAC in partnership to revise Appendix N. This is another instance of the faculty and the administration working together proactively to make Duke a stronger community. Council members, I know we have a very tight agenda today. If you have more questions please do not hesitate to send me an email at acouncil@duke.edu.

STRATEGIC PLAN PRESENTATION

Jokerst: Our next agenda item is a discussion of Duke's Strategic Plan. Our practice of late has been the early discussion of major programs in Council, which enables us to give

feedback to programs as they are in the formulation stages. Toward this end, we have heard about the Strategic Plan in Council meetings on two other occasions – at the October 22, 2015 meeting and again on October 20, 2016. Today, we will discuss the final version of the Plan, which was posted with your agenda, and we will vote to endorse the Plan at our May 11 meeting.

I would like to welcome Provost Kornbluth and Vice Provost for Strategic Planning, and a former Chair of this Council, Susan Lozier, to the podium to share the Strategic Plan report and to answer any questions that you might have about the Plan.

Sally Kornbluth (Provost): I'm afraid to touch this podium. Anyone else carrying a virus? (laughter).

Susan Lozier (Vice Provost, Strategic Planning / Nicholas School of the Environment): We'd like to say we don't have colds, but we may! (laughter)

Kornbluth: As Nan said, we had the privilege of presenting this plan to the Council before and I hope many of you who have read it several times, particularly those of you who are on some of the other governance committees, can see that there has been an iterative process of revision. I do want to say, just very briefly, to remind you that the discussions on this plan have been going on now for a couple of years and there were open web sign-ups for folks who wanted to do lunches, dinners, discussions, et cetera, and we got a lot of input from all over the campus. One thing we struggled with for a long time was the title, which you can now see here and will, I hope, see why we arrived at: Together Duke: Advancing Excellence Through Community. We hope that this was seen as an inclusive process and, although Nan referred to this as final, obviously we don't want to do

huge overhauls, but if there are things that people see that really need adjustment, please let us know. I do want to acknowledge that this was extensive work by a really engaged group from across all of the schools at Duke. The Strategic Planning Steering Committee, some of the members of which are here, but are shown on this list (refers to slide). It was a great group and it really brought perspectives from across the campus. And they also attended many of these lunches, dinners, et cetera, to get input. I also want to give a very special thanks to Susan Lozier, who did a huge amount of work as Chair of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee, and Noah Pickus, as Vice Chair, who really put a lot of work into putting it together. Also, I'd really like to call out Lee Willard, who I think may have been involved in writing many of the Strategic Plans and editing. She was a huge help, and also Carolyn Gerber in helping us edit. You will see, as Susan takes over the podium for a moment, that Duke has, for the last decade or even longer than that, put into place many innovative programs, many new Centers, Institutes, many physical structures, et cetera. I hope you will take away from this plan that it really represents not a backing away from those things, but really a change in focus on an investment in human capital. What we heard over and over again is that we want to extract maximum value from what we put into place and continue to build by investing in our faculty, students, and staff. With that, I'll turn it over to Susan for a moment to really speak further about the themes of this plan.

Lozier: Thanks, Sally. I'm going to start by saying, I guess Trina and Emily have already said a lot, but not only was it fascinating listening to them, but it's gratifying knowing that they took two years to amend Appendix N of the Faculty Handbook and we crafted the Strategic Plan in two years, so I'm feeling pretty good about that timeline (laughter).

There are some Strategic Planning Steering Committee members who joined us here today so I would love for you to stand up and be recognized for your efforts, if you don't mind. Kristine Stiles, Svati Shah, Gary Bennett, Marilyn Oermann from Nursing, Jonathan Wiener from School of Law, Peter Ubel from Fuqua. So it's been great working with all of you. And Noah as well. And it's been great working with Sally on this as well. From the very beginning of this process, which started in earnest in January about two years ago, we were out listening and talking to everybody, it became very obvious when we talked to people about what's important at Duke, we realized that at its heart, this university is all about its people and ideas. So we essentially think of this university as a crucible of ideas. These are ideas that we share, that we teach in our classrooms and many of us send out to distant parts of the world. These ideas are generated and regenerated, relayed by interactions and collisions and exposure we have to new ways of thinking. From the very beginning, when we thought about this, we said, well, if these interactions and collisions are really a key ingredient in creating new ideas and new knowledge, then what we need as part of our community are people who bring new perspectives, identities, and politics to the table. So that's how we can have that exposure to new ways of thinking. So along this line of thought, then, we think of diversity, not just as a necessity for social and cultural community, but we really think of it as an essential ingredient for intellectually-vibrant community. So at its very basic form, this Strategic Plan affirms its commitment to an intellectually-vibrant community of diverse scholars and learners. Beyond that overall concept of community, there are three themes that motivate the goals that Sally will step through in just a moment. As for the first, as we move into Duke's next decade, we really want to reaffirm our emphasis and voice support and value in fundamental inquiry and

discovery. So whether faculty members' research is multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary, or disciplinary, Duke wants to support that creative and innovative research that's making contributions in disciplines and also across the disciplines. Over the past decades, Duke's humanities and social sciences have really held a preeminent role at Duke. But through this process, and even before this process, it's been pretty obvious that Duke can't be a great university without great sciences, natural and physical sciences. So part of this plan is talking about, in order to be a world-class university, we need to invest in sciences and humanities as well as keeping up our strengths across the board. One of the reasons is that, with this inquiry and discovery, we need to think about broad-based. And that investing in the sciences not only means that there's going to be strong disciplinary contributions in natural and physical sciences, but that investment also helps us develop inquiry in humanities and social sciences and will also make meaningful contributions across the board, you know, into areas like my area in the environment, law, and medicine. The second theme is the Duke opportunity. The Duke opportunity expresses our commitment to providing a transformative educational experience for every student. As many of you in this room are aware, over the past decade, there's been a tremendous amount of innovation in curricular and co-curricular programming at the undergraduate level, and also at many professional schools as well. But across the board, not all students have benefitted from that innovation. So what we want to do is say, well, what's the best of what we've done in the classroom and outside the classroom in terms of benefitting students? And we want to make sure that has a wider application. So the Duke opportunity, we're essentially saying to all students, whether you're an undergraduate, a professional or graduate student, when you come to Duke, we

want to make sure that you have the opportunity to draw from the best of Duke. So this focus on broadening, though, also includes our efforts to really think about making the Duke education accessible and affordable. So the Duke opportunity is our opportunity, then, to really make sure that we're attracting the best and the brightest. We're talking about our overall goal is to create, enhance, and translate knowledge. Our last thing has to do with that last piece which is translating knowledge. Over the past decade, our global programs have really been primarily place-based: Africa Initiative, China Initiative, et cetera. These have their own great individually distinct motivations and goals. Looking forward into the 21st century, it's increasingly obvious that all these disparate places across the globe face many of the common challenges. What we want to do in the decade ahead is think about not place-based initiatives, but more theme-based initiatives and focus on these challenges across borders. What we really want to do is, even though many of these problems like population health or energy and water resources, even though they have definitely state, national, or international dimensions, we want to start locally. Because we want to make a real difference in local communities. And that local community could be Durham, it could be Santiago, or it could be Beijing. So we want to focus on certain themes, certain 21st century challenges that have meaning to different places around the globe and really partner with local communities in two-way engagement to make meaningful contributions at that local level. We hope to learn from this network of different efforts across the globe. So with these three things, inquiry and discovery, the Duke opportunity, and global engagement, locally grounded, we hope we really make a difference in the decade ahead. Sally will now tell you how these themes thread their way through all of our goals.

Kornbluth: Thank you, Susan. Because I assume most people have at least glanced through the plan, I don't want to be exhaustive as I want to give some time for questions. So I will just call out a few examples under the goals just to kind of highlight what we're saying. Then we will be open to questions. The first goal is really based on building human capital and the idea of really investing in the Duke faculty as scholars and leaders of the university's intellectual communities. You'll note when you look at the resources at the end of the plan that the bulk of our resources in this plan, the major investment is for faculty. This is important both in terms of our intellectually thematic areas, for instance, we talked about building the sciences, but also in terms of creating a more diverse and inclusive environment. One thing that was called out specifically in the plan that a number of people have commented on is that in some schools, this will mean target of opportunity hiring and in some schools, this will mean incentivizing more diverse hiring using existing lines. Because some schools have the capacity to grow further and some don't. As Nan mentioned or Trina and Emily mentioned, we have now hired a Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement. This was envisioned in the plan. Abbas Benmamoun will be arriving on June 1st and he will be instrumental in creating and working with faculty on a number of these programs. The other thing is that we want to do two things in this plan. One is to actually enable the faculty's work and another is to improve faculty life and to help faculty career development. So, for instance, these things like seed funding, manuscript workshops, et cetera, aimed at faculty work, are present in the plan, but also things like mentoring, leadership programs, et cetera. To really try to enhance the faculty life at Duke in the efforts to elevate us as a community. As Susan mentioned, we are interested in an

opportunity that expands to all students at Duke. There are various mechanisms in the plan. One is to create sort of vertically integrated communities of learning that are similar in a way to Bass Connections but really could be not just interdisciplinary. They could be disciplinary. It really focuses on vertical teams of faculty and students working together on intellectual problems. As Steffen (Bass) pointed out, this is what lab science has done for years, but we're thinking of porting this across all areas. We would like to make available to graduate and professional students the kinds of opportunities that we've given to undergraduates. A good example is an innovation and entrepreneurship certificate for graduate students. This has been enormously popular with undergraduates. We'd like to give graduate students these kinds of opportunities. As Susan mentioned, access and affordability is a key part of the plan. Thinking about how we can make students' experiences less expensive. Things like the 4+1 programs, et cetera. Then things like the Washington Duke Scholars program which really allow students to not only come to a more diverse environment for us to recruit a more diverse group of students, but to really make it so that they will thrive when they're here and have a wonderful experience. Our interest in global challenges, they will be theme-based. The themes will be put forward: population health, environment and water, et cetera, which are not meant to be limiting. Those are the areas in which we will be launching what we call collaboratories. These are research groups that we will put out RFAs for people not to make permanent structures like Institutes and Centers but to address intellectual areas and to get essentially seed money to really move projects forward. In terms of enabling the notion that we are globally engaged, but really locally grounded, we are going to be establishing some global centers or offices in collaboration with Mike

Merson (Director, Duke Global Health Institute) and his office. And this is really not building another DKU, another Duke-NUS, we're really just talking about small platforms that will enable faculty to do their work more easily. I should say that we will be addressing problems that have a local dimension but we hope that these local sites can all be networked so that we can really link things that are going on in Durham, in the Triangle, in the United States with problems that are being addressed by Duke faculty across the globe. I mentioned DKU and Duke-NUS, of course we want to continue to leverage those locales. We've made significant investments of money and time there and we hope that we will be able to enable faculty to use these sites very effectively. Finally, I have to say that the fourth goal was really meant to underpin the notion that human capital is what is infused throughout this plan. It underpins the community-building. We want to create a physical and cultural environment that will enhance community. It includes things like pop-up conversations, more collision spaces. But I should also say that it does include things like training programs and diversity and inclusion and we've had a lot of conversations with folks about this. I would say that many of these programs have not been proven in any empirical way to be effective. So the Strategic Plan calls for folks to come up with innovative programs that we can test, assess, and if they work, we can expand them. So that is a whirlwind tour through our goals. There is a lot of granularity in the plan. We didn't want to make it a laundry list. But I think it will give you the notion that all of these goals are in support of the themes that Susan articulated and that build on the notion of Duke as a great community in which faculty, students, and staff can work. So what happens from here? We're here today for discussion. We're coming back in May to Academic Council when we will ask for your endorsement. We

will then go to the Board of Trustees for their approval. And obviously what is important now is moving from this plan to something that we can actually implement. Jennifer Francis, Noah Pickus and others are working diligently on, first of all, how we can sequence these programmatic launches. Also thinking about who owns which of these programs. Because you can have sort of high-minded ideas but unless someone is on the ground actually making them work, they will not happen. I'll talk in a moment about financials. And also we want to really evaluate things. Because these programs can begin as we think is best but we really want to have ongoing evaluation to see if they're achieving the goals that we want to see. In terms of finances, it's been pointed out over and over again, this is germane to Don's comment about endowment return, that a lot of these goals are going to cost a lot more than the money we currently have. If you look at the sciences alone, if you're really objective about it, you would say we could spend \$1 billion. So we really had to think about how we would take money we know we have, dedicated to the plan, and at the time of this writing, we had \$132 million sort of cordoned off that we at least knew we could use as what we would call a down payment on the plan. In other words, money with which we can establish these programs, start to put things in progress, sort of a front end payment. What you'll notice as I mentioned is a lion's share of the money goes to the faculty. But deepening the undergraduate and graduate experiences, strengthening the global challenges, and, as we mentioned, full-force supporting the faculty and their work, also have substantial resources that will enable us to start to move forward. And obviously, if you look at the last plan, it was sort of the guide for fundraising, and we've been raising funds to meet the goals of the last Strategic Plan and going forward, fundraising will shift to really meeting the goals of this plan. So, with that, I

will say that we understand that this plan is a road map and not a contract. When you think back to the last plan, DukeEngage wasn't in that plan. Bass Connections wasn't in that plan. A lot of the things that we see as part of the Duke texture were not in that plan. But it set the stage for a lot of the things that came forward. So we want to set the stage that if this plan is implemented well, we're going to have an even more robust community of scholars and learners, where we all can work together to ensure the preeminence of Duke in the decades to come. With that, we're open to any questions or comments any of you might have.

Springer: Thank you for this. Intriguing thoughts for the future. Last Academic Council meeting when we hosted Vince Price, there was a discussion about the undergraduate experience and we now know that in a few weeks in May as we watch our undergraduates graduate, two out of every five of the young women accepting an undergraduate degree will have been sexually assaulted while here at Duke. One out of ten of the young men accepting a degree will have been assaulted. I think this is a serious enough and deep enough problem that I request it be acknowledged in the Strategic Plan as something Duke needs to own and fix. You speak of the need for innovative ideas. I'd like to see some plans for how this problem will be addressed.

Kornbluth: I think that's a really excellent point. You'll notice, and we've had some back and forth, and I think some of it was probably a bit of misunderstanding in communication, but the last iteration of the plan had a Provost-appointed committee to really look at the undergraduate experience deeply. I'll come back to the sexual assault question in a moment. Then, at the last Council, there was discussion of an Academic Council committee to look at undergraduate and graduate life

and that was substituted back in. I think we really need to go back and either have them both side by side as complementary, or focus on a more deep dive in the undergraduate life. It's interesting to think about the notion, as you say, of doing pilot, sort of, what can we do in terms of experimental programs to reduce sexual assault? One thing that I've discussed a lot with Larry Moneta (Vice President, Student Affairs), he's thought a lot about it, is, we have a lot of investment on the back end. In other words, once someone has been sexually assaulted, the investigation, the process. What we really need to invest time and thought into is how we prevent the sexual assault in the first place. Maybe one thing that we can say in the plan and that we can add is not just being explicit about a committee on the various facets of undergraduate life, but I think we really need to be explicit about enlisting the brainstorming of students who are living this experience. It can't just be faculty that are bringing this to bear because a lot of the social elements of this are things that none of us had as part of our experience. So I think it's well taken, I think we can add a few words on that that we can then incorporate into part of the purview of a committee that would go forward looking at undergraduate life. Do you want to add something, Susan?

Lozier: I just want to say one thing. We should think about this for all students, not just undergraduates. I think that was part of our reasoning in changing the plan. Because we did hear, initially we focused with Nan's nudging, we were understanding that an academic Strategic Plan, though focused on the academics, needs to understand that students' social experience, et cetera, impact the academics. So we did add that.

Springer: You explicitly acknowledge that.

Lozier: We do. But then there was a push

from professional graduate students that we need to be inclusive about this. So I do think that we will make that acknowledgement in the plan for all students and then Nan and Sally then working out exactly how that, moving forward, what kind of committees are addressing this issue.

Jokerst: I'll add one word too. I think that these questions about the experience, as you say, need to engage students, administrators, faculty, at the Provostial level and I think the committee associated with Academic Council is really focused more on interfacing between the faculty and the students on matters that are not the kind of deep dive that are going to be needed to address the kind of questions that Roxanne has brought up.

Kornbluth: We can re-tool the wording on that, absolutely, and re-frame what that looks like. It doesn't take that much effort.

Portier-Young: As we think about who should be included in that effort regarding prevention, campus ministry and the University Women's Center, and then other women's centers on campus, do a lot of work in this area. But I think, from the interaction that I have with them on this topic, they would really appreciate a mechanism for coming together, pooling efforts, and really being resourced to address the culture more broadly.

Kornbluth: We don't want to have a whole discussion here about this, but if you talk to people about sexual assault on campus, nearly 100% of the incidents involve alcohol. So that's an even bigger issue about alcohol policy on campus. So we should talk further offline but I think that's right.

Steffen Bass (Physics): There's a lot to like in this plan and particularly from the perspective of the sciences and faculty

development that you put in. You already stated that this is really the beginning and we will need a developmental campaign on the order of at least \$1 billion or so to flesh this out. I have two questions with respect to this. One is actually, what are your ideas with respect to this developmental campaign, because for the faculty, there is often the impression that what comes in terms of funding from the developmental office is not always very well matched with the strategic goals of the university. That's something that needs to be addressed. The second question is in terms of assessment. How well are we doing in implementing the Strategic Plan? You have that as one of the bullet points. I just wish to point out that, to my knowledge, we have never done this with any previous Strategic Plan that I have seen here on campus. It would be really good to change this and have a little bit more accountability on, if we roll out an academic plan, even if it's a road map, to reflect a few years later, what have we accomplished? Where do we stand? Was this worthwhile?

Kornbluth: I'll address the first question. It's interesting: development is not a completely autonomous machine. They take the guidance, and what we're doing now is starting to put together a number of working groups in different areas of the sciences to talk about that. I think what we really need to do is be very specific for development on what it is we want to raise money for. In the sciences, obviously one thing is faculty, core facilities, buildings, seed money, et cetera. I think we have to be much more intentional about putting a menu of options in front of donors. One thing is that if you look at Duke giving, you will notice that gifts over \$1 million to Duke come disproportionately from our own alumni and parents. If you look, many universities have gotten very large gifts for the sciences. Sometimes it's just based on a very exciting and interesting idea. It doesn't

necessarily have to be somebody tied to the university. We would like to, in the course of this, come up with ideas that are compelling, not only to attract our alumni and our normal, very generous donors, but also to attract other sources of funding. So I think we're going to have to work very closely with development because it's not easy for folks who have been raising in one area. We're going to have to actually teach the science, in a way, and also really involve the science faculty in interacting directly with donors. So I think that's the way to sort of step forward.

Lozier: And just for the second point, we appreciate that you've brought that up before at APC discussions, but also it's been a discussion for the past two years. People across the campus are very interested in us following and developing metrics of success, et cetera. That will largely fall on Jennifer's shoulders, I think (laughter), so I think we're in good hands, given her business and accounting background. But it is something we should be doing. We should understand, if we apply these resources, basically, what's the return on that investment. So I'm pretty confident of that moving forward.

Jane Richardson (Biochemistry): This may sound trivial compared to many of the other things than have been mentioned. You talked about how to enable the scientists or the other faculty to do their work. What that brings to mind to me is the huge change over the almost 50 years that I've been here, that we, as the faculty, have to do more and more of our administrative, clerical work every year. Let's put some money into getting some more clerical help (laughter). We're very expensive and bad clerical help (laughter).

Kornbluth: A couple of things. One is, I agree with you. And I think that is a totally rational way to allocate some of our resources to enable research. The other thing I would say

is that some of the specific mechanisms like the collaboratories or some of these teams for doing research, part of the legitimate budget in those things will be the kinds of staff or program support help that are needed to really move things forward.

Richardson: But not everybody is going to be in the collaboratories.

Kornbluth: Exactly. So obviously I'm not going to stand here and promise an administrative assistant to every member of the faculty, but I think your point is well taken. We have to think at least how we might do better regional coverage to help faculty with tasks. The other thing is, this is a kind of side note, but Larry Carin's office, the Vice Provost for Research, and the teams in the Medical School have been working very actively also in lobbying to try to figure out ways to reduce compliance programs. So it's not only the physical act of what you have to do, it's how we can make it so there's less of that. That's an ongoing issue.

Richardson: I can tell you, offices are stretched more and more every year on a department level.

Harvey Cohen (Clinical Sciences): One of the other issues that I think is growing with respect to faculty life, and especially in the sciences, and maybe I've seen this more from the Medical Center perspective, is that our university is growing geographically and expanding its boundaries geographically, so we will, over the next decade, have a huge portion of our sciences based downtown and in other areas in connection with that. I'm personally not sure how much really good thought has gone into what that means for the culture of the university. I think that's something that's worth some thought.

Kornbluth: I think that's a really good point.

There are multiple aspects to that. One has to do with the trivial issue of things like transportation, and making sure that if people want to attend a seminar, they have a place to park. We are thinking about what that looks like in terms of buses and all this kind of stuff. Then there's the more important one, I think, about organizing faculty around intellectual areas and making that more robust so that you have a motivation to interact with folks at a different location. Clever use of things like funding programs, symposia, et cetera, a way to actually bring people together, at least periodically, even if they're at geographically distant locations. The other thing is that there is a piece of this that we haven't gone into much, which is the use of digital, online, et cetera, in creating community. We have a new Associate Vice Provost in that area, Matthew Rascoff, and he's thinking pretty actively about that. So your point is well taken. We don't want it to be that if you go down to Chesterfield, for instance, that you're now disconnected from the rest of the Duke campus. It's going to be important to maintain that continuity.

Lozier: We understood from the beginning that in some way, when I was talking about community, it's very easy to imagine all these interactions and collisions on this campus, where we're all physically present. But I will say, people have talked about the fact with the Institutes springing up, some departmental communities have felt a little fractured. So it isn't just the fact that people are going to DKU or going downtown. So the idea of building community is important here as well as places around the globe. So there's some piece, like Sally mentioned, but we really need to think more creatively about how technology can create these communities and bring people together. And I know that Vince Price is very interested, that's something that he's talked about, how we use technology moving forward in the decade, research and learning

communities.

Jokerst: Thank you very much. And especially thank you for engaging the faculty so clearly, both in Academic Council and outside of Academic Council. We really do appreciate that. So, if you have more questions about the Strategic Plan, send an email to me at acouncil@duke.edu and we'll be happy to pass those questions along to Sally and Susan.

ELECTION OF THE FACULTY OMBUDS

Jokerst: Next we're going to talk about the election of the Faculty Ombuds. One section of Appendix N that remains unchanged is that our Council appoints the Faculty Ombuds, and this is the next item on our agenda today. Before we proceed to the appointment of a new Ombuds, I would like to sincerely thank Jeff Dawson, our current Ombuds, for his dedicated service to the faculty in this position. His insights into the position helped to formulate both the revised Appendix N, and informed our selection process of the new Ombuds.

As you are now aware, the Faculty Ombuds is an important resource for faculty at Duke. Earlier this year, we asked you for nominations for the Ombuds position, and seven highly qualified candidates submitted their qualifications and thoughts regarding the position to ECAC. A Subcommittee of ECAC then proceeded to interview finalists and select the new Ombuds, who I am pleased to present to you today for your approval.

The Ombuds Committee consisted of the following ECAC members:

Trina Jones, Law School
Emily Klein, Nicholas School
Grainne Fitzsimons, Fuqua and
Kirsten Corazzini, Nursing
And me.

I want to first share how gratified I am that my ECAC colleagues and I were to receive so much interest regarding the Faculty Ombuds position from such highly qualified members of the Duke faculty. From the dossiers submitted, we selected three candidates to interview in person. I am pleased to share with you the candidate that we selected, for your endorsement, Professor Tom Metzloff, from the Law School.

Tom's professional work includes Alternative Dispute Resolution research, and Tom has served as the Chair of the Academic Council's Faculty Hearing Committee for the past six years. Tom is also a former member of ECAC, having served a term in 2007-09, and has served as a member of our Academic Council for many years.

Some of the aspects of Tom's application interview that particularly struck me were the process-oriented approach that Tom takes to dispute resolution, his interest in creative problem solving, and his appreciation that policies and rules are living entities that necessarily undergo scrutiny and change with time and our evolving institution. His respect for faculty forms a solid foundation for understanding the faculty perspective on issues, and he appreciates the dynamics that exist between faculty, students, and administrators. Tom, will you please stand? (Applause). Tom, will you now leave the room, please? We're going to vote on Tom as the Ombuds and I thought it would be better if Tom left the room.

ECAC now moves that the Academic Council endorse Professor Tom Metzloff for a two-year term as Faculty Ombuds, starting July 1, 2017.

(Motion to endorse Tom Metzloff as Faculty Ombuds approved by voice vote without dissent)

Thank you and our warmest thanks to Tom – we wish him a quiet next two years in his new role. (Applause)

EXECUTIVE SESSION: HONORARY DEGREES 2018

(Remainder of the meeting was held in Executive Session for the presentation of candidates for Honorary Degrees for Commencement in 2018)