

Duke University

DURHAM
NORTH CAROLINA
27708-0928

ACADEMIC COUNCIL
012 ALLEN
BOX 90928

phone (919) 684-6447
e-mail acouncil@Duke.edu
fax (919) 684-9171

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Academic Council

Thursday, September 18, 2014

Joshua Socolar (Physics/ Chair, Academic Council): Welcome to the first meeting of the Academic Council for this academic year. I am Joshua Socolar, professor of Physics and chair of this Council for one more academic year. In that capacity, I'll be attending innumerable committee meetings, handling unanswerable questions from dismayed faculty and senior officers, working with unsatisfiable constraints on our Council agendas, following an implausible travel itinerary that includes a construction zone in China, assuming the unnerving responsibility of protecting our President from physical attacks with a mace --- and ... loving it (laughter). They just handed me the mace with no training whatsoever in how to use it, but I think Duke faculty know how to take such situations in stride.

Virtually all of my activities as chair are carried out in collaboration with faculty colleagues, and I truly enjoy these opportunities to get to know them better. It turns out that we can all learn a lot from each other, not only about our academic interests but about the different approaches one can take to questions of common interest.

So I'd like to extend an especially warm welcome to our new members today and

thank you for your willingness to serve. I look forward to talking with those of you who can stay for the reception that will follow our meeting. And let's also welcome Sally Kornbluth to her first meeting of the Council as Duke's Provost (applause). We will hear more from her later in the meeting.

I would now like to introduce the members of the Executive Committee of the Academic Council. ECAC's primary role, as you know, is to discern which issues should be brought to the Council for discussion and/or approval. We meet weekly throughout the academic year and regularly with senior officers and trustees to educate ourselves about relevant issues and to advise them of faculty interests and concerns. As you will soon see, we also conduct some business over the summer.

The ECAC members entering their second (and last) year of service are:

Don Taylor (Sanford School) and Sara Beale (Law School). Don is here; Sara is in Brazil today. Sara will serve as Vice Chair of the Council for this year and Don will serve as Faculty Secretary.

Many of you will recall that Brenda Nevidjon, from the School of Nursing, was

also due to serve a second year on ECAC. Brenda resigned from ECAC late this summer after accepting the position as CEO of the Oncology Nursing Society. We are sorry to see her go, but of course we wish her well.

Our bylaws dictate that ECAC should appoint someone to fill the vacated seat in this situation. We invited Claudia Gunsch, Pratt School of Engineering, to complete Brenda's term. Claudia was a candidate in the spring ECAC election and was the next highest vote-getter. I'm happy to report that she has agreed to serve.

The other ECAC members elected last spring are: Ellen Davis (Divinity School), Kerry Haynie (Political Science and African & African-American Studies), Beth Sullivan (Molecular Genetics & Microbiology), and Anne Yoder (Biology & Director of Duke's Lemur Center). Let's thank all of them for their service (applause).

I also want to mention that ECAC's work is expertly facilitated by Sandra Walton, our Administrative Coordinator, and Susan Jennings, her assistant. Sometime after my term is over I will reveal how much of the work was really done by Sandra.

You can help Sandra and Susan in two ways: The attendance sheets are being circulated, so please initial and return these to Sandra at the end of our meeting. And when you ask a question or have a comment, please identify yourself as the minutes of the meeting are transcribed from an audio recording and it's hard to know who you are if you don't say so.

I want to tell you a little bit about what is in store for us this fall, but first we have to

cover a couple of items that ECAC dealt with this summer.

APPROVAL OF EARNED DEGREES

Socular: The first concerns the approval of earned degrees, which has traditionally been an agenda item for the Council's September meeting. We have in the past had representatives of each school present to the Council a list of students who completed the requirements for their degrees over the summer, and then we formally vote to approve them. The ritual served as a reminder of our responsibility to the students and our authority in the awarding of the degrees. We go through a similar process at our January meeting for degrees earned in the fall, and in May for degrees earned in the spring.

During the summer, Bruce Cunningham, the University Registrar, wrote to me to explain that the delay between the actual date the degrees are earned and the dates of our September and January meetings causes significant difficulties for students who need official degree certifications for job applications, for professional certification, or for initiating loan repayment processes. Bruce argued, persuasively in ECAC's opinion, that our process should allow students to have the official certification of their degrees as quickly as possible. We learned also that the Board of Trustees addressed the issue from their end by authorizing the President or Provost to approve the degrees on their behalf if the timing of the next Board meeting would cause a delay.

As you, the Council, granted ECAC the power to act on your behalf for the summer months at our May 8th meeting, we took the step of approving all the summer degrees at a special meeting

called on August 20th. I'll remind you also that ECAC has been doing this for some time for the School of Nursing based on the same kind of argument that Bruce made before. But, at that time, made only in the context of the School of Nursing, and now is extending to everyone else. For the August 20th meeting, we required that all of the usual paperwork be delivered to us, so that the only change in the process is the formal approval step. To retain some measure of the purpose of our traditional method, I now want to let you know the numbers of degrees that were approved.

The number of degrees approved in each school were:

Divinity School: 25
Fuqua School of Business: 0
Law School: 2
School of Medicine: 5
Nicholas School of the Environment: 0
School of Nursing: 68 (You can see maybe why they were the first one to raise the issue)
Pratt School of Engineering: 7
Sanford School of Public Policy: 18
Trinity College of Arts & Sciences: 66
Graduate School: 161

We congratulate all of these students, and hope they all got their job applications out in a timely manner (laughter).

Now, this situation is going to arise every year in December and August. To deal with it once and for all, ECAC moves that the Council approve the following resolution:

Whereas a substantial number of students would benefit from receiving official confirmation of the awarding of their degrees by the Board of Trustees

as quickly as possible upon completion of the necessary requirements, and whereas it is not practical for the meeting schedule of the Academic Council to accommodate the timing constraints involved in the approval of degrees earned in August or December, be it resolved that the Academic Council delegates to its Executive Committee the power to approve degrees earned in August or December.

The Executive Committee must receive written presentations of the candidates from the deans of their respective schools in the same format that is required for the approval of May degrees by the full Council, and the numbers of degrees approved will be announced at the first meeting of the full Council following the approval.

I do want to mention that this process has been followed in an informal way in the past: once due to a snowstorm that cancelled an Academic Council meeting and once just for convenience, as far as I can tell. But, I think it's nice for this body to formally approve this way of doing business and I'd like to move that we adopt this resolution.

As the motion comes from ECAC, there is no need for a second. The floor is now open for discussion. It looks like either everyone agrees or disagrees or thinks that they know what everyone is going to do? Let's go ahead and have the vote. The motion passes, and believe me, it's nice to have it settled.

VACANCIES IN HUMANITIES FOR ACADEMIC COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVES

Socular: The second matter handled by ECAC this summer concerns the

composition of this Council itself. Two Council members from the Humanities division resigned this summer because they are leaving Duke. That was Maurice Wallace and Ann Marie Rasmussen. The obvious thing to do in this case, as indicated in our bylaws, would be to appoint the official Humanities alternate and then the next highest vote-getter to fill the vacancies.

Our bylaws also state, however, that only one non-tenure track (NTT) faculty member may serve in any school or division except for the Clinical Sciences where up to four are allowed.

Now we already have one NTT Council member representing the Humanities. And in the election last spring, it turns out that all of the people on the ballot who did not get seated were NTT faculty. So it's back to the bylaws for guidance.

On ECAC's reading of the bylaws, the limit on NTT numbers cannot be exceeded. When no alternate is available to fill a seat, the bylaws direct ECAC to appoint someone of their choosing. We chose to invite former members of the Council on the grounds that they had been identified previously by their colleagues as being worthy of such a lofty position (laughter). We invited José-María Rodríguez-García and Helen Solterer to serve out the terms of the vacated positions and happily, they agreed.

So we are set for this year, but ECAC would like the Council to consider the implications of the situation we faced. Why were all the potential alternates NTT faculty? Should we change the bylaws to reflect the increasing numbers of NTT faculty at Duke? At the time the bylaws were written, I believe that number was

in the vicinity of about ten percent, hence the one out of ten. I assume that was the reasoning. Now it's closer to twenty to thirty percent, so an average of around twenty-five, but even more in Humanities. Do our current bylaws fail to acknowledge the importance of the perspectives of NTT faculty on the issues that come before this Council? ECAC does not yet have a consensus opinion on these questions and therefore is not prepared to offer a recommendation. We would like to hear from you, and if it seems appropriate we will have a full presentation and discussion of the issue at a Council meeting later this year. If we do want to make a change to the bylaws, we will also have to figure out how to do it, which is more complicated than you might think because the one thing this Council is not authorized to do is change the bylaws governing its composition. For that, we need approval of the university faculty -- which never meets (laughter). But, we'll figure it out.

Jane Richardson (Biochemistry): And will that meeting include non-tenure track faculty? (laughter)

Socolar: There you go. So I will be listening to what people tell me about how to handle this but would anyone like to comment on it right now?

Richardson: I think it's an important and very central and worrisome issue, how the university handles NTT faculty. I started off as one myself, and we need more representation.

Socolar: Others? Karla?

Karla Holloway (English): I would be cautious of making a bylaw change in reference to a particular issue that has

emerged in the Council rather than a global issue that the Council has decided it's important to consider. So in conjunction with this particular issue in Humanities, I would not like to see it connected to an overall policy change for the Council. Or, I'd be cautious, I don't know if I would not like to see it.

Socolar: I should mention that this issue has been percolating, has been discussed in ECAC before as well, it just came to a head because of this particular need to fill the seats, but, yes, the real question is, what are the underlying reasons that we were put in this situation, and how do we understand how we want to deal with it going forward. Okay, thank you.

CHANGES MADE TO APC

Socolar: Next, I want to tell you know about a structural change in one of the crucial committees in our faculty governance system. Formally, the Academic Council is where we take votes and the like, but we all know that our governance system is really built on faculty input in all of the Provost's and President's committees and all the consultation that happens there. One of the major committees in that system is the Academic Programs Committee. You may recall that the past chair of the committee, Alex Hartemink, reported last April on his analysis of the workload that committee faces, which led to the conclusion that the committee could not possibly do justice to the number of reviews it will have to handle in the coming years. Responding to that analysis, Provost Kornbluth, in consultation with the incoming chair of APC, Ed Balleisen, also a member of this Council and myself, decided to expand the membership of APC from 18 to 24 faculty

so as to form two subcommittees of 12 members each for the purpose of handling reviews. A given review will now be assigned to one of the subcommittees and only in rare cases will it be brought to the full committee. The full committee will meet monthly, however, to discuss the broader strategic issues that APC handles. So there will now be three APC meetings per month, but each member will attend only two of them, as in the past. The Provost and Chair will attend all of the meetings to ensure that the subcommittees are following similar procedures and applying similar standards. We'll hear from Ed later this year about how that new system is working.

TOPICS FOR THE FALL

Socolar: That takes care of the review of summer business. Now I'd like to let you know what to expect for the fall. As you might expect, there will be some new degree proposals for us to consider, but the number is not going to be as large as last year. It's not going to be as burdensome on our agenda. In addition, I will give an update on certain elements of DKU after I get back from a trip to Kunshan where I will be talking with faculty and administrators about how to establish a faculty governance system there that is based on the principles that underlie our system at Duke. So I'm not prepared to say anything about that now. That's the purpose of the trip, to get a sense of how things might be heading there. The good news for now is that DKU did open this fall with four programs in place: the three master's programs approved by this Council, which all offer a Duke degree, plus the Undergraduate Global Learning Semester. These are exciting times in Kunshan.

I now want to highlight four issues that you'll get to hear about this fall:

First, the Academic Council Task Force for Diversity, that this Council established last February, has been working hard this summer and is making significant progress. The Task Force now consists of a 12-person steering committee, which I serve on ex officio and 7 subcommittees, involving a total of 59 faculty members. The response to our solicitation for participation was substantial and these people are bringing a lot of energy to the work -- I think it's going very well. With the departure of co-chair Maurice Wallace, though, we needed to appoint a co-chair to fill his role, and Trina Jones, from the Law School, agreed to assume that position. She and co-chair Nan Jokerst from Pratt -- Nan is here somewhere -- and is Trina here? They will update us on the Task Force activities at our November 20th meeting. It will be an interim report and will be a chance for us to comment and make suggestions on how to proceed to the full report which will come in the spring.

In a related but I want to stress not redundant matter, the Council discussion last spring on the role of the Faculty Ombuds strongly suggested a need for revisiting the description of that position. ECAC aims to establish an ad hoc committee to review Appendix N of the Faculty Handbook that defines the role of the Ombuds, as well as the Faculty Hearing Committee but we'll be focusing on the Ombuds position, and recommend changes, if necessary. We will form that committee and charge it this fall. I would welcome any thoughts you may have about what should be included in that charge. So, if you have ideas about that

get in touch with me outside of the meeting.

At our October meeting, we'll devote some time to issues relating to athletics. Professor Jim Coleman, chair of the Athletic Council, will be on hand to help us understand these issues. This will be a chance to discuss one or two issues in depth, it does not replace the annual report that he gives in the spring about what has been on the Athletic Council's agenda. We are still thinking about what issues might be the best to highlight at that meeting. If you have ideas about that, please contact me. The leading candidate right now is that we would hear from him about the implications of national trends, legal decisions, and NCAA restructuring on Duke's athletics programs going forward. But it's a chance to have a discussion about it not just hear a report of things that have been done.

Finally, in December, we will have a visit from the chair of our Board of Trustees, David Rubenstein. What I said about learning from fellow faculty goes also for the trustees, of course. As I think you will see, David is an interesting character and it's important for us to understand how the Board of Trustees is approaching various issues. So the fall schedule is roughly set, but I continue to welcome your suggestions for topics for future meetings. You are welcome to contact me or any ECAC member.

APPROVAL OF THE MAY 8, 2014 MEETING MINUTES

Socolar: We have finally come to the event you've all been waiting for. It is now time to approve the minutes from the May 8th meeting (laughter). These have been available on our website since Monday. Are there any corrections or

edits to the minutes? May I have a motion to approve?

(minutes approved by voice vote with no dissent)

FACULTY HEARING COMMITTEE

Socolar: One more item of routine business. We now need to make sure that our Faculty Hearing Committee is fully staffed. The FHC is a subcommittee of the Academic Council charged with considering complaints from faculty concerning issues such as termination of employment, violations of academic freedom, and allegations of harassment not resolved by other university bodies. The process for issuing a formal complaint is detailed in the famous Appendix N in the Faculty Handbook.

The FHC consists of 12 tenured faculty members nominated by ECAC and elected by the Council at large to serve three-year terms. With the agenda, Council members saw ECAC's nominations for the Faculty Hearing Committee.

The continuing members are:

Christina Hendrix (School of Nursing)
Willie Jennings (Divinity School)
Trina Jones (Law School)
Terrence Oas (Biochemistry)
Jocelyn Olcott (History)
Manju Puri (Fuqua School of Business)
Steffen Bass (Physics)
Philip Rosoff (Pediatrics –
Oncology/Hematology)
and Tolly Boatwright (Classical Studies)

The newly-nominated members are:
Tom Metzloff, Law School; Tom just completed a three-year term and has agreed to reappointment and to continue

to serve as chair for this academic year; Claudia Gunsch, Pratt School of Engineering and Lisa Griffin, Law School.

Are there any questions about these nominations?

All in favor of electing these three faculty members to the Faculty Hearing Committee, please say aye? Opposed? Abstentions? Great, they are elected. I want to thank all of our colleagues who have agreed to serve, and offer special thanks to Tom for his willingness to chair the committee again.

RECOGNITION OF THE UNIVERSITY SCHOLAR/ TEACHER OF THE YEAR AWARD

Socolar: So now, the event that you've really been waiting for. I want to call on President Brodhead to present this year's winner of the University Scholar/ Teacher of the Year Award.

Richard Brodhead (President): Thank you, Josh. I wonder if I'm the only one who has been worried about your initial statement that it was one of your duties to protect the President from assaults with a mace (laughter). I imagine it is your duty to protect me from assaults with any possible weapon, using a mace. And if you've never seen Josh wield a mace, you can come to the Founder's Day ceremony tomorrow, where you will see. One of the things the last two chairs of ECAC, this was also true with Susan Lozier, very tall people with excellent posture; for the carrying of maces, this is an amazingly intimidating and impressive display. So Josh, I thank you in advance for all the protection I will enjoy from you.

This is indeed a very happy moment. There is an award, one of the most consequential given to a faculty member at Duke, called the University Scholar/Teacher of the Year Award. It was established in the year 1981 by the Division of Higher Education and the General Board of Higher Education Ministry of the United Methodist Church and is based on the belief that colleges and universities draw their strength and vitality from their faculties. This award annually recognizes an outstanding faculty member for his or her contribution to the learning arts, the institution, and the community through teaching, research, and service. I am pleased to call down to stand with me for a minute this year's recipient, Warren Grill, Professor of Biomedical Engineering (applause). Warren has agreed to stand and glow while I read a brief account of his accomplishments. I could make it longer, I would know how. Warren Grill's scholarship is at the forefront of neuro-engineering, developing techniques to understand and control neural functions. In an effort to meet one of the grand challenges to engineer better medicines, he has developed the novel application of electrical circuits to improve the quality of the lives of patients with neuromuscular dysfunction such as Parkinson's disease, bladder incontinence, and mobility issues. He successfully translates his discoveries from lab bench to the bedside through collaborations with physicians and manufacturing companies across the nation. As a measure of his impact, Warren Grill's research has been cited in literature over 6,300 times. Warren is also among the most productive researchers of the Pratt School of Engineering, and is consistently among its most effective and energetic teachers. In

recognition of his talent as a scholar and educator, Warren Grill has been named the Outstanding Postdoc Mentor in 2013, was named to a Bass Professorship in 2009, and was a recent recipient of the Capers & Marion McDonald Award for Excellence in Teaching and Research from the Pratt School in 2008. He has consistently taught two undergraduate courses in BME and has fully developed two upper level/graduate courses on Electrical Stimulation of the Nervous System and in Neural Prosthetic Systems that have proven to be extremely popular with students. Warren Grill is also an outstanding faculty leader of both the Duke University and Pratt School communities. He served as chair of the University Priorities Committee, as many of you will remember, also of the Pratt School of Engineering Curriculum Review Committee. In addition, he has been elected by his peers to serve on the Engineering Faculty Council and the Executive Committee of the Academic Council. He is also currently a member of the Academic Council and the Athletic Council. Is there any Council of which you are not currently a member?? And, he has been a member of the Business and Finance Committee of the Board of Trustees for the past six years. This is what we have in mind, everybody. Teach your heart out and do the research that makes this university famous around the world, while also serving in every possible service capacity (laughter). On behalf of the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry of the United Methodist Church, Duke University is proud to honor Professor Warren Grill as Duke University's 2014 recipient of the University Scholar/Teacher of the Year Award (applause).

(Brodhead shows plaque to Warren Grill)

Warren Grill (Biomedical

Engineering): You're not going to read that, are you?

Brodhead: I just did! (laughter) These are not prizes of such cash value as to corrupt you, but I hope will be a memento to you of what you have meant to your colleagues and to this university. I want you to go home, take down whatever is over your mantle, and put up this citation of your award. And there is also a certificate. Voila. Congratulations. (applause)

Socular: Thanks, Dick, and congratulations Warren.

We now have a chance, the first of many I expect, to hear from Provost Kornbluth. Several faculty communicated to me over the summer that they would like to hear from you, if only to get to know you a little better. And ECAC was quite happy with your suggestion of discussing the procedure by which we will create the next strategic plan for academics at Duke. Sally, the floor is yours.

PROVOST SALLY KORNBLUTH

Sally Kornbluth (Provost): Thank you very much. And Josh, I'm counting on you to protect me with a mace too; I hope we have an umbrella policy. Okay, so, this may be fairly obvious to everybody why we want to engage in strategic planning, but just by way of background, I really wanted to give you my perspective on that. You know, obvious reasons are to collectively assess our strengths and weaknesses, to set shared priorities in a world of limited resources, where there are many challenges, changes, and opportunities for higher education, to

ensure that our choices are consonant with the values of the university and with the directions in which we wish to go, to ensure that we have sufficient human resources, faculty, staff and infrastructure to meet our strategic goals, and to make sure everyone is on the same page. All of this taken together to me is not nearly as important as the last reason, which is really the strategic planning process itself is a great way to draw out and articulate new and creative approaches, directions, and solutions to problems. It's not only the plan we get in the end, it's really the process by which we get there that I think is important. Now, just for a few minutes, if we think about the themes that are sort of enduring themes that really arose from the last strategic plan, and I just put this forward because it kind of gives you some perspective that the plan actually has impact. In other words, the previous plan actually did set the course for many things that we now see in place in the university. So I think everyone would recognize some of the key themes of the previous plan. Interdisciplinarity, knowledge in the service of society, key role of humanities and interpretive social sciences, internationalization, diversity, affordability and access. And the last plan was very broad, so obviously a lot of things fell under these categories, but if you look a little bit more specifically at what the plan said, I think you can also see things that really happened on this campus that really grew out of the implementation of this plan. So, increasing the capacity of our faculty to develop and communicate disciplinary and interdisciplinary knowledge, strengthen the engagement of the university in real world issues, commitment to interdisciplinary institutes/initiatives, build on knowledge in the service of society, and we can all

name many, many programs that grew out of this, attract the best graduate and professional students and fully engage them in the creation of knowledge, foster in undergraduate students a passion for learning and a commitment to making a difference in the world, transforming the arts at Duke, lead and innovate in the creation, management, and delivery of scholarly resources in support of teaching and research. I mean this is all, admittedly, a little bit “mom and apple pie,” any universities are going to want to do these things, but I think that the details that were hung around these big buckets had a very big impact on what was going on over the university since the plan was put in place in 2006.

(Kornbluth shows picture of book entitled “Strategic Planning for Dummies”)

Now, I was thinking about how we go about strategic planning and this is obviously not the answer, although when I showed this to ECAC they noted that we’re probably not going to “reach new heights of profitability” (laughter). But this is just to kind of make the point that there is all kinds of literature out there about strategic planning that we’re going to ignore, and I want to sort of talk to you about how I’m thinking about how we might go about it, and then also sort of get your suggestions, there’s nothing written in stone, but this is how I’m sort of thinking about it. So, I really think about this year, my first year in office, as a year of pre-planning. And what I mean by that is I want to generate the themes and develop an organizational structure for planning. So, I’m honestly not coming into this with any preconceived notions about exactly what the themes are going to be, and I really want to take care to define those themes because how the plan is

going to develop depends on how you slot specific programs and plans, obviously, into broader themes. The key points I want to make today are: I want to have widespread faculty engagement to generate and vet ideas, and this will be a highly iterative process. The other thing I should say is that this is an academic strategic plan. So when and where non-academic units--student affairs, athletics, admissions, et cetera -- intersect with this plan is going to be an important point of discussion. But we’re not making plans for athletics here. Now, I like to think about the plan as a roadmap with concrete deliverables, but it’s not a manual or, even worse, a contract. I mean, we all recognize that during the implementation of the last plan, for instance, there were some serious ups and downs, downs being most important in this context in the economy that impacted what we could and could not do in the plan. But I think we want to set out a series of goals that, should all go well, we can meet many of those goals going forward. So, how am I thinking about this? You know, I really am thinking about how I can get the most input possible in this year-long process of really deciding the themes before we go into strategic planning in earnest next year. Now, I don’t want to wear everybody out with pre-planning, but what I’m thinking about is, first of all, to organize dinners for small groups of faculty, and I’m talking about quite a few, not ten faculty. I’d like to have a lot of dinners with faculty. We need to think about who should be involved--should it be administrators, staff, and students as well as faculty? And how do you really achieve a cross-section of the faculty? I really want to get a breadth of opinion. I should also say that I don’t see this process as being driven solely out of the Provost’s office. And what I’ve decided

is that I'd like to name probably two faculty or maybe three faculty chairs of strategic planning that will dovetail with the things going on in the Provost's office and it will certainly be an ongoing conversation. But I really want to have faculty own the strategic planning in a real way. Likewise, I'd like to appoint to work with these faculty chairs and in consultation with them, an executive steering committee. And the idea would be that the dinners among small groups of faculty would feed information into the steering committee, hopefully many members of the steering committee would attend many of these dinners with me, and then obviously there would be discussions between members of the steering committee and other venues. For instance, here in Academic Council, APC, school governance bodies, the deans, with institute and center directors, and I'm also planning to request one-page strategic summaries from the major units. I'm not expecting each school, institute or center at this point to come up with a full strategic plan, but I think we're going to be in trouble and I think ECAC also helpfully pointed this out to me, that if the deans in the schools are marching in a completely different direction from the faculty in the pre-planning phase, we're not going to have a successful plan. So it would be good to have that input as we start to describe the major themes. So this hopefully will start very soon, and I have again to think about how we comprise these things, and run until maybe springtime, just to really spend a lot of time gathering information. And then the idea would be that through these dinners, deans and institutes and centers directors, obviously discussions with myself, the vice provosts and President as well, we will feed this into the executive steering committee, which will deliberate

themes and organizations, and hopefully by the end of the academic year, deliver a straw man white paper on what the major overall themes and organization of the strategic plan will be. I would then hope to have comments on the white paper by wider faculty, faculty governance bodies, and leadership groups. Now, you can't write a plan with hundreds and hundreds of people penning with white out. I just want to really make sure that we get enough input as we define the themes that we start out with the right buckets and the right themes and organizations. So that when we go into the major planning next year, we have broad categories that the faculty feel that they can participate in and discuss and the likelihood then would be that we would have essentially subcommittees on each one of the themes. Again, to do fact finding and really flesh out the plan. So, there are all different kinds of models you can do strategic planning by as you think about these kinds of groups. You know, we could make this an administrative-driven process with faculty consultation; I really don't have much appetite for this and I suspect the faculty wouldn't either. You could make it mainly a faculty-driven process with faculty chairs and a steering committee with some sort of administrative or logistical support, but what I really favor, and I want to discuss with you further here, is that we really do have these collaborative committees with faculty chairs and then administrative participation. So I hope to interact a lot with the steering committee, I hope the vice provosts will interact, and then again I hope to interface with the deans, institutes and center directors on this. So there is a lot of dialogue up front, and really defining what we want, as I said, the major buckets to look like. Now, how do you organize dinners and these

discussions so that you really tease out these things? We're not all going to sit in a room going "What are the themes?" What I'd like to do is think about some major questions that these dinners, these discussions might address. Now, I don't want to read all of these here, and these will be made available to all Council members; I think Sandra can send out this presentation. But I'll just highlight the kinds of things I'm thinking that we would discuss. So, as we continue to support and enhance interdisciplinary and translational work, what major intellectual disciplinary areas of excellence does Duke need to enhance? For example: how do we maximize opportunities for graduate and professional students? You'll have a chance to read these in more detail. How can we further move students out of their comfort zones, engaging with each other and their academic work in ways that prize depth and connection over badges and achievements? I mean, I think this is something really important, we have a huge welter of activities here; how do we really encourage students to dive deep? And similarly, how can we further enhance opportunities for students to engage in profound and authentic research experiences from the humanities and social sciences to the sciences? So these are the kinds of questions that I hope are really major, central important questions that, together, in discussing these, we will start to craft what the faculty are thinking about, what the important themes are, et cetera. How do we lower the barriers to cross-university collaboration and teaching? What structures, incentives and cultures need to be revised, enhanced or created to ensure greater opportunities for maximizing the quality and impact of Duke's overall research, teaching and

translational work? So these are purposely very, very broad questions. But I'm hoping that the discussions that come from these questions, again, will start to tease out the themes that are most important to faculty that are participating in these discussions. How do we extend Duke's global reach while ensuring mutual benefits for all partners, for instance Duke and DKU? And, how do we employ online educational tools to enhance teaching on Duke's campus and to increase engagement with partners globally? So, again, very, very broad questions. I'm not presupposing what the foci on each of these areas will be. But I'm hoping that if we frame many discussions over the coming year, by the time we get to the end of this academic year we will really have a good idea of what the major areas we want to focus on the plan going forward. Now, hopefully the output of this year of pre-strategic planning will be strategic planning. I'm hoping to have similar structures and discussion. That will include concept refinement, really detailing the specific proposed programs and plans. So, if we come out with broad buckets this year, I would like to have a little bit of meat around what the specificities are going to be. There'll be vetting and re-vetting, and I want to comment for a moment on the budgeting. You know, we're going to have a very different plan if we have 20 million behind it or if we have 200 million behind it, obviously. And, I don't yet know, I don't think any of us know yet, exactly, what the resource envelope is going to be, starting next year over, say, a five-year plan. And what I'd like to do, first of all, is be transparent about it and keep faculty informed that are involved in this as to what we're going to be able to do and what we're not going to be able to do. But I also hope that the plan is modular

enough that even if we can't do everything in the plan, we will be able to do elements of it. And be able to really see benefits of the planning process, even if, as I said, we can't pay for the whole plan. And, we'll see how that evolves over time. And obviously the planning itself is the first step, and then comes implementation. And that's the job of the administration, the faculty, et cetera, to really make the plan sing after that. But I'm hoping in this year of pre-planning and then in the year of planning, we're able to tease out some really interesting directions that we can all move in. So, with that, I'm happy to take questions, I'd like to hear your thoughts, discussion, et cetera.

Nan Jokerst (Electrical and Computer Engineering): Sally, I commend you for involving the faculty from the very beginning. Sometimes the perception on the part of the faculty is that a few faculty have very significant input, but the broader voice of the faculty is not heard. And so engaging the broad faculty voice, I think, will make the implementation part much easier. So, I commend you for this. I think it looks great.

Kornbluth: Thanks. I mean, the question still is: I can't have dinner with 2,000 faculty (laughter); I don't eat that much. Josh actually said it should be everyone on Academic Council, [To Socolar]: And you'd come to every dinner right? But we need to think about how to do that. And I'd like to start fairly soon and get moving on it. So I think I'd almost like to be a little bit random about it. Because I think there is a danger- you say if the impression is that only a few faculty have input- it's easy to go to the usual suspects when you really know people and you feel that you've gotten good advice in the past, and

you're likely to get good advice in the future, but the obvious problem with that is it can become like an echo chamber and then you don't get any brand new ideas entering onto the scene. So I hope to have people on the committees in some way that I haven't had any conversations with yet.

Jokerst: I will say that when we asked for volunteers for the Diversity Task Force, most of the people, or many of the people, I didn't know. But they were there and they work amazingly hard and so I think there are a lot of people on campus who want to contribute, and I think if you give them an avenue, maybe even electronic or email...

Kornbluth: Oh that's an interesting idea. Sort of like an RFA...

Jokerst: Yeah, almost to that level. Let people volunteer to at least give their thoughts, if not their time, then I think you'll have a good response from the community because the community really does want to have a voice.

Kornbluth: I think that's a good point.

Richardson: And if you solicit that sort of thing, then you can make choices ensuring that there is the kind of diversity that you want.

Kornbluth: That's right, that's right. I mean, I definitely want to have a breadth of experiences, backgrounds, et cetera, to make sure that we really encompass the whole community.

Questioner: Two questions: First, what is translational work? And second, I understand the first two of these the

faculty is involved; who does the vetting and re-vetting?

Kornbluth: Well, let me take your second question first. I anticipate that there will be a similar steering committee in the actual strategic planning process; it may well be the same one as in the pre-strategic planning process. I'm not sure of that yet, but that there will be a process by which they contact governance groups, they contact schools and institutes and centers but I think the point about electronic vetting as well, I would anticipate that as this is developed, we're going to be putting this up for general comment as well. So that's how I sort of view the vetting process. Now, I'm sorry, this was a little bit of med school jargon on translational work I carry with me, my history and when I was talking to the Arts and Sciences chairs, I said, "When I think about disciplinary and interdisciplinary, it's like I used to think about basic science and translational work i.e. stuff you translate to the clinic" and I always said you can't translate nothing. You have to have a basic underpinning. Same thing with interdisciplinary. You have to have disciplinary to get there. So I think of it as a kind of dialogue in both directions. If we're going to take either our most basic research, and translate it out into the world knowledge and in the service of society, take our disciplinary units and hope that they contribute to joint projects, I think we have to make sure that both arms are strong.

Questioner: Thanks, that's helpful.

Pat Wolf (Biomedical Engineering): It seems that you mentioned that athletics and admissions, I can't remember the other ones, weren't considered part of the planning process. I'm just wondering

where that strategic planning that does include those things happens?

Kornbluth: Right, so, I would have to defer on that one. I don't actually know how that process works.

Brodhead: It's an interesting question. When we started the current fundraising campaign, the first question that was faced was: is it better to have separate campaigns for different purposes, or is it better to have an integrated campaign? There was an argument that you could start the medical campaign a couple years before the university campaign. There was an argument of a separate athletic campaign. I thought that, as that debate went on, it became clear very quickly that everybody thought that, Duke being Duke, it's better to have an integrated campaign. The point is to try to imagine what the whole is, of which all these things are parts. Per all that, it does seem to me that Sally has made an important point in understanding that an academic strategic plan need not be a facilities strategic plan; there are millions of dimensions to it that probably won't be centrally anchored here. So then the question legitimately arises: where are those things discussed? They are discussed, of course, all through the process of faculty governance, in the case of athletics, the Athletic Council, the UPC discusses it annually, the reports that come, they come to this body, certainly they're discussed in the committees of the trustees, which, as you know, many of you are members of those committees. And so those are community and trustee committees. Anything that involves long-term commitments of resources of the university, at some point needs the trustees to be a part of it, and certainly they will have value to give in consulting on this plan, and you better hope that

they see the interest of it, since they will be creating the financial envelope that will make it possible. So, there are going to be different answers to different things. I would say, and you mentioned admissions, it does seem to me that there are questions particular to admissions that you're not really going to take up in a planning exercise like this, but for all that, the concept of who your students are, what are you looking for in your students, how you articulate that goal, and how you articulate the university's invitation to students, as to what they might expect to get at this university, seems to me a profoundly academic issue and most completely at the center of this exercise.

Kornbluth: I think that's right. In terms of framing it, the question is at what point we feed that in and how it dovetails with the plan and I think that's fair enough. And, in fact, again, this came out of discussing with the Arts and Sciences chairs which is, how we recruit impacts, obviously, what kind of student body we get. What kind of recruiting activities we want students to see when they're here.

Craig Henriquez (Biomedical Engineering): I actually like the process on engaging the faculty. One question that came to mind was: to what degree is there going to be information about the assessment of things we have already done? We've done a lot of things over the past 10-15 years that were new, that were informed by the strategic plan. But I think the faculty would like to know, how are we doing on a number of things? I don't know if that's going to be part of the process, or if there's information that will already be available, just wondered how you thought about that.

Kornbluth: I think that's a really good point. I hadn't really thought about it. I think that one way to approach that is to think about, as you say, sort of what assessment information is available. What we know, and introduce that, if you will, early into the discussions with the faculty during the pre-planning process. You know, I think it would be hard to incorporate, in a sense, backward-looking assessment into the actual plan itself, but I think it's fair enough to take stock of where we are as a launching point for the planning process. Let me give some thought to that, and discuss with various folks about what sort of information would be most useful going into the process. But certainly the status of major initiatives, institutes, et cetera that came out of the plan would be helpful. I think that's fair enough.

Peter Feaver (Political Science): We looked at that exact question in UPC last year. We learned that the administration had very good output measures, but not very good outcome measures, except in one domain where they had remarkably fine grain and that is faculty quality. So...

Kornbluth: Academic analytics?

Feaver: Academic analytics provides a remarkably granular thing on the outcome of improving the quality of the faculty, but on pretty much all the other aspects of the strategic plan, we just get outputs and then there was more hand waving on the outcomes.

Kornbluth: Well, actually, this may be fortuitous because the institutes and centers, for the first time, are undergoing external review, and so I think we're going to get at least some semi-objective measures on how these initiatives and

institutes have been doing. And so I think there may be some way to abstract out of these external reviews over the year, the kind of pros and cons and things we might want to build on or not continue to build on going forward. So I think that information may at least come out of that, even if there is not quantitative data, per se, on how they're doing.

Kelly Brownell (Dean, Sanford School):

Sally, I was wondering if there would be opportunities for input from non-academic faculty on administrative input. So, for example, students, people who might employ our students, agencies that fund education, people who track trends in education, and things like that so that there's input from outside our own group in addition to what we might generate ourselves.

Kornbluth: I think that's a great idea. And I think that may come more into the planning year than in the pre-planning year. Because I envision this as really, like I said, broadly defining the buckets, although I think that some information in terms of what the broader trends are, where our students might go, et cetera, would be helpful, even in informing pre-planning, now that I think about it. So I might want to have a little bit further discussion of exactly how one would go about that logistically. But I think in principle it's a good idea.

(applause)

Socular: Thank you, Sally. This concludes today's meeting of the Council. Thank you and I hope you will join me and my ECAC colleagues for the reception in the hallway. Our next meeting is on October 23rd.