



**Minutes of the Academic Council Meeting
Thursday, February 19, 2026**

Mark Anthony Neal (Chair, Academic Council): Good afternoon, everyone, on this warm and overcast February afternoon. Thank you for being here for this ongoing ritual of Academic Council and shared governance.

I'd like to begin by announcing the death of **Arthur "AB" Cole**. Arthur M. Cole, one of the early Black students to attend Duke (the 6th class) died earlier this month. AB, as he was known, like many of his Black classmates, recognized that the University could do a significantly better job at embracing and including its Black students into campus culture as well as ridding that same culture of demeaning insults and marginalized treatment. Out of this environment – and after earlier Black students had no success in negotiating major changes to the way Black students were treated – AB decided to participate in a crucial event in the University's history on February 13, 1969, known as the "Allen Building Takeover." The University's response was to call in the police and National Guard that day and put the students on trial. Because of a brilliant legal team and strategy, which had most of the Black students turn themselves in as participants whether they were in the building or not, the students averted expulsion and were all placed on academic suspension. Most, like AB, went on to graduate, get advanced

degrees from major universities and make huge contributions to American society. At the 50th anniversary of the Takeover in 2019, which AB attended, President Price, summed up the legacy of this significant event in the following way:

"The occupation of the Allen Building was one of the most pivotal moments in our university's history, a moment that would not have been possible without your courage and conviction and your willingness to stand up for what was right. In the actions that you took, you forever shifted our sails toward the prevailing winds of justice and equality – Thank you."

A letter was sent to his family, from me, in my role as Chair of the Academic Council, extending our deepest condolences on behalf of the faculty.

***APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 15
MEETING MINUTES***

Next, the approval of the January 15 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]

Before we go further, I want to take a moment to introduce my colleagues again, from the Executive Council of the Academic Council – ECAC, who I lovingly refer to as the “Gang of Eight.” Please stand when I call your name: **Harvey Cohen** from the School of Medicine, **Terry Oas** from the School of Medicine – Basic Sciences, **Mallory SoRelle** from the Sanford School of Public Policy, **Andrew Foster** from the Law School, **Victoria Szabo** from Humanities, **Claudia Gunsch** from the Pratt School of Engineering, and **Grainne Fitzsimons** who is the Vice Chair of ECAC, and was unable to be with us today because of an illness. ECAC meets weekly for two hours, August through May and over the summer as matters required, which was the case for this past year. And we have regular meetings with senior leadership throughout our normal meeting schedule.

ANONYMOUS QUESTION

ECAC received an anonymous question over the weekend after the agenda for today had been finalized, which is why it's not included on the agenda. The question is:

“On Friday, January 30th Duke University and Duke University Health System activated the severe weather and emergency conditions policy from midnight Friday, Jan. 30 through midnight Sunday, February 1st. This policy was then extended until the midnight of Monday, February 2nd. As a consequence, all in-person classes on Monday, February 2nd were canceled. Yet, on February 1st at 12:00 p.m. Duke's Women Basketball team played a game against Wake Forest at the Cameron Indoor Stadium. Could you offer some clarification about the decision to allow some events on campus but cancel others during the severe weather and emergency conditions policy? What message do we send to students when

we allow them to attend sport events but not classes?”

That question was initially directed to Provost Alec Gallimore, but it is probably more correctly directed to Executive Vice President Daniel Ennis.

Daniel Ennis (Executive Vice President):

Thanks for this question. This is a good opportunity to do a little bit of scene setting on the severe weather process and what's involved, because it is a very complicated endeavor across our research, teaching and clinical missions and our athletic program. John Dailey is the Associate Vice President for Public Safety and Chief of Police. He is responsible for incident command for the university. When we have a severe weather event, he is the person worrying all the details with Facilities, with Mohamed (Noor, Executive Vice Provost) thinking about the Academic Mission, with folks in Athletics, etc. He does a tremendous job. We are very fortunate for the skill he brings to that task. One thing I want to say about John – and this is an area we've been spending a lot of time on – is campus safety. He stood up incident command here in response to the shooting at Brown University. We have spent a lot of time on that topic, and he has done a terrific job making sure we are responsive to what we were learning from that horrific event, and hopefully you've seen some of the steps we've taken. That's a topic for another day, as it may be helpful to you all. John, thanks for being here.

John Dailey (Associate Vice President for Public Safety and Chief of Police):

I appreciate the opportunity. It's been my dream since I was six to come talk to the Academic Council. (laughter) This is also my favorite subject. What about the severe weather policy? It is really about you. It is

about, "Can we get you from your house, on the roads, into a parking lot, down the sidewalk, and to your classroom safely?" That's what we're thinking about. We're doing that within the context of being in a southern city that doesn't handle these things as well as some other cities might. When I get the crisis leadership team together, they're snickering at me, rolling their eyes, because we're supposed to get an inch and a half of snow and we're in the crisis mode. I know that you all coming from Syracuse or wherever, are rolling your eyes about this and laughing about our plans and how much planning we do for this. But it's 30 degrees warmer here right now than it is in Syracuse, so I'm actually laughing. (laughter)

But just so you have a level of comfort, there's a lot of planning and a lot of work that you don't see before a severe weather event. There are about 100 people who get on a call a couple of days beforehand, so everyone knows what to do. It's a matter of making sure that we all know what each other is doing, whether that's putting brine on the campus roads, or on the residential campus walkways, making sure there's extra food in the dining halls, or making sure the power systems are ready to go in case there's going to be ice.

A couple of years ago, we made some improvements to make sure that our residential students have recreation centers open during severe weather and that the libraries have study spaces open. For basketball, occasionally, what happens is that there is a basketball game when we have severe weather. It's the rule of the ACC (Atlantic Coast Conference) that if the officials and the teams can arrive, the basketball game should be held, whether or not the fans are there. So, we work with Athletics to decide the nature of the game. Is it better that students have a venue to go to,

as opposed to being bored and having a 1/5 of Jack or something like that? Quite frankly, having a healthy way to spend their time is a very helpful thing. Athletics is good about working with the fans who can't attend a game. They give them gift credits for not using the tickets, or try to help them get to another game, or something like that. As a side note, I don't know who was here in 2014 for the Duke vs. Carolina men's game at Carolina. Due to a big snowstorm, the game was canceled three hours before tipoff, because the Duke team physically couldn't get from Durham to Chapel Hill. There were a number of Duke folks who were already there. They had a terrible time getting there. They were waiting for the game three hours before and it was canceled. So, we're trying to avoid those types of situations, obviously. It is good to have an event for the students and it's not that easy.

I try to talk to a number of people and gather recommendations for the crisis leadership team. That includes Daniel, Alec, Mohamed, the Vice Presidents for Student Affairs, Human Resources, Marketing and Communications, Counsel's Office – Kim (Taylor), Maggie (Epps) from the President's Office, Tom Owens from the Health System. I'm building a recommendation to them, and they make the final decision. The first piece of information is from the National Weather Service. They brief first responders two or three times a day for multiple days leading up to many major events. That's where we get our information. The local news is on that. It's funny, because after we get out of a briefing, I will see one of our local news pick the precipitation amount that only has a 10% chance of occurring, and that's the story they lead with. It is remarkable. They are really being careful about that, so we get good information. We build what we think is a reasonable closure schedule for severe

weather. Then Mohamed (Noor) talks to most, if not all, of the deans to run the idea by them and get their thoughts to see if there are any issues with it. That's an important piece of the decision process. We also talk to the Health System which obviously has a different mission, but it's nice if we can get a consistent message together. We talk to UNC and NC State to see what they're thinking. We want to know what the city roads are looking like or what might look like. Finally, we talk to Facilities, because we have to understand how quickly they think they can get the campus cleared. Is this an event that starts with sleet and then snow? Is it all snow? Is it snow, then ice? All that matters. It gives us an idea of how quickly it's going to be before they clear the campus. The final thing we do is we try to pick a time – you may have noticed most recently – which maximizes the education time, because your colleague Professor Aaron Dinin (Innovation and Entrepreneurship)'s video last year said we canceled classes halfway through a class, and he wanted to see how many students came, even though it was only going to be 15 minutes. So, working with Mohamed, we figured out 11:30AM is a good time to start classes, if we're going to delay. We also try to work with departments. For example, one of the snow days during the second weekend was the Weekend Executive MBA Program. Of course, that continued because everyone was there. It was just an easy thing to do. So again, I know this is probably more than you wanted to know, but the big thing I want you to get out of this is that there's a process. There's a recommendation. The leadership team makes the decision. And it really is about getting all of you and our students around this campus safely.

Neal: Any questions or clarifications? We received a second anonymous question, which is really a series of bullet points,

asking about our colleague, Dan Ariely (Fuqua School of Business). As this is an ongoing personnel issue and was a topic of the February 15, 2024 Academic Council meeting (minutes are available on the Academic Council website if anyone wishes to read), we will not be addressing that matter today.

CONVERSATION ABOUT THE STATE OF FACULTY GOVERNANCE AT DUKE

I'll now invite the Chair of the Arts & Sciences Council, Professor Denise Comer, and also a faculty member in the Thompson Writing Program, and Don Taylor, previous Chair of the Academic Council (2017-19) and also a faculty member in the Sanford School of Public Policy, down to the front to begin the conversation for our last agenda item: **The State of Faculty Governance at Duke**. As Council members know, we asked for advance questions for today's conversation, and you should see those received on a handout at your seat.

Welcome, Don and Denise. Don, do you feel any vibes about being back at the front of the room, especially since the last time you were at the front of the room? That was when you were the Chair of the Academic Council. (laughter)

Don Taylor (Chair of the Academic Council 2017-19 / Sanford School of Public Policy): That's all right.

Neal: We won't revisit that. I contacted Don and Denise about two and a half weeks ago for this conversation. I think it would be useful, obviously, to have a broad conversation about shared governance. Don, because of his service in 2017-19 and being far away from the process, he doesn't have the same skin in the game at this point in time. Denise is someone who is actively

doing shared governance, leading the Arts & Sciences Council. I want to start before we get to these questions, for the two of you to think about and share with your colleagues what you imagine is an ideal relationship between faculty and leadership in the context of shared governance?

Denise Comer (Chair of the Arts & Sciences Council / Thompson Writing Program): Thank you for inviting me. It's nice to be here. We have had several conversations in the Arts & Sciences Council about shared governance. And Mark Anthony Neal, you came. Daniel Ennis has come on occasion. I'm happy that this conversation is happening, and I'm happy that these questions were submitted that we can talk about. I'm not sure I have a perfect model, but I'm going to say it would be something that should be developed collectively by the shared governance bodies with consultation and representation in the spirit of shared governance. The key elements would be reflection on what's working well, recognizing when pressure points or tensions occur, being willing to talk candidly about those, understanding each other and understanding where different groups' or individuals' values, expectations, or perspectives are coming from. Those would be the key values in the model.

Taylor: The most important thing is a shared understanding of reality, both in terms of what governance means. I can have really good governance in my mind, and the President or the Provost could do something that I don't like, or I think is wrong. However, it's not my job to decide. They're the President and the Provost. We, faculty, need to make sure we are focusing on the process. I've been hearing from a lot of colleagues saying we need to refresh our system. Sometimes there'll be things faculty,

or at least some of the faculty, won't support. And that's okay. We're still colleagues, and we're all still trying to make Duke the best Duke that can be. We should have that kind of shared understanding of both reality and goal, and that's what we need to get to.

Neal: Let's jump into the first question:

"I wonder if we might consider a faculty budget committee at the university level. I know ECAC serves in that capacity now [Chair Neal added: which is not actually true], but it seems there is a lot on ECAC's plate already. Having a dedicated faculty budget committee that advises on budget implications/priorities for teaching and research may highlight shared governance in that area. The Trinity committee that Denise (Comer) has set up may be a good model to discuss."

Taylor: It's a very reasonable idea to consider a university-wide budget committee. If we're going to add new committees, I would suggest thinking about some committees we could do away with, rather than continuing to add more and more committees. Denise and I were talking about how hard it is to get people to serve on committees. But I would say the University Priorities Committee (UPC), it's my understanding that is where you're trying to take the finances of big Duke, meaning all ten schools and the Health System, and align them with the academic priorities of an R1 University with the Health System. And are they aligned? But the discussion at that level is so high. Maybe it's time to have a more focused budget committee that just focuses on the ten schools and can focus on not only relationships between schools, but within schools. I would say if we did that, I personally would prefer Daniel remain involved, because UPC is now a Presidential

committee and Daniel convenes it. If we move to a university-only budget committee, I still think faculty would be better off hearing from and learning from Daniel, the EVP.

Neal: With some clarity about UPC, it's chaired by a faculty member – Veronica Root Martinez (Law School). There are several faculty members who are on that committee, who are assigned and nominated for that committee through ECAC. So, it's not as if there's no faculty input on the university budget process.

Comer: I appreciate that my name is in this question, but I don't want to take credit for it. It was in the bylaws of the Arts & Sciences Council prior to when I became the chair. It had been a defunct committee for a while. In the spring, prior to when I became the chair, it was decided in the Council to reconstitute that committee. So, I just kind of did what I was supposed to do with reconstituting it. This is the first year that it has been convened, and Steve Vaisey (Sociology) is the chair of it. He's doing an excellent job. Kate Henzis (Vice Dean of Finance & Administration, Trinity College of Arts & Sciences) and Gary Bennett (Dean of Trinity College of Arts & Sciences) serve as ex officio members on it. We've been having great conversations. I'm learning an entire new landscape and vocabulary coming from the Humanities perspective. I'm not familiar with a lot of the terms. As all Arts & Sciences Council committees do, the committee will have an annual report at the end of the year and is also giving a presentation about that in May. It's an advisory committee, so we can advise Kate and Gary on things. But they still get to make decisions. They're also working with big Duke for other decisions. I wouldn't want people to think it's like a magic solution for everything and all the problems.

It's something that needs to be carefully thought about and actively reflected on in terms of process.

Taylor: If I could do one thing for the budget understanding of faculty, it would be to normalize everyone's understanding. When I chaired the UPC, we called it the ribbon chart. It's the breakdown of revenue for all ten schools. It shows you that the revenue of the School of Medicine is more than a billion dollars and is heavily dependent on research grants. Arts & Sciences is about half of that. Sanford School of Public Policy is ten times smaller than Arts & Sciences, but we are massively dependent on tuition. So right away, you can quickly say, "The School of Medicine is really big. Even though tuition for medical school is very expensive, they are not that dependent on tuition because of how big the amount of research is." I wish all of us had that burned into something we saw all the time. I would love to normalize the ribbon chart being known and seen by everyone. I've never seen it publicly. I don't think it's that surprising, but it is so useful to see all schools and just to say, "Look how different the schools are in terms of where the revenue comes from."

Neal: That's why it's often difficult to talk about a composite number in terms of the university's wealth, because every school does not have access to that same wealth. You mentioned the School of Medicine. We know that Trinity has been underwater for a generation. It's one example of that.

The next question:

"The adoption of ChatGPT and AI in general seems to be happening without any public faculty leadership. Decisions appear to be made among a closed circle of administrators. This should be a place

where faculty governance has a clear and decisive role. What is the Academic Council and Trinity Arts & Sciences Council, among other units, doing to ensure faculty governance in AI adoption going forward? This would include what companies Duke signs licenses with, how much is paid, and what due diligence Duke is conducting on those companies' human rights behavior, labor practices, data and surveillance policies, climate impact, etc.”

Taylor: I wasn't in any kind of role when this happened. I was on sabbatical.

Neal: This is proof that we did not vet the submitted questions. (laughter) Provost Gallimore, please feel free to weigh in on this at any moment. Our understanding from ECAC is that there are, in fact, four different faculty-led committees that are exploring the impact of AI on campus. You will hear their report in the Academic Council meeting when the report is done. I know from my ECAC colleague Victoria Szabo, that they are turning in their reports tomorrow. Provost Gallimore will have a conversation with ECAC about the findings and will also share that with the full Council and the larger university.

Taylor: I think everybody realizes that if you use a model, it's changing so rapidly. It's difficult to understand what to think about it or make of it.

Comer: I'm glad to hear that there are committees thinking about this and doing reports and forward movement on this. Provost Gallimore, when you visited, Arts & Sciences Council collected questions in advance and posted them. And that question was among them. So, I'd encourage you to look at the minutes to see Provost Gallimore's response from that. I won't try to paraphrase it. We had a student panel at the

Arts & Sciences Council this past fall of undergraduates talking about their experiences with teaching and learning with Generative AI. And I'm in the process of setting up a panel for May with several key leaders across Duke who are either leading initiatives or involved in Generative AI activities. This will be news to some of those who I've already talked to, but I haven't laid out the structure yet. But one of the questions I'm asking them to think through in advance is: What should the Arts & Sciences Council be considering over the next few years? Where are the opportunities for intersection? Because, as Don said, sometimes it's hard to imagine, but hopefully these people who are working in that can offer some threads, as this question did too.

Neal: Next question:

“At public universities like UNC – governed by state open meetings laws – it is possible for faculty, the media, and the public to attend the meetings of almost any faculty governance body.

Although Duke is not subject to the same legal requirements, would faculty governance and administrative leadership here be willing to open a broader array of governance committee meetings, including the Executive Committee of the Academic Council, to faculty (and possibly media) attendance? This would help faculty and the Duke community understand how our faculty representatives are engaged in current campus decision-making.”

Don, you're a former Chair of ECAC. There are at least two other former chairs – Kerry Haynie (Political Science & African and African American Studies) and Trina Jones (Law School), who can feel free to weigh in on this question.

Taylor: I think they actually do it on signal at UNC for what it's worth. (laughter) I'm a three-time graduate, so I can say stuff about my folks. Being in leadership has a lot of access to power, powerful people and information, so I don't think that gives me blind spots. But blind spots are blind, right? It's a very reasonable idea for ECAC to try to do a better job, or more jobs, of talking with faculty and hearing from faculty. But having an ECAC meeting with somebody from The Assembly or The News and Observer there, nobody's actually going to say anything. I was on a negotiated rulemaking committee that was created by the Affordable Care Act. The meetings were ruthless and open, and all the deals were cut in the bathroom -- that's how that works. So, when it is completely open, you're not going to get people to be open about things. For example, if President Price or Provost Gallimore comes, that's what this is. I assume the Chronicle is here -- this is a version of that. I just don't think there's going to be the kind of give-and-take feedback that's useful. Just by hearing me, you could say, "You would have thought that because you had power." That's my answer.

Neal: We talked about this question yesterday. There are a couple of things. I'd like to begin by affirming my colleagues on ECAC that this is not fun. You are giving up eight hours of physical time a month in the service of the university and shared governance, but that's just a small part of the time we contribute. The reality is that we have access to privileged and confidential information, which is the purpose of having this go between the larger Council and a smaller board. We could have conversations about what it would mean to enlarge the board. What would the board look like with 12 folks? Folks from every school? You'd be

surprised how unlovely it can get when eight people are in the room. The beauty of the process is that we're not all coming from a place of consensus. We all think very differently in response to the schools we're coming from, our own sense of what the university should or should not be doing. I think my favorite time at ECAC was when we weren't even ECAC colleagues, I had just been sitting in for the last three months. I always got a shout-out to Cam Harvey (Fuqua School of Business), who is always going to be on the left side of something in a conversation at ECAC. And there's some value to that. From an administrative standpoint, that idea -- and this is the most important thing -- is reinforced over and over again, particularly for new ECAC members. I was fortunate and had served on ECAC before I became the Chair of ECAC. But in order for this to move, there has to be some level of trust in which the administration can feel comfortable to share privileged in some cases and confidential information with us, so that we can serve as feedback to them. Not everything that we discuss in ECAC comes to the Academic Council because it doesn't work. It shouldn't happen in that context, because not everything needs to be broadly discussed. Should the larger Council hold ECAC accountable in terms of communication? Clearly. I think one of the things that we discussed is something to think about going forward. The Board of Trustees do not share the minutes of their meetings with ECAC, but they give us a summary which at least gives us a sense of what might have been talked about without necessarily knowing who and what the details were. It might be useful, going forward, even in my opening chair remarks, to just comment on some of the things that we might have talked about during the course of a semester or a course of a month between Academic Council meetings. We could probably do a better job. All of this

comes from the conversation we had with ECAC yesterday. We could do a better job of orientating particularly new Academic Council members to what the full range of our impact is. Like the question earlier about finances, many faculty don't know what UPC is. That's one example. It would be helpful to give an orientation about the role of UPC; the Academic Programs Committee, which is APC, which governs what we do academically; the role of Global Priorities Committee (GPC), which has gone away for years and is now up and running again. Those are just three examples. We surely could do a better job in communicating some of those concerns.

Kerry Haynie (Political Science & African and African American Studies):

In my experience, the time you put in ECAC is not just the time you put in. You become experts. You get detailed knowledge, and that's important to help faculty members think about some things quite a bit. That's part of your goal in representing the larger faculty, which is to spend some time learning about the issues and some details. So, when leadership comes, you can have an informed conversation. You probably can't do that in a larger context. I remember that there were several times that Vince would call me. It wasn't completely required, but he wanted faculty to be in the loop. As the representative of the faculty, there were things he wanted me to know. There were things that he would not share widely, but he wanted some faculty to know. Sometimes I would take the information to ECAC. Sometimes we disagreed. We kept it private. But there was a faculty member in the loop. I like that system. I know that such sharing doesn't happen in other places. At those places there are more backroom deals than what I imagine is the case here. I feel that I was always in the loop. Some faculty members were always in the loop. It would

be good if for the more sensitive decisions that leadership has to make that we can remain in the loop.

Taylor: That's well said, and it's also well said that we should be held accountable by our Academic Council colleagues.

Neal: As a reminder, the ECAC membership is elected. If you're concerned about the quality of leadership of ECAC, you can dramatically impact that by voting in the new ECAC members that will come up for election in the next few months. The same can be said of Academic Council. Part of the challenge that we find all the time, both in terms of ECAC and the broader Academic Council – we are fortunate to have all of you in the room right now – is that not every one of our colleagues is interested in being engaged with faculty governance on this level. That's just a reality.

Josh Sosin (Classical Studies): I wanted to add to Kerry's good point about expertise. There's another thing that people can do. They can let ECAC know about their interest to serve on UPC, APC or GPC, and the innumerable other committees where you have a vantage and a view on the complexity that people have been describing here. That's when you really learn about the operations. We all collectively have a role. Ask peers who seem to have a real knack for such service, whether they are agreeable, and encourage them to submit their names to ECAC. We play a large role in this as well.

Comer: I appreciate this question, because I like to think of myself as valuing transparency, candor, honesty and authenticity. And probably many people in this room share those values too. This question, to me, seems to come from a place of frustration that it feels like big things are

happening behind this closed door and I'm not aware of it. Things that are impacting me downstream are happening behind this closed door, and I'm not hearing enough about it. I really like any creative ideas about how to increase the transparency, if we're thinking of it on a continuum. I'll also say that I am in the Thompson Writing Program and some scholar and teacher writing studies. As an example, we're having our program review next year. We're generating our self-study, which right now is a 43-page single-spaced document. You are going to have to read that at some point, Provost Gallimore. We're doing a transparent process. My hope is, by the end, everyone in my unit will be able to say, "Yes, this is a transparent process." That is the goal. But that doesn't mean I'm drafting this initial version on Google Docs with everyone watching and commenting on it right now. In fact, I've been drafting it in private. The first draft I'm ready to share will be this Friday. Then we're going to go through rounds of revisions. There is something to be said for creating safer spaces where people can talk without worrying about being quoted in the media and frozen into a certain perspective that maybe they were just having for that moment, and we'll rethink it. That's what we want people to do which is to rethink things at another time. I think those are constraints with a completely open model.

Veronica Root Martinez (Chair of UPC / Law School): My superpower as a faculty member – and I bet a lot of people are super powering here – is that I'm good at looking at information and asking an interesting question. Imagine that you're the administrator on the other side of 12 people with that superpower, all looking at the information and all having a different question, and now open up all of the meetings. I think everybody on the UPC is

doing their very best job to represent the faculty in the very best way they can. But our meetings are stacked. We're very much taking account of the time. We're trying to not waste any of the time. But I don't know if it would be super productive if there were another 30 faculty members in the meeting. I would like to go back to what Josh said. Josh is laughing at me. He is on the UPC. If you're really interested, it's a wonderful idea of thinking about how you can participate. But 100 people can't run the store. Our faculty governance contemplates a certain level of representatives doing some of the work, to the extent that you can assume that we're doing that work in goodwill and in good faith, and we're doing our best. I do think that's what most people are doing, because none of us have to do this, and we all have other things we could be doing with our time.

Neal: Thank you, Veronica.

Jocelyn Olcott (History): I just wanted to follow up on that. I think Denise really put her finger on the sentiment that drove the question. I wonder if there is a system by which somebody could announce the major issues on the agenda and people could ask if they could submit a question. Because I think what happens is that a lot of very smart colleagues populate all these committees, but they have their own expertise. And somebody whose core research and teaching might be intensely impacted by something happening on one of these committees, isn't part of that conversation. I mentioned this in the last meeting, the number of U.S. experts who are on the GPC committee is quite striking. Maybe nobody on the committee is an expert on the question that's on the table. Could there be a little bit more proactive effort on these committees to invite people into the conversation, or at least make the

information available that those conversations are happening such that others could have their input?

Neal: That's a fair critique. I will say that it is what ECAC attempts to do. When we're presented with names from the President, the Provost and their respective committees, we will respond with names that aren't on the committees, with folks who we think have a certain kind of expertise. But the engine that makes this work is, of course, Sandra (Walton, Executive Assistant to the Academic Council). Sandra will tell you there's no shortage of folks that we ask who decline service. When you talk about UPC, the meeting is once a month, same with GPC. APC meets three weeks out of a month, and sometimes every week. We do think there should be a certain level of expertise. This is a very personal issue, at least from my advantage. And again, I'm sharing the ongoing relationships and conversations I've had over the last 20 years with Professor Haynie and Professor Trina Jones about how, when issues of race have come up on campus, previous administrations have been unwilling to reach out to those with expertise in these areas to help the university work through them. We are very cognizant of that reality.

Cam Harvey (Fuqua School of Business): You have heard this before. We need to focus on the goal, and the goal is to maintain and enhance our status as a great research university and a venue for students to grow and contribute positively to society. Governance is a means to achieve that end. We could be much more effective in governance. In corporate or nonprofit governance, it is very important to separate the two aspects. One is operational, and that is mainly handled by the administration. The other one is strategic. I think it is naive to think that faculty who are busy teaching,

doing research, should be burdened to allocate multiple dozens of hours researching operational issues at Duke. That is not efficient. What we need to do, in my opinion, is to change the balance. I am also on the UPC, and my expectation was that this would be a great assignment. It is a great assignment - but I thought the focus would be on the strategic priorities of Duke University. It is more of a budget committee – and I have been on budget committees before. So, I think we need a venue for strategic discussions. You heard me say this last year. We need a mechanism for the faculty to weigh in, to give advice to our administrators on key strategic issues. That is lacking in our current governance structure. ECAC is not that venue. ECAC has enough to manage, and I know that from experience. Can we shift the focus to make it more efficient for the faculty and focus faculty attention on giving advice on key strategic issues? At the same time, we can move some of the administrative/operational material that goes from committee to committee – the same slide deck, over and over – or perhaps present this material as an information item rather than a regular agenda item? So again, we need to step back and think about the goal and how governance can be used to achieve the goal.

Neal: Provost Alec Gallimore, we've been in ongoing conversations with your office about the Faculty Futures Committee. Would you like to share a little bit? To backtrack, this was a model that ECAC began talking about during Trina Jones's leadership, of creating a more university-wide group of faculty who would be in conversation around these strategic issues outside of ECAC and UPC.

Alec Gallimore (Provost): First of all, let me backtrack a little bit and talk about something I said at the Arts & Sciences

Council about a framework of shared governance, and how I believe we do tap into faculty. The traditional way that people think about shared governance is the various “alphabet soups” of committees. That's an important element. And I consider that to be the rose, if you will, the structured shared governance. But a very important element of the matrix of shared governance and of the insight we receive from the faculty is our academic leaders: our deans, chairs, and others. That combination or overlay of structure of shared governance through the various committees plus the academic leadership, is critical for us to have the strategic input from the faculty. I understand what Cam is saying, and I appreciate what Cam is saying. I will say though, if I look at the committees that we have on the AI Initiative, we have an enormous number of faculty members who are doing just that. They're providing guidance to us in terms of how we think about AI and so on and so forth. There's work we can do. There're improvements we can do, of course. There isn't a strategic direction that we take up at this university where we don't have significant input of faculty members, because ultimately, you're the content expertise, and it simply doesn't work otherwise. That's one thing.

What we've been talking about is the notion of the Faculty Futures Committee, which is how to think strategically, to your point, and get faculty members in the various colleges and schools to engage in that. What I've been doing is having discussions with deans about how to embrace and engage that. There are different models you can think about, but I think there is a general agreement that a lot of the structures that we have in the schools and the colleges serve a very important purpose, perhaps the operational side of things that Cam talked about. But there may be an opportunity to

think about another structure that provides a little bit more of a strategy. But there are other things that we have. We have Boards of Visitors. We have Advisory Committees and Executive Committees. So, what we have to do – and this is the last thing I'll say – is to make sure that we're not clouding out good ideas from myriad ways by creating a structure that doesn't actually serve the purpose we want.

Neal: Thank you, Provost Gallimore.

Haynie: One of the things that I learned quickly when I became the Chair of the Council is what Duke is – the ten schools. When you say doing strategic planning for big Duke, I'd like to ask the deans what they think about that, because the schools are independent bodies. We live and operate in schools. It's hard to think of strategic planning for Duke when you have ten schools, and the deans and faculty in those spaces. Don mentioned the budget difference – tuition based versus research based, and a number of things. I'm the Dean of Social Sciences in Trinity. There are more faculty in my division than in the Law School or Sanford School of Public Policy, etc. It makes Trinity a different kind of beast from other schools. It's hard to think of a structure that would allow the kind of strategic planning that Cam talked about. The schools are so different that I don't know how to imagine that kind of a structure.

Neal: Next question:

“Over the last decade or so, the size of the administration has grown significantly. I have the sense (public data aren't available to show one way or the other) that the number of faculty committees and working groups has grown in tandem. Two questions here: (1) What challenges do we face in

staffing faculty service and governance roles? (2) the Christie Rule was created in a time in which the university was a smaller beast and more work was done in fewer committees. It's no longer obvious how much substantive work (as opposed to consultation) gets done in standing committees. How well does the Christie Rule work in a Duke that is bigger, more decentralized, and graced by a larger professional administration?

[The following was not read aloud, but provided on the handout]

President Price has mentioned in the Academic Council that faculty need to more actively embrace leadership roles in our community. Faculty have expressed concern in the same venue that on any number of issues the administration has moved forward without due collaboration with faculty. It could be that both assertions are true. But it could also be that there is some dysfunction here, a shared practice in need of re-affirmation or repair. Where do you think we are?"

Taylor: I would say, Duke has a great system of faculty governance, and we need to focus and hone it, because of the budget pressures we are facing. It seems like we do need a refresh. If I was thinking of principles of how to do that, the first one to me is that you don't want to waste anyone's time. Cam, you may be sort of saying some of that. By that, I mean, we don't want to give busy work to faculty on committees. We need to think at the committee level exactly what is happening. How can we make this as important as possible? The essence of the Christie Rules is that the administration should ask faculty and chat with faculty about anything that's important to the university, which is kind of everything. In general, that has been done

pretty well. The same thing happened to me when I was the AC Chair that Vince or Sally (Kornbluth, former Provost) might call me or text me. Kerry and I have talked a lot about this – there's a big difference between being consulted and thinking that's not what I would have done, because one thing about being a chair is that you know just enough to be dangerous, but you don't have the accountability of actually making the decision. You don't have to make the final decision. It's easy to say, "If I were the Provost, I would have done this." I think this belongs here. If I'm rambling, please forgive me. Whenever we talk about DKU (Duke Kunshan University) and the faculty, we say, "Why didn't we do this ten years ago?" And Alec says, "That was two provosts ago." That is true. This is my 29th year at Duke. There's a theme that the faculty changes. What's important to faculty is research, teaching and figuring out how to acknowledge that people make decisions and then they move on, while the faculty are still here. How do we acknowledge that things have been done in the past, but not only fight over what happened? For example, I was the Chair of the Committee that issued the recommendation on DKU to this Council in 2016. If I went back and knew everything I know now, I would have probably been opposed to it. But guess what? That's all in retrospect. Now that we have it, I think we have to make it the best thing we can make. I don't know if that sounds wishy-washy. To me, it's a reality that we did our best at the time, and it was complicated. There are hard things and good things about it. I'm not sure if I've answered this question.

Neal: Denise, from your vantage in the Arts & Sciences Council, to the spirit of this question, what does robust, good, shared governance look like? What might it look

like, particularly as Duke has expanded over generations?

Comer: I have heard feedback from members of the Council and Arts & Sciences faculty expressing frustration with things that happened in the Academic Council or through committees in the Academic Council, or from the Presidential or Provostial committees. I get it. When you came and visited, Mark, you put up a slide about the percentage of representation on this Council that are faculty from Trinity. We don't have a Trinity line. We have the Social Sciences, Humanities, etc. We have a lot of representation, and we have a lot of representation on all these committees. There still seems to be a sense that, decisions are made that impact faculty's working lives in ways that they didn't expect. They didn't have a chance to know what's coming. To be fair, anybody can come to a Council meeting. Anybody can read the minutes, and the same goes for the Arts & Sciences Council. People can do that. We get emails. And we all know that we read or don't read emails depending on how busy we are or what deadlines we have that day. Sometimes we forget them. I don't think there's any effort to try to secret information necessarily, but this would be one of those areas of tension that would be worth exploring further. Could there be more cross-body communication and earlier communication? I don't know enough about the history of the Christie Rules. I know it was finalized in 1972. From what I've understood, it's been a model for many other institutions of shared governance. It probably did a great job at that time and is still doing. It's something from 1972 that's still around and has had an amazingly long life. The number two (question) about the Christie Rules could be something worth exploring. Maybe more coordination or communication could happen across the

governance bodies of the schools. I've never been the Chair of the Academic Council. I've never served on this Council. I've never been in any of the other schools other than Trinity. So, I am saying this from my own small area and vantage point.

Neal: I will be a bit facetious in thinking about how a robot structure of shared governance looks like at the university level. Every one of you is in a department. What does that look like in your department? If you're honest about what life is like in your department, if you've been a department chair ever in your life at this university, why would you expect the tension you get in that space to be any different in this space? That's not to say you don't do the work, but it also means that you have a certain kind of realistic lens about what you can actually achieve within the context. I made the mistake of being on the ECAC while I was a department chair. It was absolutely beneficial for me in the role of department chair to understand the full gravity of the university. It informed how I thought about the things I did as chair, knowing what the landscape was. But the job that I had to do and the commitments to ECAC and the Academic Council were somehow easier than those on the ground as a department chair. It's much more difficult, right? It's the conversation we've been having, particularly now, in terms of what's happening, in terms of our government. Democracy is not easy. Not everybody is invested in the same way that we would like them to be invested for the process of work. That doesn't change, simply because we're at a university where we think the values of the university would be more reflective of that engagement. Next question:

“Thank you for the opportunity to discuss faculty governance in our meeting on Thursday. I would welcome hearing the

administration's definition of healthy, robust shared governance and what metrics—if any—it uses to assess its effectiveness. In addition, for what types of decisions should faculty be meaningfully engaged? Would the administration (or ECAC/AC) consider developing a more systematic process—such as a survey or structured input mechanism—to evaluate the health of shared governance, particularly among members of President and Provost committees? I raise these questions based on my experience serving on several Duke-level faculty committees, where I have at times been concerned about the limited role of faculty—specifically, the difference between being asked to listen and being genuinely engaged. In my view, shared governance is strongest when faculty input is not only solicited, but also met with meaningful feedback and clearly integrated into the university's decision-making and core functions.”

[Recording cuts out and picks up with President Price addressing the question]

Vince Price (President): We live in a world where everybody is fond of saying we need metrics to assess the effectiveness of this or that. They are harder to come up with than one might imagine. But I'm certainly open to a project like that, if faculty feel it is constructive and useful. But it's hard. How do you judge the effectiveness of governance of any large complex organization? The hint that was provided here is useful. We can use different tools to gauge out people who are engaged in shared governance, whether in this body or in committees, to provide some feedback. I don't know if Academic Council customarily does a survey of members. What do you think about the past year? What will you do going forward? We do incorporate this into many aspects of the university's work, but not uniformly. I think it's a good suggestion.

There's no harm there. As a faculty member, my career was built around doing survey research. I want to tell you that there's only so much you can learn from a survey, even from the very best survey. That's not a reason for not doing it. One has to be thoughtful about how you make use of the data. But I am a fan of bringing in more data. We're talking about representativeness. If anybody is part of a consultative process and not feeling good about that consultative process, we should know it. The mechanism described would be a good way to do that.

Neal: I should note that the question of assessment is a very important thing to introduce. When we talked about this at ECAC yesterday, we wondered what might be a better way to assess some of the work those committees are doing? As a practice, every one of the ECAC members is appointed to the APC, UPC, every PC you can think of. We do talk with each other about our sense of what happened in the meetings. That goes also for the Board of Trustee Committee that we're on. So, at least we have a conversation among ourselves about how valuable it is. It would be interesting to create an assessment tool that will allow us to do that. As suggested yesterday by Sandra, that would likely happen after her retirement. (laughter)

Taylor: To me, it's interesting to see the difference between being asked to listen and being genuinely engaged. I think all of us probably want to be genuinely engaged. It will be surprising if everything we did in faculty governance was equally distributed on that. So, the question is, how do we focus and move the needle towards more general engagement? I look back on all the different committees I've been on. I haven't been on the Athletic Council for probably more than ten years. But back when I was on it, it felt mostly like show and tell, because what

happened was that you get notified that one meeting a semester was at a certain time, and if you taught during that time, you missed the only meeting of the semester. So, I just dropped off the committee. It wasn't worth my time. It doesn't mean there was nothing happening there. I actually don't know what's happening now. If I were thinking of that, APT (Advisory Committee on Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure) is the most profound committee we've got. So, there's a shift, especially with Athletics. One way faculty could do is that we are not going to have anything to do with it. It is what it is. We have no idea what it is or what it will be. The reason I say that is, if we went back ten years and asked Dick Brodhead (former Duke President), "Would we be doing what we're doing today?" He would say, "Absolutely not. There's no way." And I'm sure everybody would have said it. The problem was that we inched up into it – one decision at a time. I love sports, and Duke was a big-time athletic University before. It was a great university. We've been in the ACC since 1953. To me, that doesn't feel like a very productive place for us to be spending time on. APT is the most important, and then the finances are very important. That's just my personal perspective.

Neal: As you mentioned the APT, just a reminder that APT is one of the best examples of faculty consultation.

Trina Jones (Law School): I want to celebrate the service that faculty give to the university. Faculty are committed to teaching, to research, but also to the idea of the university, and that's why faculty volunteer so much time serving on all of these committees. It's hard. It's a heavy lift. Often there isn't sufficient compensation or recognition of that work. I think that the elephant in the room for me is, how do we

value this service? Because there is an opportunity cost when we ask faculty to serve on APT or on a special Academic Council committee, such as the Faculty Hearing Committee, the heavy lift that Charlotte Sussman (English) did when she was looking at Academic Freedom last year. That's often uncompensated and unrecognized. We don't always get leave or teaching credits or other forms of compensation. We talk a lot about our values and how we value faculty input, but do we really value faculty input in the ways in which we recognize that input? I'd like to hear some conversation about incentives to get faculty to turn briefly away from research or pedagogy to do this governance work. Thank you.

Neal: Denise, does Arts & Sciences Council have a volunteer army in the sense that the representatives are not elected but volunteer in the department?

Comer: We have 36 units in Trinity. Each unit has a representative and an alternate. In our bylaws, it says that each chair decides within their own unit how to conduct that process. So, that might happen in some units, while in other units, there might be a formal election where faculty are voting for their representative and alternate. I don't know how that plays out in each unit. That would be an interesting thing I should know more about. Tony Snipes is the program coordinator for the Arts & Sciences Council. I'm so grateful for all of his efforts. He knows about it. We have ten standing committees, and we have two ad hoc committees this year. Each committee has 8 to 15 people on it. I'm always emailing people, and they often say no because they're busy. It's not because they're not interested or don't think it's important, valuable or interesting. They're just busy. I get people who say yes. We do have a

volunteer army for the committees, and those are elected by the ECASC (Executive Committee of Arts & Sciences Council) too. But I take your point, Trina. I think more recognition and more incentives for administrative services would be helpful.

Neal: The next group of questions is a suite that was submitted together. I'm not going to read all four, but perhaps there could be some discussion about the points raised here regarding shared governance in the current context.

[Questions are provided below, even though they were not read loud]

“There are many questions to be answered about shared faculty governance consequently Thursday's panel discussion is most appreciated. The strategic realignment that began in Spring 2025 and the significant consequences for faculty, staff, housekeeping, and others on the campus that followed raise significant questions about the nature of governance at Duke. Does it even exist?”

How to square the notion of shared governance with substantial library buyouts/RIFs which occurred absent knowledge of or input from the Provostial libraries committee? Yes, employment contracts are confidential and yes, cost cutting is operational, but there is surely room for faculty input when it comes to the deleterious intellectual consequences of cutting library staff in areas critical to university mission.

The same must be said of the unilaterally imposed salary decrements in the School of Medicine where the rationale has not been clearly stated and faculty have been left in the dark. Never mind the closed lines of communication between senior leadership in

the School and faculty on the School's Steering Committee. Salary decrements linked to research funding levels given the realities of the current climate do little more than destroy morale.

In sum, faculty do not feel heard when they are relegated to having to contend with the consequences of decisions made without them. What does faculty governance mean if faculty have no clear recourse when shared faculty governance principles are violated?”

Taylor: I was on leave last spring and this fall. It was actually a great time to be on leave, and it was a hard time for all of you here. I'm sorry for that. But if I go back to the year of Covid, Vince and Sally brought together a 2030 Committee of faculty. We started meeting immediately, and we were asked to put together proposals and ideas. At the beginning, we were thinking that the financial profile of the university might shrink, so we were thinking about these things. There were faculty really engaged in that. In retrospect, basically the stock market bounced back so fast and eased some of the financial pressure off in some ways. One thing that worries me – Daniel and I've talked about this – is that we have these ideas, and we did all this work, but they just kind of drifted away. Sometimes people say, “Old faculty are opposed to change. They won't try to do anything harder or new.” But that wasn't true. We were really trying to think things through. I wasn't here for the shared governance that took place this past summer, but what I was doing was trusting the people who were here in these positions, just like they had trusted me back in 2020. There's a big difference between being consulted and being disappointed in the decision that was made. I've heard a lot about the librarian cuts in particular. The only thing I would say about that is I'm pretty close with a couple of librarians. And

some of the professional librarians experienced pushback from faculty, which they find somewhat disrespectful, because they felt like we were kind of over in their business. I heard some faculty say this was wrongly decided. I have no idea whether it was wrongly or rightly decided, or even if we can figure that out. But I do know that some of our colleagues, who are professional librarians, felt like the faculty were kind of shelling out a little bit and they had undertaken agonizing decisions. This was their perspective, just a different perspective.

Neal: I do want to read this last part of these questions.

“In sum, faculty do not feel heard when they are relegated to having to contend with the consequences of decisions made without them. What does faculty governance mean if faculty have no clear recourse when shared faculty governance principles are violated?”

Comer: I honed in on that, the first sentence, especially. That's very well phrased. The person who wrote this captured how a lot of people feel. For me, matters with personnel and HR are some of the trickiest areas of shared governance, because even earlier today, Mark, you received a question, but you didn't address it, because that's an active personnel matter. That's the fiduciary responsibility the Board of Trustees and the senior leadership have. In the same way, it makes it murky with shared governance. We could, within shared governance, have certain suggestions, proposals, desires, aims or inquiries. There are other people who are operating with particular rules and constraints, some of which we can know about, and some of which we can't, ultimately have the responsibility. In an August retreat earlier this academic year, President Price, you said

that trust was an important element of healthy shared governance. I agree. When you came to visit, I said, “We all want to trust, but I don't know if everybody has 100% trust right now.” But something you said, Mark, when you came to visit has stuck with me. You said that we raised these concerns, and we feel all kinds of feelings emerge – positive and negative, because we all want Duke to be better and we expect better of Duke in some cases. That is a shared value that we can trust, even with personnel decisions that I'm not allowed to be privy to. And I understand why, because I'm not in HR, but I can trust whoever is making those decisions, doing so with the idea of making Duke better. It's a difficult area and might be worth exploring more too. It's the same as asking whether the media can be present for every ECAC conversation or every committee meeting. That's one version of transparency. But maybe there're some other things along the way that we can come up with to help people feel more heard.

Neal: I'll open it up to any comments from the audience. From my understanding of the work that we do here and the work that's done at our peer institutions, there's something wonderful to be said about the fact that our version of shared governance is looked at in admiration from our peers. That says something about what and who Duke is. Even as we're at the pinnacle of what shared governance is considered by our peers and other institutions. I will add one more thing about our conversations in ECAC. I'm going to take President Price out of this for a moment, because I think we always grant respect and gravitas in our conversations with him. I'm sure that the Provost and Executive Vice President don't feel the same way. (laughter) There are very honest, frank, difficult and contentious conversations that take place in that room. I

can't imagine the context in which those conversations would remain if there were 27 other people around the table. By the way, you all would have to stand because there will be no space for you. I wanted to add that point that I know it is almost natural, given the political leanings of the faculty – and I lean with them – to be distrustful of administration. I understand in some ways, that is the role of faculty to always be suspicious and skeptical of decisions that are being made. But it's also important for us to make sure that we're having honest dialog with leadership, even if we disagree. The system of shared governance here at Duke that was passed on to me from Trina Jones, from Erika Weinthal, from Kerry Haynie who I served on ECAC with, from Don Taylor, is on the pinnacle of what this process should look like.

David Malone (Education): First of all, thank you all for having this conversation, and I thank the three of you in particular for all you give to the university. This question has to do with the framework of faculty governance of this particular body. This crosses over much of today's conversation. I want to ask about the range of issues that you think are within the purview of faculty governance in the Academic Council. Is your sense that this range has narrowed over the last 20 years or so? What is the current range of issues that this body might take up, and what should that be? We could use Don's comments about college sports as an example. College sports are in crisis, and that's something I think a lot about as a huge Duke sports fan. To what degree should this body be involved in making decisions about the future of the role that Athletics will play on our campus?

Neal: Thank you, David. That's a great question.

Taylor: From around 1946 until sometime in the last 15 or 20 years, most of the country thought we – meaning higher education, especially elite higher education – were mostly good. You know, American exceptionalism. Now I was actually struck last year when I was on sabbatical and spent a lot more time with normal people. (laughter) It was enlightening to me how many educated people who value education said, “Yeah, I think the Trump administration is trampling the Constitution and not following the rule of law. But you guys kind of had it coming, and needed knocking down a peg or two.” That's what's different. For NIH (National Institutes of Health), I don't know what that's going to look like in the future, but it's not coming back exactly like it was. I think our stature has been turned down. The money is being and has been turned down. Our cost of attendance is so big, and we rightly talked about our need-based financial aid program. We used to say, if people just understand it, they would be better with it. I actually think they understand it pretty good now, and they don't think it's fair. “They” is this ambiguous middle class that's ever expanding. I'm not sure the scope of the issues is different. It's just the heat is turned up, and John Wayne is not coming. So, we have to figure out how to earn back some trust and respect.

Comer: I'm not going to comment on Athletics necessarily, but I'm going to say, I can't really speak to the scope of what the Academic Council does. Again, I'm not a regular person in this room all the time, so I just don't know about that. But from the vantage point of the Arts & Sciences Council, sometimes there are things that are handled in committees of the Academic Council or in the Academic Council that Arts & Sciences Council – again, there are Trinity representations here – wonders how come it didn't have a role at some point in

the process. Maybe not amending the power structures, but some kind of feedback loop or meaningful engagement? There are moments like that. Those are the moments that are worth leaning into to just think through and explore. And it could be that everything operated as best as it should or could have. Maybe those are the moments for thinking about things a little differently sometimes.

Leonor Corsino (School of Medicine): I know we're running out of time, but I'm going to pose my questions, so we can think this through, maybe for the next meeting or another meeting. As I listen today, I cannot help to think about we mentioned that our faculty are teachers and are doing research. But I want to speak on behalf of my clinical colleagues who work in the School of Medicine. If I recall correctly from previous meetings, a large percentage of our budget at our university comes from our colleagues who are day in and day out seeing patients in the clinical setting. Their voice, many times, is not represented in this governance body as advice to our leadership. As mentioned earlier, they don't have the flexibility to take two hours of their clinical day to be here and provide the feedback. I want to make sure we remember them. I don't speak on behalf of all my clinical colleagues, because I'm not 100% clinical in the School of Medicine. But I want us to remember that we really want to hear from them, as I hear all the time, sometimes decisions we make in this setting impact their ability to continue to be in an academic setting when things are very tough on the other side of healthcare, and that represents a big part of our budget.

Neal: Thank you for sharing that. Additionally, the clinical / medical side with 2000 faculty is the largest group of faculty on campus. I will say in response, we have

not had any Academic Council Chairs, as far as I know, in recent years that came from the medical / clinical side. Every Chair who's taken this position, the wide-eye open thing that happens for you is the first conversation you hear about the medical enterprise. Five of my other colleagues who are on ECAC can attest – thanks to Harvey and Terry – that we spend a significant amount of time in ECAC every week talking about the medical enterprise. There're some critical issues that we didn't discuss today that at some point have to come to this place and ECAC about decisions being made around salary reduction. This will be my last comment today. I was thinking about David Malone's comments about what we should be doing. Fundamentally, I see my role as protecting the best interest of Duke faculty. I say this in terms of for us to do the work that we do most efficiently and effectively, but part of that is recognizing what the university is, which is not about protecting our comforts. Those are two very different things. And I say that as someone who spent the majority of his career, before he came to Duke in 2004, at public institutions where no such comforts existed. We always have to be clear about things we lose and things we still have. I'm not trying to sing hosanna to the rhetoric of the university. (laughter) There are leadership here that can do that. But again, when we look at it, fundamentally, it's about what research support we have in terms of having dedicated research funds, in terms of what our 401(k) looks like particularly if you've been here for 20 years, in terms of our health care. Those are all real things. And again, it should be better. We can obviously mourn folks who have been lost in terms of losing jobs and things like that, but just look at the folks eight miles down the road in terms of what the quality of education is at UNC for instance, you understand that we are in a very different kind of space, even as we

want this to be a better place. Thank you for taking the time to engage with us today. We look forward to more conversations.
(applause)