



Minutes of a called meeting of the Academic Council
Tuesday, June 17, 2025
Held via Zoom

Mark Anthony Neal (Chair-elect, Academic Council / African & African American Studies): Good morning, folks. I am Mark Anthony Neal, the incoming Chair of the Academic Council. Unfortunately, Trina Jones (Chair, Academic Council) is unable to join us today because of a family emergency. We are grateful that all of you were willing and able to adjust your schedules to convene with us today in what is obviously a very challenging moment for higher education and for Duke specifically. ECAC has been working and holding our regularly scheduled meetings since the end of the semester. Since the end of May, it's been jointly the current ECAC and the incoming ECAC members meeting together to make sure there is a consistent exchange of information that's being presented. We envision today's meeting, more than anything, as a listening session, an opportunity to allow incoming ECAC members to better understand what's going on, but also jointly, the two Academic Councils - the current and the incoming Academic Council. Unfortunately, for various reasons, many of the Senior Leadership Group and Executive Leadership Group were not able to attend, though I believe Daniel Ennis (Executive Vice President) will be on the call today.

A couple of reminders before we get started. The gathering today is the extension of the

Christie Rules - the shared governance, which has long established Duke as relatively unique in comparison to our peers in terms of shared governance between the faculty and administration, but also reminding you that there are multiple sites of shared governance in which you can engage. ECAC and the Academic Council are important sites obviously, but there's also the University Priorities Committee (UPC), the Global Priorities Committee (GPC) and the Academic Programs Committee (APC) which some of you might be familiar with or might have been members of in the past. Additionally, because the information we get is largely about what the intent of the changes are, the implementation processes often occur obviously within the schools, we encourage you again to press and have conversations with your deans and department chairs about what this process is looking like on the local level, and of course, to also engage your local faculty governance councils in the context of what's happening. Going forward, your engagement on these issues is going to be critically important in terms of Duke succeeding, but also for Duke to do what it needs to do, and for us to make sure to hold Duke accountable in the most humane and sensitive ways. I should also remind folks that while the financial constraints have generated most of the information and the concerns that folks have, there are other

challenges and changes that are being implemented at this point in time that are being considered. One of which is around DEI (Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion) initiatives. Kim Hewitt (Vice President for Institutional Equity and Chief Diversity Officer) has constituted a working group. And I should share, a working group that did not include any faculty that was against the wishes of ECAC multiple times. But she led a working group under the auspices of inclusive excellence. They have posted some of their updates and the document they're working on for public comments. I should note that ECAC did not co-sign, and in fact, we're very critical and concerned with some of the things that are in the document. But you should feel free to go to the site and offer your comments as you see fit.

Also, a reminder, that the conversations that we have in ECAC with the Executive Leadership Group and/or Senior Leadership Group are largely confidential. We are happy to share today what we can share and get the answers that we might not be able to share today to you at another point in time. A quick outline about how the process is going to go today. Please use the raise hand feature in Zoom if you have questions. My colleagues, Cam Harvey and Josh Sosin as well as Sandra and Jennifer from the Academic Council Office will be helping to monitor these dynamics as we go forward. Now I open it up to all of you for whatever questions that you might have and concerns that you want to raise at this point in time.

Roxanne Springer (Physics): Thank you. I noticed from the reports coming out of AAUP (American Association of University Professors) that there were complaints about the lack of faculty governance surrounding the procedures of offering staff buyouts. I want to ask two questions. And I understand from my Chair that when it comes to buyout

offers made in our department that he was informed, but not consulted. So, I want to ask who is making those decisions and based on what? And following up from that, when it comes to offering early buyouts to faculty, who is going to be determining who gets offers and how? What's the rubric?

Neal: To the first part of that question, Daniel, feel free to jump in on part of this, it was our understanding that the VSIPs (Voluntary Separation Incentive Program) were offered in consultation with the deans and the schools, and also in consultation with chairs.

Daniel Ennis (Executive Vice President): Yes. Let me try to create context with regards to the broad theme of engagement with faculty governance, because I honestly feel like that is not reflective of how this process has gone. I invested personally enormous amounts of time with faculty governance, and I'm happy to detail that here, because it's important for you all to understand that this was an exhaustive process. I met with ECAC, basically weekly, for the better part of two and a half months. We were in front of the Academic Council once in a holistic way, and then responsive as the process went through. I've met with every single faculty, except the Law School faculty. I spent detailed engagement time with those faculties. I was in front of the Arts and Sciences Council and Chairs. I was in front of the Advisory Boards, and all sorts of administrative departments, School of Medicine's Chairs, etc. Given the amount of time within which we were trying to structure this process and navigate a complicated landscape, I have to say I feel quite good about the way in which we engaged our faculty. That's response number one.

On response number two, it's disappointing to hear that from Steffen (Bass, Chair of Physics). That surprises me to be honest. But I'm not living in the context of every decanal decision and process in terms of how they arrived at the names that were going to be offered the Voluntary Separation Incentive Program. So, I would have expected that deans and the central team would navigate a number of questions about where and how best to think about shrinking administrative function in support of our faculty and missions. But I would have expected also, to the extent possible, that there'd be navigation with deans and administrative leaders at the department level. If that didn't happen, it's disappointing. What I would say, to give grace to our academic leaders, is there's a lot that they are navigating. And the ways within which we're asking them to step up, in a very complicated and dynamic environment, I do feel like the job we've given them, to be honest, over the past several months has been incredibly challenging and demanding at a professional and a personal level.

The final thing I want to say is that when it comes to faculty governance, especially regarding personnel-level decisions, it's not entirely clear to me how we should interpret or apply the Christie Rules. Incredibly sensitive personnel issues had to be navigated in the context of coming up with those to whom we'd be offering the Voluntary Separation Incentive. One thing to contextualize: the VSIP was offered to 939 folks, 300 of whom have accepted to date which is to be honest, pretty surprising to me, because we gave them 45 days to consider the offer. We're probably now in the middle of the process. We're at a 32% acceptance rate. We've had 4% decline, so 37 of the 939 have declined so far. That tells you that maybe we found a positive spot

with regards to the benefit of the incentive, such that people are responding in the way we want them to, which is obviously to work as hard as we possibly could to reduce the likelihood of large involuntary separations in order to navigate our budgetary goals and expectations. So, I'll stop there. I hope that's responsive.

Neal: I'm going to ask Kerry Haynie to jump in, as a Social Sciences Dean in Trinity, to get a little bit more clarification on how some of this played out on at least the decanal level in Trinity.

Kerry Haynie (Dean, Social Sciences): I was surprised to hear what Roxanne said. I'm the Dean of Social Sciences, as you all know. And our process unfolded with our Trinity chairs very much involved, at least in the Social Sciences division. I met with every chair individually, along with representatives from my HR Team. And we had a conversation about the criteria that we would use to decide who to offer the VSIP to and that criteria were shared with all the department chairs. And it's my understanding that my co-Deans did the exact same process that I did. I can definitely speak to meeting with my chairs individually, having a conversation about how to organize the list, so I am very surprised to hear that from Steffen. And I also second what Daniel said that the senior leadership has appeared before many groups, including our department chairs in Trinity. They've come to talk about this process and to notify us about the process.

Neal: Thank you, Kerry. To the second part of Roxanne's question, and Daniel can also add to this as he sees fit. The criteria for retirement - what is essentially an enhanced retirement plan, is set up individually by each of the schools. It's not as if people were picked and chosen. You're eligible or you're

not. And if you choose not to take the deal, then you choose not to take the deal. And again, we're very specifically talking about regular-rank tenure track and non-tenure track positions in the case of the retirement offer. As I have joked to many of my colleagues, half-jokingly, I actually do really wish that I was 65 years old, because I might take the offer that has been put on the table. Daniel, you can add any color to that if you see fit.

Ennis: Yes, happy to. One other point to make on faculty governance, a room where we spend enormous amount of time deliberating and getting in perspectives from the faculty voice, was the University Priorities Committee (UPC), which was just terrific. I have to say that committee has been enormously helpful in my time at Duke.

On the faculty retirement program, I'm not as close to this. Mohamed Noor (Executive Vice Provost) has really led the charge and done an incredible job, working closely with Antwan Lofton (Vice President of Human Resources), the deans, the Legal Counsel, etc. But, the process is one in which each dean, working fully with that central team, decided the criteria. The criteria are almost exclusively an age-based criteria. It's just a different age by schools. As you heard in the case of Trinity, it was 65. In the case of School of Nursing, it was 55. That was a function of the demographics of the faculty, and I think the School of Nursing maybe wouldn't have had many offers if any, to give if 65 were the age. I don't know the specifics. So, there is a little bit of variation on that School of Medicine's program. It looks different in terms of the criteria used. I can't speak to that in detail. But the process is underway, and it was done at the direction of the deans in terms of where and how they wanted to define the criteria, but working

obviously very closely with Mohamed, Legal and HR.

Jocelyn Olcott (History): I have a follow up question. My impression from our department chair is that she also felt like she was just told what to do and wasn't actually consulted about departmental needs. We have a pretty tight staff structure, so we were surprised to get VSIPs. But my question is actually more about non-departmental units. Duke is such an interdisciplinary place, that of course there are many units that are critical to our research, teaching and mentorship. Some of which seem to have now been completely wiped out by the VSIPs. I'm curious how those decisions were made. The one that I know best that's closest to my heart is the Center for Latin American & Caribbean Studies, and that was explicitly over a very clear plea by the entire faculty council of that unit. It has an endowment. It's unclear what's happening with the endowment with the restructuring. So, I'm just wondering how those decisions were made. The second part of the question is what alternatives were considered in terms of meeting the financial exigencies besides mass layoffs and retirements.

Neal: The first part of your question is something that should be directed towards, and we will again direct it towards the Provost and the Executive Vice Provost, which is where those decisions would have been made in terms of decisions that impact the academic aspect of Duke University. We (ECAC) were given information about this. We weren't given specific details about it because of privacy that we don't have access to. We weren't told the names and things like that, because that information is confidential. But we were aware that there were going to be VSIPs that would have an

academic impact. Daniel, you can jump in for the second part of the question.

Ennis: First, let me just close out the last question, just so you have the facts. 240 faculty will be given the voluntary retirement outside of Medicine, and 40 in the School of Medicine. So, 280 altogether.

Let me take the first one up just as a broad matter, which was we were honestly challenging ourselves and looking for leaders to evaluate in critical ways in which we're serving our mission. So, it was really important in terms of the emphasis on strategic realignment which was to challenge everything we do and work within a much smaller resource envelope. That would lead to not just trimming on the margin. It was meant to really challenge priority programmatic supports. Within the Provost area, that kind of hard thinking occurred. And you're experiencing and responding to some of that. So, it isn't surprising that would emerge from a process like this, because that was actually quite strongly, the direction with regards to this process. And the same is true for each of our deans, and the same is true for each of our administrative units. We challenged ourselves to rethink the work, rethink programs in the context of a much more reduced resource base.

The second part of your question is what else was considered in relationship to the personnel moves that are so painful for all of us and with which we are all struggling. As you know, we started this process in February with an approach of slow expenses, slow capital expenditures, slow operating expenses, take down the normal travel and entertainment expenses, the kind of places where you can move quickly and less painfully, as it relates to our talent. And that was important. But we recognized

fundamentally that the funding threats to the institution were too severe not to consider more holistic change and a programmatic organizational and financial restructuring. That led to the target that we talked about with Academic Council (in March) and that informed the process. It was top down in the respect of - we set an ambition with regards to reducing operating expenditures over the course of the University's five-year operating plan. But doing that strategically and thoughtfully, in terms of the fact that we weren't trying to take it all out immediately, that we recognize, especially obviously, when you get the program, it would likely take more time as we navigate how we support our faculty, how we support the curriculum and teach our students, etc. Then the schools took it from there. The Provost's Office took it from there and made very hard decisions, all of which we're reviewed centrally, but we're ultimately driven locally. Whether it's at a dean level, a departmental level, as in the case of the School of Medicine in particular, where the departments are so large and then ultimately, really driven by that leadership, and rolled up into an accountable framework with regards to building a financial plan. There are a number of questions that go along with that that I typically get, like why can't we raid the endowment given the crisis we are facing, things like that. But I'll stop talking so we can take more questions, and then we can come back on topics like that.

Neal: I also think it'd be important to clarify, for those who aren't familiar, Duke essentially has three management centers: Daniel oversees central university functions, the Provost has his particular area, and the Medical School is the third area. ECAC has been far less engaged and involved in what has happened on the School of Medicine side, which looks very different than the University side. And we are making efforts

going into the next semester to better engage with the Dean of the Medical School and other figures. We've been fortunate in that we have members of the Basic Sciences and Clinical Sciences faculty that are on ECAC and will be on ECAC next year. They have been very helpful giving us some guidance in terms of what's happening on the School of Medicine side. As you can probably sense, the information coming from central Duke has been much more forthcoming. And again, to allow Daniel's point to give the Provost some grace, they have been less than forthcoming. But it was also a very challenging dynamic, and that's not to excuse them, or to excuse the fact that they're not necessarily on the call today. But those are things that we'll continue to engage with.

Ed Balleisen (Senior Vice Provost for Interdisciplinary Programs and Initiatives): Could I offer Jocelyn just a little bit more context?

Neal: Alright. I appreciate that.

Balleisen: This is my understanding that with respect to CLACS (Center for Latin American & Caribbean Studies) in particular, that there are conversations going on with Romance Studies and Trinity about continuing some support for the Center. My understanding is that CLACS is going to be situated within Romance Studies going forward. This is not my portfolio, but I have had a conversation with Mohamed about it, and Kerry has been part of those conversations as well that there will be continuing support for CLACS. It will not look exactly as it has previously, but the Center is not going away.

Olcott: That's a radical change to its operation. It was deeply involved with Sciences, the Nicholas School of the

Environment and everything else. And now it's part of Romance Studies. That's a different deal.

Jen-Tsan Ashley Chi (School of Medicine): I'm a professor in the School of Medicine. I serve on the Basic Sciences Faculty Steering Committee and am just hoping to actually let everybody know about what's happening in the School of Medicine.

There's a policy being rolled out that focuses everything on basically the salary retrieval based on external funding. Everybody knows NIH (National Institutes of Health), DOD (Department of Defense) and NSF (National Science Foundation) have already cut funding significantly. So, instead of supporting faculty, the School of Medicine came up with a policy for Basic Sciences. If a faculty's three year rolling average salary covered by external grant falls below 50%, they're going to be placed on a probation, and afterwards there will be a salary reduction to the floor of \$50,000. Just to put in perspective, the current minimum postdoc salary is \$62,000 to \$64,000 a year. It's very likely a faculty supervising a postdoc will have a much lower salary than a postdoc. This would make it financially untenable for the tenured faculty. It also sends a demoralizing and deeply troubling message about what Duke values in its faculty and their service, and it disregards all the teaching and the committee service we've been doing for the University. It also penalizes any kind of exploratory, high-risk effort, and as well as navigating a temporary funding gap. For a junior faculty, it is really difficult. And what's even more alarming is how the policy was created and by who. And would this policy be extended to all the schools or the departments next?

As I mentioned, I sit on the Basic Sciences Steering Committee which is supposed to be

basically a faculty governance body for the School of Medicine's Basic Sciences faculty. We had no opportunity to actually provide feedback or risk consent in advance. We were only informed after the policy has been in place in a different Basic Sciences department. Many faculty now are already placed on probation. And this directly bypass a principle of shared governance and violate the Christie Rules which the Council has adopted as a part of the major policy change about faculty employment that usually is received before enacted. So, to understand the faculty's perspective on this new policy, we conducted a survey of all primary Basic Sciences faculty. More than 75% responded and provided feedback. The response was overwhelmingly negative. Faculty are not just concerned. Many of them are confused, disheartened, and questioning how the decisions like this are being made without faculty input. Many exceptional faculty members already expressed their desire to leave Duke. Many of the junior faculty who joined Duke recently already told us they actually regret coming to Duke, and this will harm Duke's reputation for years to come.

An additional thing is a restriction on discretionary fund. A new faculty, a lot of time, relies on discretionary fund and startup fund to run their lab. Because of this restriction, they have a hard time taking a PhD student. Right now, we are told about 80 PhD students who come in the second year cannot find a lab. I feel that this action has raised significant concern regarding the fairness and process, and also potentially, this would essentially constitute constructive dismissal for the tenured faculty, whose employment protections are being eroded without a declared financial exigency or program termination.

So, we have written a formal letter to the Dean and the Vice Dean, and asked to post the implementation of the policy, as well as coming to engage in a conversation, commit to a transparent and cooperative review process with a full faculty participation, and reaffirming the importance of shared governance. This is an issue that I hope to draw your attention and seek your support as we actually going forward, try to navigate this difficult landscape of the federal funding. Thank you very much.

Neal: Thank you. I'll ask Daniel to jump in, and Terry Oas if he feels comfortable. Trina and I met with the Council of the Basic Sciences faculty about six weeks ago when some of this was shared with us, and we have expressed our concerns to the Provost and the Executive Vice Provost about the feeling that representation is not occurring within that space. I have nothing to update you directly, but I think Daniel might have some additional information. But first I'm going to ask my colleague on ECAC, Terry Oas to add anything if he sees fit.

Terry Oas (Biochemistry / member of ECAC): Sure. Thank you, Mark. Ashley actually did a good job of summarizing our activities and all of the things we've been working on in the Basic Sciences Faculty Steering Committee to try to engage our school's administration in a true faculty governance format and where there is give and take about policy changes that are anticipated. And I think it is the consensus of the entire committee that that process has not taken place. And because it hasn't taken place, we are getting the distinct impression that our faculty governance body - Basic Sciences Faculty Steering Committee is being worked around because the Vice Dean, Colin Duckett, and an assistant are meeting with individual departments. These kinds of meetings are scheduled, many of

them, prior to the first available date for Colin to discuss the policy with the Basic Sciences Faculty Steering Committee. It appears that the faculty governance format is being ignored by the School of Medicine in an attempt to promulgate a policy that is very unpopular. That's all I'll have to say right now.

Neal: Thank you, Terry.

Ennis: Several responses. One, I'm feeling, obviously, you're paying in a significant way. And this is an enormous change in policy with really profound implications for your research programs. I appreciate the sensitivity, having been very close to Basic Sciences Departments at Harvard Medical School, I'm quite familiar with these challenges and issues. One thing I just want to clarify is the degree to which the rules that they worked within to create the faculty separation incentive which is a voluntary incentive, is *this* related to the decisions made to whom they would offer? Or are these now suggested to be permanent changes with regards to salary coverage requirements? Can you clarify that? And then I'll have some other comments for you.

Oas: Yes, they are proposed as permanent changes. They have nothing to do with retirement incentive programs at all. They are just a statement of the expectation of the School of Medicine for what they define as productivity. And that's what the 50% recovery rate over a 3-year rolling average is about. As the Basic Sciences Faculty Steering Committee, we don't necessarily disagree that there needs to be a policy that addresses the low recovery rate. But we are objecting to the process by which this policy has been developed and the way it's been communicated which is all single direction. The meetings I've mentioned that Colin is having with individual departments appear

to be also single direction kinds of meetings. It's not hearing what the problems with the policy are. We have proposed that there be a pause, as Ashley said, but in fact, they have not responded to that request for a pause on the policy.

Ennis: Thank you. All very helpful. I appreciate the spirit of this feedback and engagement, but also the fact that the Basic Sciences Council sees relative merit potentially, with a much better process and much better consultation. I think, Terry, if we benchmark across the country, there is a variety of expectations and policies in place and salary degradation is not uncommon. Within Medical Schools, that is more often the case within a Faculty Handbook than not in my experience, in relationship to productivity, which is across a broader mission base in terms of the clinical productivity, research productivity, teaching, citizenship, etc. But that doesn't make it any less complicated and challenging to enact and to consider with our faculty. What I would say, maybe, again, as a point of grace for the School of Medicine leadership, and for our colleagues who aren't living in the School of Medicine, the School of Medicine is, without question, facing the most profound stress financially that ties back to many contributing factors, not the least of which is the pressures on the Health System's contribution which has only grown dramatically actually over the past five years. But in broad strokes, Medical Schools are subsidized by the clinical mission, and that has become challenged. The School of Medicine is disproportionately large as a research enterprise in relation to that clinical mission. If you look at our School of Medicine versus our peers, our research portfolio is much larger than what that clinical support would normally be connected to. So structurally, there's an imbalance there that is creating real

pressure, because that research mission requires heavy institutional subsidy. Now you come into a situation where we face profound pressures on the largest parts of that research portfolio. One of the points of our preeminence as a School of Medicine is our vaccine program. We are a world leading vaccinology institute, and as you know, that is under profound stress. So, there are enormous pressures on the trajectory of the school's research programs. And they are needing to respond aggressively in the face of those pressures. That isn't a sufficient excuse for lack of process as is being described here. But I would just contextualize the statements to say we need to do process better, but we also need to have shared understandings of the enormous challenges in front of our School of Medicine, and the pace with which we need to move against those challenges.

Neal: Thank you, Daniel.

Jerusha Neal (Divinity School): I'm asking this question on behalf of a full professor who has served on ECAC in years past. When this meeting was called, I've been asking around to see if there are questions that folks wanted me to raise. This was from this faculty. They were worried about the lack of morale issues, the sense that different schools had different processes for how decisions were made. The real desire in this person to somehow be of assistance given what seem to be really critical positions that are being lost, and also just giving folks a sense that we are indeed in this together and are supportive of each other. This person remembers a history that I'm not sure about. I wrote to Trina about it, and she said she'd look into it, and she may have. That information may be present on our call today. This person remembers that back in 2008, 2009, there was some sort of request made to professors who made above a

certain benchmark or perhaps were of a certain rank, to voluntarily give up some benefits or perhaps even salary. She wasn't sure of the actual policy. But she wondered if that had been thought of at all and if that would be helpful at all. I don't think in terms of scope that she was naive enough to think that would solve our problems, but in terms of a material way to save some crucial positions that are on the chopping block, and as a way to actually demonstrate our commitment to each other across the University. She wondered if that had been discussed. Thank you.

Neal: Quick response before I again pass it on to Daniel. There was something of that nature that was done during the Covid period for folks who logged above \$285,000. ECAC has directly asked the Provost and the Executive Vice Provost about whether or not this was thought of as an option at this particular point in time. Their response was something along the lines of actually wanting to maintain merit, also wanting to maintain a certain level of morale, both amongst faculty, but also amongst senior leadership. My guess, and Daniel can add some color to this, is that while that might look like an obvious vehicle for those of us who are in Trinity or some of the other schools, it's a very different conversation for what's happening over on the clinical side, and I think what has been expressed to us is a real fear of losing clinical faculty in the context of such a budget cut or cut to salary. Before I ask Daniel to come in, I will also like Daniel to talk a little bit about the general feeling in line with Jerusha's question, that Duke is far ahead in this process than most of our peers and why that actually is the case, when it doesn't feel as though our peers are making some of the same sacrifices at this point in time?

Ennis: Lots to process with you here. To be clear, those were extraordinary moments when leaders, our higher paid faculty and staff have made decisions to forego salary and/or benefits in the face of uncertainty. In the case of Covid, that was one where the hemorrhaging felt very real, especially for universities that had large academic medical centers. Our clinics were literally shut down and we were unable to take care of our patients. And then to have a very high run rate of costs associated with the broader research and teaching mission, we obviously were navigating a lot of uncertainty with regards to enrollments, etc. I would say that was a moment where I felt, in broad strokes, like, okay, we don't know what the future looks like, but it's upon us in a terrifying way, and we have to slow the cash burn immediately. So, contributions to retirement 403(b) were held back. We all expected, or prayed for anyways, that was a temporary moment, and we would return to some level of normalcy. And it happened actually far faster than any of us would have expected when we were making those decisions. As you'll recall, we contributed back half of the retirement contribution that had been basically taken from employees through that process. These are extraordinary moments, and that tells you so much about our community that we have that impetus, and we are hearing that strong interest from many people.

We don't share the view that this is a temporary moment. We are working from a view that we are dealing with a structural reduction in support of our mission. From the start, we've been very clear that we're not trying to do any temporary holds. I would say, for instance, salary reductions, you pay for them both because ultimately markets move, and you need to get back into market alignment in order to compete for, support and retain the best talent. But you

also pay for them in the fact that we're going to go forward as an enterprise, and we want to move forward strongly, so we have held from the beginning, a view that we were not going to make salary reductions but that we were actually going to increase salaries. And that's exactly what is happening. So, every member of our community will participate, as they annually do, in the merit pool. There aren't salary reductions being asked of anyone in our community. In addition, we did actually critically evaluate whether we should reduce retirement benefits on a progressive basis to respond to some of these questions. And we ultimately decided that's actually not the signal of what we're trying to achieve, given what we know at the moment. So, we also are deferring any reduction in retirement benefits, pending more consultation and more information gathering. I think those should indicate to you that while this is a really hard moment, we're committed to the move forward together, and we're committed to doing that in ways that are reinforcing on investment while obviously taking very hard measures in the near term. We are continuing to invest in core priorities. You can see, Reuben-Cooke Building, the fences have gone up. We're going to renew and modernize our facilities, which is long overdue. Our financial aid support of our students is not going to be reduced. We're making hard decisions, but I have to say in terms of broad spirit, we have a strong point of view that this is not a moment that calls for short term actions and sacrifice. But rather long-term thinking about where we want to be and what we're going to look like, and how we invest in the future coming out of a very hard process.

The other thing that's very important to note about progressive measures is that the largest percentage of our faculty in this salary range are in the School of Medicine.

Most of them are clinical faculty. And we committed to those clinical faculty when they became part of the University and the Health System that we would tie their salaries to market and make a significant investment in compensation. That was a 3-year commitment. We're in the third year of that commitment. If we were to walk back that commitment that would be profoundly distressing in terms of what we commit ourselves to do with our faculty. In the name of our collective faculty, I can assure you that that would have been something that would have been profoundly felt by our School of Medicine faculty, and honestly understood to be a breach of our obligations to those faculty. So, that was another consideration in our process.

Neal: A couple of things, Daniel. Would it have been of any value, symbolically, as a public gesture for the executive leadership and the senior leadership to have taken salary cuts particularly early on in the process, so it felt as though leadership was sacrificing something also?

Ennis: I think the same set of comments apply, which is this is about setting us up for the future. We compete in markets for administrative talent. We compete in markets for faculty talent. When you step back from those markets, you feel the pain in the long term. I've seen it again and again and when you hold salaries flat, or take salary reductions, it comes back on you with regards to competing for talent. As I said, we were all about actually supporting the traditional merit increase process for everyone in the spirit of we're going to move forward together. We're going to move forward together looking different and working into a different resource envelope, but still very much investing in our talent.

Stefani Engelstein (German Studies / Gender, Sexuality & Feminist Studies):

I'm actually glad, Mark, that you asked the question that you just asked first because I'm a little nervous about this question. I admire and respect all of the administrators that I know at Duke. My impression from where I stand in the faculty at the moment was that the first set of notices went out to staff and the second set of notices is going to faculty. I am wondering where the administration is in this list? We have heard for years from The Chronicle of Higher Education that across the board in higher education there has been an increase in the number of administrators disproportionately to the increase in students, or much less increase in faculty, and it is very hard often for groups to see in their own ranks who might make these kinds of judgments. I think the question is clear, and I'll just stop there and whether this will also apply to the administration?

Neal: ECAC is aware of reductions that have occurred in the Provost's area. Again, because of confidentiality, not all of this has been made public, but that was something obviously encouraged by ECAC. Daniel, you can jump in now.

Ennis: I just want to note that Allan Kirk is here, and I would like him to speak to that prior conversation about School of Medicine commitments.

I think there's a little bit of a narrative here, which is that this is an action finally being borne by the lowest paid or lower paid members of our community. It's just absolutely not the case. If you look at the demographics of who was offered a voluntary separation, it actually trends more senior in terms of title, compensation and experience. I would expect honestly the exact same to be what we'll see when we get

to the involuntary separation phase. So, that narrative is not a true one. The data doesn't support it. And it's important for people to understand that.

Now there's a second point of great cynicism across many faculty and many outside observers, which is the kind of ratios of faculty to staff and the worries that we're distracting resources from our core mission. As President Price challenged us when he spoke to the Academic Council, some of these criticisms need to be stared at quite objectively and with a true evaluative lens for how we move forward. I would say that's a great concern, and I think you will see significant administrative shrinkage through this process, because the target required of the Provost's area and the Central Administrative area was dramatic. We'll see a different looking administrative structure moving forward. What I would say is that that analysis is not a sufficiently sophisticated analysis and doesn't do justice to the nature of the academy. I do think we do ourselves a disservice when we don't actually interrogate a question like that. For instance, we have grown our sponsored research portfolio significantly. Every incremental dollar sponsored research is going to be connected to is an incremental resource, mainly postdoc, but also graduate students and/or other administrative technical staff. We subsidize that. It's not money making, but it's our mission. We are in the business of trying to raise money for our mission. That's a revenue generating component of our mission. We may or may not be able to justify the staff we put against that. But most businesses would say, you're not going to be able to find revenue without investing against that process and finding talent to support the revenue generation. So, we could go line by line across the revenue. Part of what we do - finding the funds, implicates the need for resources.

The final part is that the compliance burden on you, but also the University as a whole, has increased dramatically. It's been a shocking experience to think about the nature of the compliance, infrastructure against research, against all manner of really hard and complicated risk management issues, but each of them, and we could review them, have demanded that we bring on new capabilities, additional capabilities to respond to federal and other funders requirements. That's a conversation we should take up more analytically, in a more fair way, honestly to our colleagues, than the way it's often handled in terms of the cynical experience of it across the academy.

Neal: Allan, would you like to jump in about the question around the clinical faculty?

Allan Kirk (School of Medicine / member of ECAC): Sure. I'm trying to get into the 30,000-foot view before we get into the weeds. But the thing that is great about being at Duke is its beautiful heterogeneity. There is no Duke faculty member that is like this homogeneous thing. And that makes messaging from the central standpoint very difficult, because it's hard to say things that are clear and distinct, that are actually applicable to everybody in a common way. This is particularly true when we're talking about the campus and the clinical faculty, and even within the School of Medicine, the academically heavy clinical faculty and the clinical service faculty. They're very different. There's a huge revenue stream attached to certain faculty's activity that does not encumber an additional expense as it ramps up, and then there are some that does, and how we have to treat those faculty are quite different. I will say one of the big caveats that I wanted to bring up is saying that we are not cutting salaries broadly is not

really true. Certainly, within the school there are some salaries that are going to be cut, and there are some places where we're not going to apply the merit pool, because the economics just don't support it. And the speed at which those economic changes are happening in Medicine are much faster than those in other areas of the University. So, I would really caution against broad statements about how we're compensating our faculty, because there is no single statement that actually is accurate for all of our different faculty. I also say that within the School of Medicine we've been given very stiff budget cuts to hit, and we've been given the freedom to hit them - how we feel is appropriate, which I think is great. But in some of those cases it involves salary cuts or changes in research portfolio, so everyone is attacking this the way they think is best in a very earnest way. But it really does hamstring us some when a broad central statement comes out, saying we're not cutting salaries, or we're going to support this, or we're not going to support that, because in the heterogeneity of Duke there is no single answer that's going to be right.

Neal: Thank you for that.

Paul Jaskot (Art, Art History & Visual Studies): This is kind of a comment and kind of a question. I guess this is yet another meeting in which the question of size has been brought up. The President, I think, a little bit unfortunately, emphasized in his message that Duke will get smaller. He didn't say Duke will get more ambitious or Duke will get more creative. It was Duke will get smaller. I've heard right sizing from several administrators. That's a very common term. And, Daniel, you also just said where we want to be, and what we want to look like. All of those imply that there's a model for the University out there. And of course it's a financial model. Everybody

understands that we have to cut, and we have to make difficult decisions. Everybody understands that. I don't think we need to hear there's another financial pressure, although it is interesting to see the endowments might only be taxed 8% instead of 20%. I know it's still not a good thing, right? But I guess it's the model that I'm worried about. I value, trust, and thank God for my ECAC colleagues and thank you, Mark Anthony, for bringing us together, who are being consulted on this model, but it does sound to me like there's a model out there. Is the model that we are going to be a smaller regional university? Because smaller means that we're going to compromise on research, or we're going to make some cuts, or we're going to be less global. Or, you know, fill in the blank. There's a model there, and the model is not financial. The model is intellectual, educational, and about research. And those are faculty priorities, and those are faculty questions. So, I trust that ECAC is being informed about whatever model keeps being talked about for being smaller. If it's not an intellectual model, then that's not the mission of the University. So, that's a problem. But if it is an intellectual model, I think that has to be shared, and somehow the faculty have to be included in that conversation at a broader level.

I'll give you two examples. One is that, as far as I know, the Library Council, which is a Provostial committee, was informed about what's going to happen in the library. They weren't consulted. They weren't asked. They weren't asked, what do you think? Should we shrink area studies more than the science division? No, that wasn't the conversation. The conversation was, we have to make cuts, and this is what we're doing. That's one example.

Then the other example is, I just happened to be talking to a friend at Amherst this morning, and she says there is indeed a CFO Committee talking about modeling endowment possibilities - what that might have to look like, that includes, of course, faculty participation. So, there's a model out there in which the research and the educational side of the mission, which is what we lead with, are included as part of that conversation. It doesn't mean it's any less serious financially. It doesn't mean we're not going to have to make tough decisions. But my statement, and perhaps the question is, if there's a model which something like what we want to look like, your words implies, then I'd like to know what that model is, and I would like to participate in helping to shape that model, and I hope that ECAC is being included, not just as a consulting body there, but as a body that actually helps shape that. That's my statement.

Neal: Paul, one of the models that was used back in 2008 during the financial crisis, also during Covid was to set up faculty committees that would consult with senior leadership and executive leadership about what is happening. Because of the pace of what was happening in this particular moment, and this is around the time I started attending ECAC meetings, the idea was that ECAC would essentially serve as that body and entity in this particular moment. Now, a couple of things, things that you suggest, Paul, and that we're all clear about. There's a fine line between being told what's going happen, to be read into a situation and to honestly be consulted in that process. And they're always going to be contexts in which we will have feedback based on consultation and that feedback might not be considered at all. I will say, though, when you consider some of the things that Paul raised around the financial side, there are faculty

representation on APC which is the Provost's Committee, UPC, GPC where a lot of these decisions will also be made. There is faculty representation there, and those faculty members are generally chosen through the process of recommendations from ECAC. So, there is faculty input in these particular points. But I think a critical question to ask Daniel, in the absence of Vince Price (President) and Alec Gallimore (Provost), is there a sense that the choices now are being driven by the financial concerns with the expectation that the academic concerns will then have to fit and meet what is happening financially, as opposed to making, as Paul suggests, decisions based on the academic mission first?

Ennis: First of all, Paul incredibly well said. I hear you. I believe very strongly in the concerns. If there's failures of process of consultation, obviously, that's not going to serve as well in the long term. But the questions of model have to be front and center constantly, not just in a moment of crisis and during, you know, what feels like a profound threat to the institution. This was a dilemma, and I think it's important to put voice to this. I've said this in a variety of forms throughout the time, which is when you enter into a period of financial stress which we very much believe and worry we face, you're going to have to take hard personnel action, you have to perform a function that is incredibly uncomfortable and which you want to be holistic, and you want to assure that the proper attention and thought goes into the model questions. At the same time, you cannot leave employees and their families incomplete and in a zone of uncertainty. It's inhumane in ways that are deeply uncomfortable as a values matter. We struggled with the question of what is a timeframe to work within that feels humane, but also allows for as much consultation as

possible, which I described at the top of this Zoom. But you're never going to get that balance right. And we did on the margin tend towards urgency, because we received counsel actually from many faculty along the way, which was also, don't leave us in suspense for a prolonged period of time. The pain and distraction of that would be too hard to bear. So, we put a relatively tight timeframe on it, and we worked with that value as a primary value. There were obviously very large tradeoffs to having done that and we're hearing that here, which is we didn't have the kind of extensive model consultation. But we absolutely have to have that on an ongoing basis. And I would say, each dean and each school as was being described by my colleague, who's the Chair of Surgery (Allan Kirk), did their best on a bottoms up basis with as great attention to the mission of each part of our wonderfully heterogeneous environment to be responsive to a minimum, not harming the model and ideally positioning ourselves for strength, and, by the way, continue to make significant investment. I don't think we are doing justice to the process and to the narrative of this experience by not actually demonstrating that we will make in this plan, through this process, very important investments that will set us up and be responsive to concerns about drift model, lack of focus on model, etc. So, those are some high-level thoughts and comments back.

Neal: Thank you, Daniel.

Kathy Andolsek (School of Medicine): I first just want to say, thank you, Daniel. I'm so grateful for your participation. I think you're always thoughtful and seem authentic. And I frankly wish the President and Provost had similarly prioritized this meeting. So, thank you very much for

coming and taking the questions, and really responding so thoughtfully to them.

I want to take us in a direction that's somewhat different first and then kind of return to the more common thread. I've been at Duke long enough that I think we have decided to prioritize pausing a tenure clock for issues such as parental leave, which we didn't used to have before, and also during Covid, which I thought we were remarkable. I would certainly recommend thinking about doing that again. If you want to talk about helping anxiety with some of our younger folks, I think adding an extra year, or if we don't know, it's going to be only a year, adding two years, whatever it is. I think that might make a strong statement that probably has a monetary value attached to it. But I'm not sure that it's as painful as some of the other issues that we're considering. So, I would say, can we just do that?

I also appreciate your data, Daniel, and it would really help me to know of those 280 faculties, how many have tenure? And if they have tenure, what's the implication of not taking this voluntary separation? And if it's somehow impacting them being able to participate in the life of the University with their tenure and the expectations around tenure, helping to understand what that is like? And are we really reformatting what tenure means at this institution? If so, again, faculty participation as we embrace those new opportunities, or what the new future is going to be. Because I don't think that's clear. And I think, at least on the School of Medicine side, it seems like some people were offered not 45 days, but 30 days, and the 30 days overlap the new academic year for which they'd already made commitments. So, it was a little less clear how actually they could operationalize something, even if they may have wanted to. I think some of that is in there, too. I

appreciate Dr. Kirk's wisdom, and really honesty with some of that. I guess, to work with about faculty from ten different departments, and I can say some younger faculty, like Assistant Professor type folks in Clinical Departments have been asked by their divisions to take a voluntary salary reduction. So, if they've been asked to do that, again, I would say it'd be nice to have leadership take a similar voluntary salary reduction. Because I really think that's hard to ask our most junior faculty or disproportionately junior people to do that when we're not willing to sort of embrace that far more broadly.

Secondly, there's been some divisions that have clinical faculty asked to not take vacation or to really minimize their vacation time so they could optimize their clinical productivity. I'm not sure that's even safe, let alone attentive to what we expect for faculty to be able to take care of their own personal needs and well-being, and maintain really the best they need to be for patient care and team members, while they're still prioritizing their own well-being. I think we just need to think about what the message is like going more broadly than maybe what was even intended here. I'm on the Clinical Sciences Faculty Council. This has never been brought before us, so kudos to the Basic Sciences Faculty Council for at least having the conversation.

I would finally say that I think one opportunity that we have as a revenue source, or at least I think we have, is tuition, which is disproportionately at least, risen faster than the cost of living. I would say that whatever we do, I hope someone's being thoughtful that we don't compromise the educational value that we're giving our students, because I know there's a lot of fund shifting that inevitably happens. But I would think that that's a source that we want to

make sure that if a student chooses to come here, we're delivering the Duke education that they deserve and expect. Thanks very much.

Neal: Thank you, Kathy.

Shai Ginsburg (Asian & Middle Eastern Studies): Thank you all and thank you, Daniel. I really appreciate all that you do and your straightforwardness. And this is a comment for you, and more to other senior leaders who are not on this call. And this is to piggyback on what Paul said. Throughout the process we have not heard once about what the vision for Duke University as an educational institution is. We have been told we need to cut, to reduce our labor force. But reducing a labor force is not an educational mission. I've yet to hear what our mission is and who determines what that mission is. Thank you.

Jessilyn Dunn (Biomedical Engineering): I just wanted to jump on Kathy's comment. I really appreciate the thoughtfulness around junior faculty, and I do want to mention that I think it would be helpful to consult junior faculty if there are decisions being made. For example, some things that seem like they might help like extensions of tenure clocks can actually be detrimental to junior faculty in some ways that you probably might not recognize without talking to junior faculty about those details. I agree there is an extreme tension right now for junior faculty who are trying to figure out how to navigate this situation, but I think some of the methods that have been used in the past actually may not be as helpful in the current climate. Thanks very much.

Springer: A lot has been discussed here about faculty governance. But there's something that Daniel said near the beginning of this call that I want to turn

back to, because he said something about the Christie Rules being possibly unclear about the role of the faculty in determining what happens to the faculty and forgive me if I'm misrepresenting you. Through the AP&T (Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure) Committee, through committees that hire in the first place, it is typically the faculty who desire who to hire, who to promote. And so, when it comes to deciding who to prune, if that's necessary, then I hope that faculty will be involved. But more generally, it seems to me as though in the past few months there has been a disagreement between administration and faculty about what faculty governance is, or should be at Duke, so I encourage everyone to actually go back to the Christie Rules and try to implement some guidelines for those discussions going forward.

I also want to say that the reason, for example, that consulting simply with deans and not chairs cannot answer the question about decisions that maximize teaching and research in the University side, is that the deans actually don't know which staff are critical to our teaching and research. So, the chairs really have to be consulted.

Another thing I want to say is one thing that's given us a lot of problems, is transparency. It was in a discussion that came from President Price, where he talked about offers being made, but it was important that people who got offers not talk to each other about it. That raises concerns about fairness.

Finally, I'll say that in the same spirit of interrogating conventional wisdom about the ratio of administrators to students, I want to interrogate the conventional wisdom that salary is actually appropriately correlated with merit. So, the kind of reflexive decisions about salary, Daniel, that you were

talking about and retaining people, I hope that that will get a closer look. And I'm so grateful, Daniel, that you are willing to engage with us honestly and forthrightly. This has been an incredibly uncomfortable meeting for everybody, and most particularly for you, and I thank you.

Neal: Thank you, Roxanne.

Matthew Adler (Law School): Let me just echo a couple of things. Again, Daniel, thank you so much. During this meeting and prior sessions with Academic Council, I've been impressed by your empathy, by your thoughtfulness, by your sharing information to the extent that you felt that was possible. I certainly appreciate the need for quick action and the tremendous financial stresses that Duke is under.

Just to echo two points, though, that others have said. One is, it would be very useful to know what the model is, and we can talk about the role of faculty and administration in designing the model. Here I mean the intellectual model. But some sharing has to be where we are going to be in terms of research and teaching and other types of products across the schools. That would be very useful. As you said, we are making not just temporary cuts but permanent cuts, because we view this as a permanent hit. I understand it's emerging. But some sharing of what that intellectual model is as a senior administrator sees it would be very useful.

The other point is, I completely understand that individual level data about who has been offered a VISIP or retirement package and going forward a reduction in force can't be shared, but presumably some high level de-identified data can be shared. You've already given that in terms of the numbers of staff and faculty, it would be useful to have more of that in terms of by school or by unit

and salary range. I think that would be helpful to the members of Academic Council. I assume that can be done in a way that does not identify individuals, does not compromise privacy and doesn't jeopardize market position. Part of the frustration here, and again, you are feeling that which is not fair because you've shown up, is that I don't think we have a sense exactly as to what the cuts have been, and presumably it's impossible to tell us more without compromising privacy.

Cam Harvey (Fuqua School of Business / member of ECAC): There is one common message that hopefully gets back to the President and Provost. And indeed, this is a message that I've relayed to them in the past. Duke's strategic plan, the 2030 Plan, failed to identify risks and it needs to be redone. Given this new reality that we're in, these changes are not going away. We need a new plan, and a plan is not a spreadsheet. We need to think deeply about what Duke will look like in the future and do this very thoughtfully. The faculty need to be involved. We need an initiative. Let's call it the 2035 Plan. But we need to get working on it right now.

Neal: Thank you, Cam. I want to reiterate again how thankful we are that many of you took time out of your summer schedule to join this Academic Council meeting. My 2-year-old grandson is in the room with me at the moment, wondering when his grandfather is going to get off this Zoom call. So, I know that we all are making sacrifices in this moment. I also want to thank members of the Executive Leadership Group and Senior Leadership Group, who joined the call - Daniel, who always gets high fives, but I also want to thank Ed Balleisen, who, I know, continues to think of himself as being a part of the faculty and not just a member of upper administration. So, I

want to thank you two in particular for joining the call.

ECAC will continue to function with meetings fairly regularly over the summer, with the new ECAC beginning July 1st. Whatever concerns you have, please continue to send them to us, so that we can respond to them. And I assume we will also be meeting with senior and executive leadership over the summer before the semester starts. So, whatever questions that you have, please share your concerns with us in that context. And again, thank you all for joining on the call. Trina was not able to join us today and this would have been her last official event as the outgoing Chair of Academic Council. So, please drop her a note and thank her for what was tremendous service for the last two years, and in particular over the last five or six months. Thank you all and enjoy the rest of your day and summer.