



**Minutes of the Academic Council Meeting
Thursday, January 15, 2026**

Mark Anthony Neal (Chair, Academic Council): Good afternoon. Happy New Year! I hope all of you had a great holiday season — at least better than mine — which was a gift and a curse. I came down with pneumonia during the holidays, which meant I had to stay home, not go anywhere and get some work done. So, it was a productive holiday. And I want to use this opportunity to give a shout out to our colleagues on the health side, because they were amazing, for the night that I had to spend at Duke Health. Other than that, I hope everybody had a nice, productive and enjoyable time with family and a break from Duke business, even though I know that wasn't the case for a lot of folks. Congratulations to our football team, which had an amazing run over the last six weeks, and one that no one could have imagined they would have. We'll talk more about what their success means for the university, and Athletics in general, far down the road.

A couple of announcements: The annual election of the Academic Council will begin later this month for service to begin next academic year. All faculty who are eligible to serve will get an email about the process. Eligible faculty are already opted in. Though you have the choice to opt out, we hope that you won't. We want as many of you to stand for election and service as possible. The only exception is the Clinical Sciences in the

School of Medicine, which has close to 2200 eligible faculty. So, they are already opted out, and if they are interested in running, they will need to opt in. For all other schools, if you do not opt out, you could receive enough votes that would allow you to proceed to the nomination ballot and the subsequent election ballot. Please encourage your colleagues to consider service on the Academic Council. It has remained in my almost 22 years at Duke, the most rewarding service that I've done for the university. And that, of course, includes two terms as a chair of my department, which was not as rewarding as you might think. (laughter)

***APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 4
MEETING MINUTES***

Next up, the approval of the December 4 meeting minutes. The minutes are posted with today's agenda. Are there any corrections or modifications to those minutes?

[minutes approved by voice vote without dissent]

***TEACHING & MENTORING
EXCELLENCE REPORT:
CONTINUATION WITH Q & A***

We will now move on to the Teaching and Mentoring Excellence Report, a

continuation from the December 4 meeting. The co-chairs from the Committee are here again today. We will ask them shortly to come down in respond to your questions. As you know, from the email I sent earlier this week, the vote for this item will be conducted electronically beginning tomorrow. ECAC and I have received a number of requests to do so since the December 4 meeting. Also, we will be separating the votes to reflect the APC (Academic Programs Committee)'s recommendation, so you'll be voting on three distinct items. The portal for voting will open on Friday and will conclude next Thursday.

Bridgette Hard (Psychology & Neuroscience / Co-chair of the 2030 Teaching and Mentoring Excellence Committee): Hello everybody. It's good to see you all. Happy New Year! The first thing that I want to say is that we're excited to be here. The work that we put together into this report that you're going to be voting on was a lot of blood, sweat and tears. It was a tremendous amount of thought and effort from a large group of people. It's exciting to see us so close to making some important steps forward for Duke.

One of the things that we learned a lot over this last year and a half is that people at Duke care a lot about teaching and mentoring. We have incredibly passionate educators here. We also learned that people are hungry for greater clarity and support for faculty around teaching and mentoring, and how to do it effectively. So, the work that we did was initiated based on multiple prior faculty committees which recognized that we have a strong need to define very clear standards for mentoring and teaching excellence in the same way that we did for the research excellence back in 2018. Now, we're here to answer additional questions

you have. Although we do want to remind you that the report you've been provided with is very detailed, many of the questions you may have — if we don't have time for all of them today — will likely be answered in that report. So, please make use of it. Use the search function if you don't want to read all the pages. But again, we're going to be here to answer some questions for you. Before we do that, Jerry has a couple of thoughts to share as well.

Jerry Reiter (Statistical Science / Co-chair of the 2030 Teaching and Mentoring Excellence Committee): I want to say three things, connecting to some of the comments from last time we were here. One, our committee's overarching intention was to try to find ways to enhance the experiences of our faculty colleagues and students at Duke. We did not have the intention of minimizing Duke's identity as a research university. We certainly don't have the intention of loading on lots of extra work onto our faculty colleagues. Indeed, it's our hope and belief that with the kinds of clarity and standards that Bridgette referred to, we all will find it easier and more enjoyable to be teachers and mentors at Duke. The rubrics that we've put in the report are starting points. They're suggestions for individual units to take back and define what makes for effective teaching and mentoring in their context and disciplines.

Second, there were some comments about what we call the career track faculty last time when we were here. With regard to those recommendations, a key goal of ours was to build on the work of a previous committee that was charged by the Academic Council, and to more clearly define the distinct roles that faculty in these positions have, even though they share the same name. So, we're hoping that that kind of clarity would make our faculty

colleagues' experiences better. We haven't heard a lot of controversy around those titles and definitions, to be honest. As we've talked to the deans, the Provost, APT (Advisory Committee on Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure), APC, DUS (Directors of Undergraduate Studies), the chairs and others, we haven't heard much there. There are other recommendations in the report that are related to future prospects of our career track faculty. We recognize that those recommendations may not go far enough for some folks. We heard that last time. But we do believe that the recommendations will improve the experiences of our faculty colleagues in these positions, recognizing and rewarding them for all that they do for Duke. In some sense, I think we had the mantra — the old saying — “let's not let the perfect be the enemy of the good.”

Finally, there's a lot of implementation details that need to happen. This is at a high level. This is all you can do in a report of this nature. This is going to be an iterative and faculty-driven process, from revising and developing new processes and methods for evaluating our teaching and mentoring, to units figuring out what makes for effective standards in their contexts. Each unit is going to have that opportunity. It's not intended to be a one-size-fits-all document. We were asked to comment on some of the questions raised last time. We're happy to take any questions.

Josh Sosin (Classical Studies): I want to thank the committee for its work on an important subject. If time had permitted last December, I would have offered my support for the comments of our colleagues in Nursing and Statistics. Tom (Blodgett, School of Nursing) asked: if regular rank non-tenure track faculty do research, teaching, and service, just as tenure track

faculty do, why are they not similarly eligible for tenure? The answer was that they tend to teach more and publish in less prestigious journals. But tenure track teaching loads vary dramatically across departments. Also, I think we mean prestigious in different communities. This is only sort of an answer.

We were encouraged not to view the tenure track designation as superior to the regular rank non-tenure track; this is honorable. But when you have two classes of workers with identical or comparable qualifications, training, attainment, and duties, but on the other hand different protections, entitlements, and franchise, then to insist that they are equal is perhaps not as kind as I think we all intend.

Mine (Cetinkaya-Rundel, Statistical Science) wondered why the report does not confront this inequity. The response was essentially: “Let's clean up this mess now and revisit first principles later.” But this seems backwards, and as an institution we claim to lead with our principles. Equity is one of them. Academic freedom is another. And in a world of cellphones, social media, and contempt for the academic enterprise, our teachers need as much protection as anyone.

But the protection of the academic freedom is not something you work out after you've built the superstructure. It's the design principle that you start with. How can it be premature to discuss first principles and the possibility of tenure for those whom we now call regular rank non-tenure track faculty and who are no less expected to teach, research, and serve? If after that, faculty want to erect a bureaucratic process that cedes further responsibility over core activities to an administrative apparatus —

and I hope not — we can discuss that then, from a fairer position.

So, while I appreciate the proposal's seriousness of purpose, to my eye, it puts heavy bureaucracy in front of fundamentals and doesn't lead us where we ought to be going at the moment. I offer this as a comment. You can respond as if it were a question.

Hard: This is not the kind of pushback that I ever expected. I find myself delighted to receive it. It's been amazing to hear people saying, "this doesn't go far enough; we need to create more equity and less hierarchy." I do think that what our recommendations say is that we need to revisit this in five years, get everything in place, make sure we know what's expected of people in the career track, even just to get promoted, because there's vast inconsistency in what's required even to be promoted within these tracks. It sounds like there is support in the future to put forward a different kind of proposal and a different kind of vote to figure out a version of tenure or a version of tenure for career track faculty. Just to remind us, I don't think that's what we are voting on in this proposal. The vote here is more about the titles of the tracks for career tracks that not everyone is called a PoP (Professor of the Practice) who does vastly different kinds of things. But I hear you. I don't think we're voting on that right now, but I love hearing that. This is something that people want to revisit. I think that that kind of groundswell will make it more likely that we actually do revisit it.

Sina Farsiu (Pratt School of Engineering): These are very important comments, and I appreciate that. But I would like to note that if you tenure everyone, there would be less opportunity for hiring non-tenure track faculty. When

you look at the reality of the world, when you are trying to hire a non-tenure track position, you have more freedom. Mandating that everyone get tenure, the unintended consequence of it would be that some of those people who have today's job might not be offered that job. Let me remind you that the tenure was a start to give the academic freedom, mainly to the researchers, and of course, to those who teach controversial issues. Do we really believe that all the courses we teach require that academic freedom? That's the reality. Let's think about it in the next five years and see who needs this protection, because on one hand, all our colleagues, not only the people who teach, but our staff, why shouldn't the staff have tenure? They do very valuable work. They should be able to speak their mind when needed. Let's think about it and perhaps have a committee on revisiting who requires the protection of tenure. I'm just worried that if you extend the concept of tenure to everyone, you might get to a situation that no one would have the real tenure. Thank you.

Hard: Again, we're not voting on giving tenure to anybody today, but I appreciate this. It suggests that this is a topic we care a lot about, and we want to have some time to give adequate discussion to.

Stefani Engelstein (German Studies): I want to thank you for the work that went into this. It's clear that it has a wide scope. Also, I enjoyed listening to you talk about your goals in undertaking it. That said, as someone who is passionate about teaching, and who has literally never met a faculty member at Duke who isn't passionate about teaching — I've been here for ten years. I'm not saying they are not there. I'm just saying I've never met them — I do wonder about the imposition of a large amount of bureaucratic pseudo-documentation, which

is how this appears to me. The guidelines or the structures you've come up with were taken from the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine, which is a portion of the campus, but not all of it. While the idea of very clear rubrics, outcomes assessments, alignments and self-studies might be helpful to some people on campus, no one is preventing them from doing that if they feel that it will improve their teaching. You've talked about having a lot of flexibility from department to department, depending on the discipline, but only within the structure and framework you've set out, which is already, I would say, difficult to align with perspectives, for example, in Humanities. But even for areas outside that, I would simply say that I trust my colleagues. We are faculty at Duke University, one of the leading universities in the world. We have reached the top of our profession, where people who are expert at what we do. And it feels like you're suggesting hiring a bunch of learning innovation specialists to babysit us. We've all done busy work before. We're used to doing busy work, but this is a kind of particularly problematic busy work, because it seems to intervene in the relationship between the faculty members and their students. What we're trying to do in the classroom is indeed a form of excellence that I would not define as effectiveness in the way that you have defined effectiveness. You stated that the reason you moved that definition of effectiveness was because it allowed for documentation, whereas other forms of excellence didn't allow for documentation. I think that in some areas, those other forms of excellence are actually the ones that we're striving for. I would also mention that I was at a public university for 14 years before I came here. I was at the University of Missouri. It was frequent for their administration to try to get us to categorize and reduce what we do to things

like bullet points, lists and rubrics. That didn't seem like it was worthy of what we try to accomplish in the classroom. Unfortunately, I have colleagues that I know at both University of Colorado and University of Kansas have this framework that they work within. I would say that it's not worthy of them. I'm not sure why we should think that it's worthy of us. Our peers, from whom we seem not to have been able to get models, are Harvard, Princeton, Yale, and Stanford. I ran this by someone who I trust extremely about teaching matters. She's dedicated her whole life to teaching here at the university. And she falls into the category that would be affected by the title changes, which she would actually be pleased to have a different title. But you know, people who are in those positions will be more widely affected than those of us who teach less, at least the ones who teach more. I know that some Professors of the Practice are Professors of the Practice in different ways, but many of them are teaching professors. They will be particularly affected by this requirement of inserting a level of mediation between the faculty member and the class, between the faculty member and the peer faculty members who are doing the judging in the peer to peer review, and the tenure promotion by reference to outside categories, structures, frameworks and technocratic employees who are brought in. Because evidently, we're not trusted to be able to teach on our own.

Reiter: Thank you for the comments. I would say a few things. One, we did have Humanities representation on the committee. Two, this is not supposed to be a one-size-fits-all document. For example, if you have a definition of excellent teaching for what you want to do in your department, that's what it should be. The goal was to try to jumpstart the process of units talking about

and defining what teaching excellence and mentoring excellence means in their context and in their discipline. And this was a skeleton, a backbone to start with. I think that the effective course design is something we all want to do. I think having an effective learning community is something we all want to do. Right now, how do we evaluate teaching at Duke? Course evaluations. That's it. I think that's a problem personally. They're biased. They're completely ineffective. You get three responses. I sat in the Dean's office on promotion things. I've been a Chair. I don't know what to do when I get those things. And it's such a difficult thing. So instead, we can have a teaching observation. It's not one every year, every semester, every class. That's not it. It's every couple of years, as we get closer to the promotion time. It's not necessarily for senior faculty, though they're welcome to. It's for the assistants and associates, as they have to build the evidence for promotions.

Engelstein: Maybe I misunderstood something. Are you suggesting that we can design whatever we want? Because I'm all in favor of peers sitting in on a classroom now and then. But that's not what this sounded like to me.

Reiter: I think that it's set up in a way that there are multiple sources of evidence that a department could gather. It could be peer evaluations. There're always course evaluations. But hopefully they'll be retargeted to assessing what students can easily assess, which is the learning community, for example. You can say, "Here's my syllabus. It's annotated. This is why I did this." So, we're hoping that there's a diversity of ways for people to have their courses evaluated, not just course evaluations. And departments will get to pick them with their school leadership's approval, so that there's some norming, if

you will, some baseline level. But we want to push it down to the departments. I agree with you. I don't think there could be a one-size-fits-all document. Yes, it was pulled from the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine, but we modified it a lot. We started there, but we tried to think carefully about what would make sense for different units, not just Sciences.

Hard: I think I should also highlight that the creation of these recommendations is not in any way to say that we are not already doing these things. We know that we are, but there's not a good way to capture it. If I'm creating an effective, engaged learning community, and all I have is basically a course evaluation which is about how many students like me, that's not capturing the effectiveness of what I'm actually doing. We love for departments to layer in additional things they think are valuable and important. But the first principle of course design is to have goals for your students and to have a plan for how to achieve them. Creating an engaged learning community means creating a space where students trust you, they trust each other, and they feel comfortable engaging and challenging things together. The third thing is to keep trying to be better. We do think that those are things that will be universally agreed upon. But if people want to layer in additional things that represent the richness of what they do with their pedagogy, that's awesome. We're tight on time. Thank you so much for engaging in these ideas.

Tom Blodgett (School of Nursing): Could you remind us what we'll be voting on?

Neal: There was an APC resolution, which is what the Academic Council is responding to. The resolution was provided, along with the report, with our agenda. Tomorrow you will get a Qualtrics survey which will lay

out very specifically what you're voting on in response to the APC resolution. At this time, we will go into Executive Session.

[Executive Session: A conversation between Chair Neal and Provost Gallimore regarding DKU.]

Following the conclusion of the Executive Session, Chair Neal returned to open session for the remainder of the meeting.

ANONYMOUS QUESTION

Neal: For the next part of the meeting, there is an anonymous question that ECAC received. We have Krishna (Udayakumar, Chief Global Strategist) here to answer the question.

[An Anonymous question regarding Duke's Global Strategy Report issued in October 2025]

The need to develop a focused approach to Duke's Global Strategy seems necessary and worthwhile, but the three chosen thematic priority areas (health, climate, and economic development) effectively erase the Arts and Humanities. Duke's international reputation has, in great part, been accomplished by our scholars and programs in these areas, including units carrying our name far beyond US borders, like Duke University Press and the Nasher Museum of Art. Can this report be revised, keeping the spirit of focus and efficiency, but without shooting Duke in the foot by eliminating languages, art, and culture from its global strategy? Why should we cut precisely the things that have proven to bring great results? Perhaps we could have a fourth thematic area (arts and culture?), or condense two of the three existing ones to make space and correct this harmful

omission? Our international philanthropy networks would surely appreciate the change as well, especially our prominent alumni in these areas.

Krishna Udayakumar (Chief Global Strategist / Chair, Global Priorities Committee): Thank you very much. Since the beginning of the last academic year, I've had the privilege of chairing the reconstituted Global Priorities Committee (GPC). For the last six weeks or so, I've had the privilege of also serving as the Chief Global Strategist, working closely with Provost Gallimore. Thanks very much for the opportunity to engage on this important topic. And we'll hear a bit more as we go to the next agenda item as to what the report actually is, the strategy and how we're trying to operationalize it.

Just to give you a broad background, the Global Priorities Committee is working with stakeholders, including the trustees, the Provost's Office and other senior leaders, to take a broad view of where Duke was last academic year in terms of its global engagement. As you heard from Alec (Gallimore, Provost), over 20 years, we've had incredible amounts of global activity in a very decentralized way. We thought it was a good point in time to assess where we were and try to define broadly a path forward focused on the vision and principles of global engagement, and what we think might be the right measures of success for our work going forward. What has come out of that was a report that was released in October (2025). Hopefully we've all had a chance to look at it. It started, I think, importantly, with a reaffirmation to the commitment to the global engagement. For Duke to be a great university, we must be globally engaged — whether to recruit talent, students, faculty, and staff from a global talent pool, or to address the

problems we take on through our scholarship and research. It almost all cut across boundaries. It also attempted to try to lay out some approaches and principles that I'll get into.

But here the question is the idea of thematic priorities. We did address the idea of the need for focus, as the question acknowledges as well, in order to think about a focused path forward. And where we landed on was not a reassessment from scratch of where our strategic priorities might be, but rather to affirm that the way that we engage globally needs to align with the key priorities of the university as a whole. So, three areas as a starting point were suggested — health, climate and sustainable economic development — which align with the strategic priorities of the university itself.

Secondly, we also looked at geographic priority areas — not to say we work in some and not in others, but rather to say that if we thought about regional approaches, we could potentially bring groups of faculty together here and bring potential partners together in ways that could have further impact and sustainability for that work. We did identify in the report some areas of the world. And we thought, in looking at what our peers are doing as well, that there was a distinct advantage in Duke's long-term engagement in many areas of the Global South that we wanted to build on. None of those is an attempt to say that we should value less any work that's happening across the universities, certainly not in Humanities, Arts and Interpretive Social Sciences. In fact, we tried to make explicit that we value and expect a very broad range of work to continue and demonstrate the excellence of the diversity of work happening across the university. As I said, we have no intention of trying to eliminate things that may not have

been started, particularly as areas of strategic priorities, as a forward-looking piece.

The last piece I'll add is that there was also clarity that this is not intended to be a static plan. It's not something that's going to be still in the next three or five years from now. It is not going to be the only thing that we refer to. It was a starting point to have exactly this sort of conversation, to engage broadly the Duke community. We have multiple pathways by which this will continue to evolve. First, part of my role as the Chief Global Strategist is to stay engaged — and engage even more — with the faculty and the broader community, including our global alumni network, to ensure that we are evolving our strategic priorities and partnerships as we go. The second is a continued refinement of the Global Priorities Committee as a faculty-led Provost's committee, and part of its charge will certainly be to look at and provide clear recommendations, partially at the level of proposals and programs, but also broadly at the level of institutional strategic priorities as we navigate a highly dynamic global environment.

Alec Gallimore (Provost): Just to augment that, when we released the report, it's just a starting point, as Krishna mentioned. We held a number of listening sessions — in person once and a virtual one. We heard loud and clear that many members of our faculty, particularly in Humanities and in the School of Arts and Sciences, didn't feel it reflected their expertise. Also, the history of Duke Global, which, frankly, a lot of the starting points 20 years ago were the focus of the humanities globally, especially in parts of Africa which haven't been listed in this report. Then we hosted a dinner with a number of Humanities faculty engaged in global scholarship to hear their thoughts on

how we should move forward. So, I just want to say that this is very much a living document. We're in the receiver mode. We're always getting feedback. And we now have a structure where it allows us to take this input and actually to affect change in terms of goal strategy for Duke University. I appreciate the feedback we've had. The last thing I'll say — and I know you've heard this, so I'll make it more broadly known — is that last year, we focused an effort on Global Duke. This year, we're halfway through a major yearlong focus on Duke Science and Technology. Next year, the focus is going to be in the Arts and Humanities. I can assure you that one of the takeaways from this conversation is the notion of Global Duke, and that the intersection of the Arts and Humanities is going to be something we'll be focusing on next year when we do that work. Thank you.

DUKE GLOBAL STRATEGY / STRUCTURE UPDATE

Neal: We will not be taking any questions at this time. We are going to invite Valerie Hausman, Associate Vice Provost for Global Administration, and David Bowersox, Vice Provost for Finance and Administration, to join Krishna to present on the global priority structure going forward.

Udayakumar: Thank you very much for the opportunity to review the recent progress, and to open the floor for conversations here as we go forward. Dave and Valerie are going to join me in a few minutes but for the sake of efficiency, so that we can get to the listening mode and having a conversation as quickly as possible, I'll go through much of the content. But this is a joint effort to try to move this work forward. What we'll cover is a bit of our global strategy and priorities, the organizational changes that we are putting in

place to implement that strategy, and then most of our time in discussion.

In the beginning of the last academic year, we went about reconstituting what was a dormant committee for several years, the Global Priorities Committee, which is faculty-led, and undertook a strategic initiative, an engagement with the Board of Trustees across the entire academic year. In parallel, we had some benchmarking, both here at Duke trying to get our hands around the breadth of global activities that have been underway for many years, and taking a look at what this field looks like in terms of our peers, both in the U.S. and in some international universities, and input along the way from across the global community and the Duke community. All of that resulted in an iterative process that then released our Global Strategy Report in October of this academic year, as we just heard, as a starting point for continuing this work.

What we wanted to anchor ourselves on is to make sure that we laid out the vision for the university. When we thought about global, we took a broad sense of how we think about the ways we engage with people, with cultures, with ideas across borders, in order to reflect the approaches that will enhance the mission of our university. We thought the vision was about building bridges with boldness. Part of what has made us distinctive over decades is the interdisciplinary collaborations, both inside of Duke and outside of Duke. The second part of the vision of global engaging is about connecting, reflecting, innovating, and opportunities, especially to ensure that we have experiential learning across the Duke community. And the third is that we're committed to pursuing open inquiry and unbounded discovery, ensuring that we create a culture and maintain that open

inquiry, and are able to challenge assumptions in the work that we do.

We also articulated some of the core principles for the global engagement across our diverse community. At its core, of course, it is the collaboration — both here and with local partners across borders — committed to impactful solutions for some of the world's most pressing challenges. This is done with substantive cultural literacy, experiential learning as a way to engage responsibly with real-world communities, and a commitment to bringing together diverse perspectives to inform how we design teams and programs. Reflection and growth are key attributes to the work that we do around the world, including self-assessment as well as engagement with local partners, connecting knowledge to action as part of the value we're bringing, but very much in a context and culturally aware mechanism, challenging the norms and then, of course, purposeful curiosity.

As we talked about, we did take on this idea of strategic priorities in recognizing both in terms of where we are as a university, and in terms of rapid changes in the world, that the strategy acknowledges the need to have focused and coordinated approaches. And what's clear is that we need coordinated, non-centralized approaches in order to enable both more effective and more efficient program design and implementation. As I highlighted, we do expect a broad range of global activities to continue to thrive. The intent of trying to identify some strategic priorities is not to diminish the work that's happening here. Again, this is to guide our future. As we mentioned, this is a highly dynamic process that will continue to evolve over time. We identified in this report three thematic priority areas that we have talked about — health, climate and sustainable economic

development — to align to the strategic priorities of the university, as opposed to an open reflection of what we might do from scratch. I mentioned the approach to geographies. And some of this was to think about ways in which we could move from either a hub-and-spoke of engagement with partners, or a bidirectional approach, where in many cases we were working with different partners in similar locations without the benefit of bringing that together into more of a networked, regional model, as opposed to the bilateral engagement. Third, thinking about the value of our campus partnerships, as well as the tremendous relationships that the Duke Global Health Institute over decades has created in ways to learn from and navigate the world, and to help support more broadly, our research and education activities. Fourth, anchoring in partnership with our global network of alumni and ensuring that we are engaged broadly through alumni engagement and development around opportunities for philanthropy, and stronger engagement of our alumni as a key aspect of both engagement and sustainability. As Alec mentioned, we have seen this as a starting point. We've continued to refine it based on early feedback, including helpful feedback from some of our faculty in Humanities, Arts and Interpretive Social Sciences. As Alec also mentioned, that led to a dinner conversation, but also an ongoing series of conversations with our faculty in those areas. We intend to continue it over the coming months to take on some of the critical challenges in thinking about important topics. For example, what should the future of area studies be for a university at a time when Title VI funding has gone away, at a time when many of our peers are shifting their models to move away from those types of centers? So, really to be much more forward looking in trying to identify

where we can help to design the next generation of solutions.

The strategy is called both the world at Duke and Duke in the world. This is about bringing the best of the world to Duke and the best of Duke to the world. We recognize that part of our global engagement is about the world at Duke, which includes everything from making sure we're bringing diverse global voices and partners to Duke, to supporting them through our education and research missions, and ensuring global content is available here on campus. We are adapting the lessons from all of our global engagements to ensure that we're actually better at the work we're doing, both locally and through other partnerships, and then ensuring that we're appropriately supporting our international students, staff and faculty here as part of our Duke community.

When we thought about what is going to continue to make us successful and how we define this going forward, we wanted to think about domains but also recognize that there's a very broad set of activities which happen across the university, not to get down to the level of specific metrics that might apply to everyone. So, anchoring this is the value created for our mission. How are we advancing research and education from our ability to engage globally? Second, are we thinking about our global engagements as opportunities for innovation and impact? Are we thinking about the educational program design and the development of research questions that we can answer globally, so that we can learn from them and adapt for our own reciprocal learning? Are we thinking about translating our insights into impact in people's lives? Third, how is our approach to partnerships and engagement evolving over time? Are we demonstrating principles of respectful partnership in the ways that we're engaging

around the world? Are we finding stronger opportunities to bring together more parts of Duke University, across our community to work in concert in our global activities? Then fourth, are we ensuring that we are building for sustainability and creating the right levels of support? For sustainability, are we thinking about ensuring that we are designing programs and evolving programs for them to be sustainable over time? In terms of support, are we ensuring not just the financial support, but also the ability of adapting our administrative infrastructure to ensure that we're supporting as much as possible the work that's happening around the world?

Now, we've spent the last few months thinking about how we take these core principles of global engagement and translate those into an operational plan to move us forward. I'm going to ask Dave and Valerie to come up and take that on, and then very soon, we're going to stop talking and make sure we're in the listening mode.

David Bowersox (Vice Provost for Finance and Administration): Hi, everybody. It's going to take a minute to talk a little bit about the structure that we're putting in place — some of which is there, some of which we're building as we talk now. This is about intending to engage our faculty to help set our global direction and, at the same time, provide ongoing input around opportunities to improve our processes and remove barriers to success. One thing that's important to note is that what's not shown here is the most important piece. (refers to slide) And that is the global programs themselves. So, they remain where they should be, decentralized, with our schools, with our institutes or centers, and the faculty themselves. You all do this work. It's also important to point out that we intended for this structure to be fairly lean.

And I won't say "lean nice," but lean and streamlined. This is the support of our strategic realignment initiatives at Duke.

What the slide depicts here is, first, the Global Priorities Committee. Krishna has talked a bit about it. This is a faculty-led group that is intended to engage members of the Duke global community, to identify opportunities we have, to evaluate proposals and to advance university's global vision. Also, this faculty-led team is there to advise the Provost on strategy related to our global ambitions. Next comes the Global Strategy and Innovation Team. This team serves as global ambassadors for Duke and has a big focus on building partnerships on innovations and on global fundraising. It's a team that reports now to Krishna, the Chief Global Strategist. Finally, we come to the Global Program Support Team, and it's led by Valerie Hausman. Here, we are making some additional fundamental shifts. What we learned from our feedback is that the support for advancing global initiatives and our evaluation of risk is highly decentralized. It doesn't have enough academic coordination to it. It's complex just by the nature. It's not unusual when helping a faculty member or a program in the global space to have to encounter a need to overcome and work through issues related to specialized grant management, legal and tax advice, support for visas, travel safety, export controls, risk management. The list could go on and on. Our current processes are fragmented in terms of navigating all these issues, so the result tends to be that a system which is not really nimble can slow us down. With that, no pressure, Valerie is going to address all those things and talk about it.

Valerie Hausman (Associate Vice Provost for Global Administration): I have been at Duke for 20 years, the past seven of which

I've been focused on DKU (Duke Kunshan University). Before that, I worked at Fuqua School of Business. It was around when Blair Sheppard (Former Dean of Fuqua School of Business) was here. And we were thinking about the global strategy.

I want to talk about the remit for this Global Program Support unit, or GPS, as we've been calling it. In the course of the work with GPC, we've been referring to it as the front door to Duke. I think of the intention as a single point of entry, as you all try to navigate systems at Duke related to global engagement. It could be an engagement that's already up and running. We have, for example, lots of work in Africa. We've been hearing a lot of questions like: Is it hard to pay vendors? Should we have a separate legal entity structure? Things like that. But we also understand that you will, over time, have new potentially complex multi-disciplinary initiatives that need a lot of attention. And it's very hard. I can come up with at least 20 different areas or departments at Duke that touch global work. So, the idea is that you come in through this Global Program Support unit, and we essentially help you navigate. The intention is not to hand you off to another department, hand you off to legal, export control, or something like that. The intention is to help you get through the process and reach whatever the end point you're trying to achieve. I think it's important for me to say that this Global Program Support unit will work on both new and existing initiatives. There's a lot already happening. And we want to recognize that. We want to make life easier for those of you who are already engaged in that work or have something that is new. When I think of something complex, I think of initiatives that potentially cross schools, programs, and disciplinary areas — where you need to come together around a proposal that might go to the GPC and need

evaluation and discussion there. This office will help you with that. It will partner with you to make sure that the proposal is robust enough so that the discussion in GPC is effective.

A few specifics of our portfolio in this Global Programs Office, which Dave alluded to, include providing analysis and risk assessment for the global work. I want to note that I know over the years, many people feel that Duke has been extremely risk averse as we've looked at global engagement. What I don't want this unit to be is a place where good ideas and entrepreneurial things go to die. That's absolutely not the intention. But we do expect to stand up what I'll call the Global Operations Committee. It will be a cross functional committee that will have representatives from all of the relevant areas at Duke, some of which are legal, tax, finance, potentially government relations. But I think the difference here, as we move forward, is that we do want to partner with faculty early on. I can tell you from my time at Duke, that sometimes things get lost in translation. We don't always have faculty at the table when we're discussing risk, and that can be very frustrating. So, the goal is to partner on the academic side as well as the administrative side.

We will also be involved in helping you with international agreements and MoUs (Memoranda of Understanding). You can think of that in two ways. One, this office will be a repository for those agreements. But also, as you're thinking about developing new agreements, we will partner with you to make sure that it gets the appropriate level of review, whether in legal or in other areas. We will help you bring it to the point of signature and make sure you're getting to where you need to be. We'll also be looking at agreements that have been

in place for some time and may be coming up for renewal, and you may need some help going through that process as well.

We will be managing funding opportunities. There's more to come on that. The GPC, as a committee, will be looking closely at our priorities, looking at the pool of funds we have available, and hopefully taking a perhaps somewhat more intentional approach to the way we do calls for proposals and the way we allocate funds. Certainly, we want to honor agreements that have been made thus far. That's important to say.

We will be tracking and reporting Duke's global activity. That's not just so that we know what we're doing and where, but also to measure the impact and the financial investment. Are we accomplishing what we set out to? It may help us identify gaps and opportunities moving forward. Finally, communication is incredibly important for this whole global organization. We're already working on the communication strategy. So, in addition to launching a new portal and website, we hope to have an editorial plan in place which enables us to tell stories about all of the good work that's been happening for decades, as well as the new work going forward. I'm sure there'll be other things that find their way into the portfolio here. But my message is that the intent is to make life easier. We have the global@duke.edu email. I certainly invite you all to write to me directly, and we will do our best to help you get through it. With that, I will turn it over to Krishna.

Udayakumar: Just to give you a sense of where we're headed, you already heard about how we're trying to operationalize the organization and the team. We're going to continue the engagement through many channels, so that when faculty, staff and

students identify additional opportunities and needs, we can try to be responsive to the coordination of leaders of global programs across the university, and to make sure that there is strong coordination and communication there. We're going to continue to invest in global initiatives, but what we have started to do is to try to understand where all of these investments were being made and not cut any of them off by any means, but rather to bring them with transparency to the Global Priorities Committee, so that we have a faculty-led committee that will help to determine what the priorities should be for where these investments are going. Similarly for GPC, we're in the process of developing criteria processes so that the committee can review proposals and programs that have global engagements. You heard about the Operations Committee. Even though it's not formally up and running, we're already trying to problem solve in real time by bringing people together. As you've heard from Valerie, we also have this global@duke.edu as a starting point. Please reach out to Valerie or any of us. Let me stop here and we look forward to the feedback.

Steffen Bass (Physics): I like all the things that you laid out. But what I want to implore of you, of course, is to not forget the small stuff, because the small stuff is what really touches most of the faculty. Every time when a Duke professor travels overseas to give a talk, to work with a collaborator, that is global engagement, right? The best way you can support that is having an office that helps faculty renew their passports, get the required visas, educate us about export controls. There is a whole list of Chinese universities that I probably shouldn't have ever entered to give talks, because it would get me and Duke into a whole lot of trouble. But most of us don't know about these

things. There was a time this fall when Duke Visa Support was nonexistent. I hope that by now it's resurrected. But don't forget about it. Please also add an informational component which is easy for us to access, which teaches us about export controls and all these things, because that's where the rubber hits the road.

Udayakumar: I completely agree. I think at its core, there is a strong recognition that entrepreneurial ideas and activity of our faculty are the drivers of the global engagement without a doubt. There's no intent to say that there's some top-down strategy. It's really about how we empower and support them in ways that, as Valerie said, make life easier to Duke Global and give pathways to try to create sustainability for them.

Cam Harvey (Fuqua School of Business): This question might be more directed to Vince (Price, President) and Alec. It is a simple question. Can we afford to do this? We have gone through cost cutting. We are going through strategic realignment. Maybe this is an example of part of the strategic realignment. And indeed, at least for me, my idea of a global vision is to do things that help us maintain or enhance our reputation as a great research university. So, that always needs to be in the back of our mind. There are other universities that are taking different strategies. Vanderbilt University is in the news. They have a local strategy — campuses in New York, San Francisco, and the strategically important metropolis of Palm Beach. (laughter) So again, choices need to be made. I am repeating myself from my previous question. Given that our resources are limited, are these allocations to global initiative the best allocation of the resources to achieve our goals?

Udayakumar: I certainly welcome input from others here. My thinking on this, for what it's worth personally, is quite different from saying we're going to invest all this money. In fact, the opportunity we have in front of us is around creativity. We're at an inflection point where we have to do more with less. The work that I've been doing in health innovation for 20 years is about studying how people do more with less. And part of what's interesting here is not, "Let's invest more money globally and in programs," but rather how we think about what success and impact look like and think about more creative and resourceful ways to get there. So, you didn't hear me up here say, "Let's build more campuses."

Jocelyn Olcott (History): Decentralization, to me, is a feature and not a bug. I know you keep saying this isn't top-down, but you've articulated some strategic priorities that obviously create exclusions. Presumably, that's where funding resources will be directed. Duke historically, as you said, is a place that a lot of this stuff has come from the faculty, and that's been part of its dynamism. As we hire a new faculty or a faculty's research objectives or agendas shift, that's where we start to direct resources, and that has allowed for a lot of vibrant research and teaching. I don't see what's gained by what does look like a quite top-down approach. I think that having this be accompanied by gutting some of the Latin American Studies, as you know, which was really gutted, turns out to be a mistake, because we just intervened in Venezuela. It's not a great time to be cutting back on Latin American Studies, also cutting back on the East European librarian, possibly of strategic importance right now, as well as the Middle Eastern Studies librarian. So, it seems like we're cutting in the places that research would be happening in favor of a strategy. It does feel like that it's coming from the top.

If the process is going to come from the top, it's important to know how you came to that agenda. I hear you saying that it's faculty-led. There're wonderful faculty on the Global Priorities Committee. I will say that a person from History who works on the United States, a fabulous colleague, is not the person of a very international faculty I would pick to do that. It seems like if this is how you're going to approach it, which is going to be very top-down, you need to be quite attentive to how you're incorporating input into that strategy.

Udayakumar: Thanks very much for the input. The intent is not to be top-down. It's how we operationalize this and how we make sure that we are making life easier for all of us who work internationally. I certainly understand that some of the strategic realignment things were underway. There's some unfortunate timing. And that was disconnected from the work we've been doing on this global strategy. But what we've tried to put in place reflects that we're in a different place than we were a year or six months ago.

Patrick Halpin (Nicholas School of the Environment): This is more of a plea than a question. When we're dealing with global priorities, I would appreciate if we did take into consideration about things that are not national. Duke has a huge footprint in the global oceans research, and the oceans are 70% of the planet. But almost all the surveys and things we get ask, "What country do you work in?" I don't have anywhere to check the box, seriously. (laughter) It is a huge oversight. We have a huge impact, but literally everything is focused on what countries you're working with, or what international relationship you have. Many of us work on things that are truly global, and they ought to be part of the global priority. Thank you.

Udayakumar: Absolutely, there's fabulous work happening in the Marine Lab and in some of the things that we've been already engaged in. Think about the global impact around things like the coastal resilience, which certainly is a massive issue in different geographies. But I totally agree. I think we need to find ways that are not boxes of countries to check in terms of where we work.

Engelstein: I work transnationally and comparatively across Europe, in spite of the German home. When I read the document, I kept coming back to the question — what does “global” mean in this document? Does it mean anything that's not American? Is it any individual thing that happens outside the country? Or is it something global, something that has to do with networks across wider spaces? I was also trying to figure out how this new organization would intersect with the things which you said can keep existing in a non-centralized way. Everything that every one of my colleagues does is international. It's not clear to me whether there's any connection here. Also, I wasn't sure about educational initiatives, for example Duke in Berlin (Program) through GEO (Duke's Global Education Office). Is there some connection there? How do you intersect with all of the things that are going on and are international — I'm just going to call them “international,” because that's a word that I understand — which will presumably continue going on.

Bowersox: It's a great question. As far as GEO and students, we think about GEO as a program, just like research programs are programs and others are programs. GEO is going to continue to operate and do great things. We see the officers or the GPS there as an enabling function — a support office. Particularly, if you're a faculty member and

you work in an area where you're self-sufficient pretty much, you don't need that service. I'd love to hear from you, but you don't need to come to us. It's kind of like that. But on the other hand, some do work in areas that need assistance and have to come in and navigate other things. That's also what we're there for.

Neal: If there are no more questions, thank you for responding and presenting. We are adjourned.