



Minutes of a called meeting of the Academic Council
Monday, August 4, 2025
Held via Zoom
1:00 – 2:00 PM

Mark Anthony Neal (Chair, Academic Council / African & African American Studies): Good afternoon, folks. I want to thank the Council members from both the 2024-25 Academic Council and the new Academic Council for 2025-26 for taking the time to join us this afternoon for this second called Academic Council meeting. I want to remind folks this second meeting is specifically to be in conversation with Provost Alec Gallimore, who was not able to attend the first called meeting in June. And of course, folks will want to know where things are going in terms of the strategic alignment, and particularly in light of some of the news that has come out about letters being directed towards Duke from the federal government in recent weeks. I'd like to begin by honoring a request from President Price to give a few opening comments before we get started. I'd also like to acknowledge the other university leaders who are on this Zoom, including the Executive Vice President Daniel Ennis. Vince, welcome.

Vince Price (President): Thank you, Mark. It's good to see everyone. I have just a few brief comments to make today. First, to acknowledge that this is a difficult time for many as we navigate a challenging financial and policy environment. And the Provost is here today to talk about the ways we're

remaining focused on maintaining our academic priorities as we move through our strategic realignment process. As I noted in my remarks to this Council back in March, as we were initiating this important realignment, our aim in this effort has been not only to seek cost reductions across the University as they are needed, but also to reimagine our work and consider the ways that we can ensure that all of our work is clearly aligned around our highest priorities. And we are fortunately moving through these rough financial and political waters in a position of both institutional and financial strength, both in absolute and relative terms compared with peers. But it's still very difficult work, most of all for those members of our community who are directly affected.

Our goal is, and it has been to maintain our strategic focus. We will find ways, even as we work to cut costs, to invest in funding student access and opportunity, to catalyze faculty research efforts and advance healthcare in our region, all of this, as we maintain our core commitment to a superior liberal education and our distinctive brand of residential undergraduate experience. Secondly, I recognize that Duke, alongside many of our peers, is navigating an increasingly complex landscape surrounding higher education and our broader research mission. Last week, as many of you know,

we received correspondence from the US Department of Education and the US Department of Health and Human Services regarding certain programs within the University and Duke Health. I know that this news is concerning to many, but Duke is committed to following the law. We've had a strong team in place to support us through this moment. As we head into a new academic year, I ask that you stay focused on the important work we do every day for our students, faculty, staff and community. I'm confident in our ability to navigate through this moment, and I want to express my deep thanks to all of you for your leadership and your continued focus on delivering on Duke's commitment to excellence. Thank you all for being here today and thank you for all that you're doing for Duke.

Neal: Thank you very much, Vince. Just a few ground rules for today. We'll be taking questions via the raise hand function. There's also a Q&A function, which will be monitored by my ECAC colleague Victoria Szabo. We will begin by posting a question that we received in advance. With that question posted for a minute or so, we will then move on to a response, additional comments from Provost Alec Gallimore, and then questions to be directed at the Provost.

QUESTION SUBMITTED TO BE ADDRESSED

"My continuing concern is that we are making structural realignments when we don't actually know what the financial burden is going to be (e.g., obvious points like the endowment tax potentially dropping to 8% from 21%). We are peremptorily doing damage on our ability especially to fulfill the teaching mission and support students (for example, we are losing our DGSA with no back up plan; and that's not

half so bad as what is happening in other programs). I know you and ECAC colleagues know this, but I have not heard anything strategic yet from the Provost on these points. For example, if the financial situation is not as bad will there be a process to decide on which priorities of the university will be refunded? In the meantime, is the Provost scaling back on his initiatives, such as AI? If not, how does he expect that to go forward with fewer faculty and staff support? Is that initiative going to go through a prioritization process that is led by faculty?"

Alec Gallimore (Provost): Thank you all for providing some time for us to meet and talk about the strategic realignment process. Just to echo again what was said before, this is an intensely challenging moment for the University and for higher education, and we are undertaking an opportunity, if you will, that we've been having to deal with - frankly, one that forces us, as we believe the right way to go forward is to reduce our workforce. But I also want to acknowledge the fact that there's tremendous uncertainty about what may come down the pike in terms of additional and regulatory burdens we may face. But one of our greatest assets that we have at this moment, without a doubt, is our shared governance. So, I appreciate you for taking time out of your busy summers to join this conversation.

This is quite a moment for higher education. And Duke is not new to that. We're seeing many of our peer institutions and other institutions forced to compromise core values, hollow out ambitions and retreat from the world, and I stand before you to say this is absolutely not what we're doing here at Duke University. And I know I speak for my colleagues, and none of us want to leave Duke University after our time in

leadership here in a state worse off than we found it, and I'm no exception to this.

So, what I thought we would do, to walk us through the conversation, is to talk about four questions. One, just to remind ourselves, how did we get here? Two, what's the latest? Just to keep you updated – what's going on? Three, what's the longer-term version that we have? And fourth, the importance of faculty governance and the role that faculty governance will continue to play.

So, how did we get here? We began the strategic realignment process about five months ago, and in fact, the first meeting we held after the President's Executive Leadership Group meeting was with ECAC on February 26 to talk about the need for this process. This process has been one in which we have been very deliberate in terms of engaging academic leadership. So, we worked with our deans, our center directors, our institute leaders and faculty members as much as possible to make sure that we do things in a strategic way as much as possible. We've engaged also with various forms of conversations with faculty governance tools, Academic Council and other faculty governance bodies. And this process has been quite iterative. It's been highly collaborative. We submit proposals and then we get feedback from our academic leaders. We refine and revise how we're doing things. We do all of these things with the lens towards preserving and protecting the academic integrity of Duke University and the academic units that the deans and other leaders represent. It absolutely forces us to look at what we're doing and how we're doing it, and it forces ourselves to ask this question - is there a better way of achieving the outcomes that we want? Asking ourselves if we can do a better job is not new to Duke University. We do a

number of reviews and reflections, but this urgency has forced us to do it at a new level. And some things key to note in terms of the times we're in right now: First of all, we are at a process now where Duke was early and proactive in doing things, and that puts us ahead of our peers. It gives us more flexibility time to make deliberate decisions, rather than having to be reactive in making cuts. Also I want to note that this has not been a one size fits all process. In other words, we're not applying a peanut butter approach here. Instead, we're using a strategic lens in terms of where we're making the reductions to make sure that we uphold our core values and academic mission with really an emphasis on student facing missions. We also wanted to prioritize our academic core, so our academic mission remains paramount. And we want to make sure that we safeguard what makes Duke great, our excellence in research, teaching and student engagement. And to that effect, the other thing we wanted to focus on was preserving key student facing functions. So, areas like student affairs are not seeing the same level of reductions, because we want to make sure that we maintain our reputation in terms of the services that we provide to our students. We've also identified areas in which we want to make sure that we protect the other elements of our academic mission. For example, protecting the library collections. While the library has certainly contributed in terms of the strategic alignment and the cost reductions associated with it, we've also done a process in which we wanted to protect the resources that directly support the faculty and student scholarship. I also want to make sure that we don't think about the notion of increasing efficiency in the lens of austerity. What we're doing is we're using this moment in which we're doubling down, looking at how we're doing things, and asking ourselves - can we be more

efficient as a way of stewardship, and it really does ensure that every dollar that supports Duke's mission, we do so and use it as effectively as possible. So, to that effect, no one is taking a bigger hit financially than central units in the Provost's Office. We are bearing as much of the brunt as possible, because what we want to do is to be as lean and efficient as possible, while we protect the front-line workers, the academic units in terms of doing the work that they do. So, we're also looking at the possibility of consolidating efforts in the Provost's Office to become more efficient as an institution. For example, we're looking at our academic centers. We're looking at the Nasher Museum, the smaller schools. We focused on areas of HR, business operations, finance, to find ways in which we can be more effective by spending less money at the same time. We're also looking at areas of risk mitigation as well. We've implemented programs to impact and mitigate the potential negative financial impact that Duke can see coming actually in the short term. Let me give you two examples of this. One is that we've been working with private lenders to make loans available to students in anticipation that the Grad PLUS programs might be eliminated. And a second one, realizing that many of our international students are having a difficult time getting their visas, we started this program in partnership with the deans, in which we allow our graduate students who cannot make it to the US in time for the regular start of the semester to begin their coursework online and not have to pay tuition until they arrive.

Let me shift now to a little bit of an update of where we are with a staff action, and the primary one we have so far is what's called VISIP - Voluntary Separation Incentive Program. We offered this Voluntary Separation Program to about 940 of our staff

members. To put this in context, we have, if you exclude the Health System, over 12,000 staff members. So, this represents not even 10% of the staff that we have in this area. Of the about 940 or so staff members who were offered the VISIP, about 600 accepted, or about 5% of the staff workforce. We were very happy with around a 64% uptick in the VSIP, and we're hoping that that will minimize the number of RIFs (Reduction in Force) that we're going to have to make, or involuntary separation moves we have to make to the staff. We're working through that process right now, and we'll be able to report on this in the not-too-distant future.

Let me focus now on the faculty action side of things, and there are two programs to focus on. One is solely in the School of Medicine, which is called the Faculty Separation Incentive Program, and the other represents the other nine academic units, the Faculty Retirement Incentive Program. What we did is we offered these programs to about 275 faculty members across the 10 colleges and schools. So far, about 40 or so have accepted these offers. And again, to give you context, we have at Duke about 1650 tenure and tenure-track faculty members and almost 2600 other regular ranked faculty members. So again, it represents a small fraction of our faculty body.

Now, even though percentages seem small, we understand the pain disruptions are causing. And I have to acknowledge that this time is very difficult for Duke University, and it goes beyond the people who are leaving Duke or have left Duke. It actually extends to people who are here and the notion of survivor's guilt and the continued uncertainty and anxiety we face. We're holding a number of sessions, Q&A sessions and workshops providing counseling with members of our leadership team and other

members of our community to help manage how we get through this very difficult time, especially providing support to our supervisors, managers and the department chairs. These are substantial reductions. There's no doubt about it. And they will have an impact on the academic mission in the short term. In fact, in reviewing in detail each of the reports and the plans that were submitted by the deans recently, one of the things that comes out is our deans may be asking more of you in the short term, more of our faculty members, higher teaching loads, perhaps less support staff, greater patience. Unfortunately, you're going to see some things that are going to be problematic in the short term. You're going to see reductions in internal turnaround times for administrative matters. You may actually see some things that are making your work a little bit more difficult. Our North Star, though, what we're trying to do is, we're trying to minimize the impact on the student experience throughout this process. One of the things I'll talk about, and we can discuss later on in the Q&A session is our work on AI and automation to help minimize the negative impact of the strategic alignment, the reduction in workforce is going to have on our workflows. But even this won't happen overnight. One of the things that we're engaging in as well, and we're continuing engaging in, is the notion that some of our staff members are going to be doing more individually, and therefore they should be recognized for this. So, reclassifying staff members throughout Duke University is something that David Bowersox (Vice Provost for Finance and Administration) and his team are working with the school CFOs and HR leadership this month. We've already made some of these changes when it was imperative. We do that, but we will be doing that in the context of still making sure we minimize any change to the funding envelope

associated with the strategic realignment. We'll need to make very difficult choices – there's no doubt about it - around our programs or project initiatives, and we just simply won't be able to support quite as many new initiatives out of the schools, [UIC](#), or the central units like the Provost's Office. One thing, though, is historically, we've not been great at shutting down things after we've started them, even shutting them down after they've outlived their usefulness. We're now forced to exercise this level of discipline. Although we've had a strong process so far, with a tight timeline that you're seeing with the various staff and faculty programs I just mentioned, I want to remind you that this is a multi-year process - - that is schools and units have multiple years, typically three years or so, to achieve their strategic alignment. And as such, there's opportunities that we built into the system to adjust and pivot as needed.

One aspect of the question submitted was, if the financial situation isn't as bad, will there be processes in place to decide which parties of the University will be refunded? Things that we stopped doing, maybe we'll start up again? I wish I didn't have to say the following, but I have to say that all of our intelligence thus far suggests that it's way too early to entertain such a notion. The current environment is way too fluid. It's unpredictable, and frankly, we're at a time where it just does not allow us to take our foot off the driver's pedal right now. Therefore, the intent is to stay the course, to make decisions collaboratively with the faculty, deans, department chairs and unit leaders to the fullest extent possible. Let me talk about another element of this question, which is the longer-term vision. Frankly, many of us in the leadership, if not all of us in the leadership, we view this as a moment for Duke University. Many other institutions and our peers are, frankly, bogged down,

and they're reacting, and some of them are actually paralyzed. But Duke is not. By exercising fiscal restraint and starting early, we're making sure we don't sacrifice our key elements, and that Duke is well positioned to take advantage of the aftermath of this moment, regardless of what it looks like. In other words, we're managing the challenges of today while plotting the course for a brighter future. In fact, the fact that we use the term strategic realignment is for that reason. We are being strategic in everything that we do. At the same time, even though they're going to be some challenges and there's going to be some short-term pain and changes in the long term, I believe we must continue to make strategic investments in key priorities, particularly in those areas in which we have an opportunity through philanthropy to find other sources of funding, other than the federal government. One such area is people. So yes, we have reduced the employees that we have here at Duke University slightly, but we're still investing in our people. We've provided the normal merit raise increase. We're protecting benefits like the college tuition support and robust retirement plans, and we are still hiring faculty members, and my expectation is that we'll continue to do so. President Price mentioned access to our undergraduates. Only about four years ago or so, our incoming class comprised about 11 or 12% people who were eligible for Pell. That number is now almost 24%, but it comes at a fiscal price. So, in FY 26, to maintain our commitment to the access to Duke University, we have increased our financial aid by 12%, to over \$200 million, because we have a commitment to making sure Duke is accessible to students who have the talent and work ethic to get here. We're investing in our research enterprise. We're spending over \$600 million in facility renewals over the next five years. We're

adding capacity to our libraries. We're improving our museum. We're also doubling down on improving our instructional research buildings, like Reuben-Cooke Building, Biological Sciences Building and Hudson Hall Engineering Building as well. And there are also a number of academic priorities that are continuing to go forward. Let me talk about a few of them right here. One is we're in the process of developing a university wide strategy in AI. In May, we rolled out a suite of Duke-managed AI tools, and we've provided equitable access to all of our students, and a large fraction of our staff and faculty members have access to OpenAI ChatGPT-4o. We've also created an AI boot camp for academic leaders, so the academic leaders at Duke University can fully take advantage of this new and amazing technology. And I will be charging the faculty AI Initiative and Steering Committee later this month to focus on the four key areas that Duke is engaged in AI. When I started as Provost, even right before I started, I heard about the fact that Duke didn't have a coherent plan for a global framework going forward. We are now in the process of creating that. In May, we wrapped up a year-long strategic engagement on Global Duke with our Board of Trustees, and we also reconstituted the Global Priorities Committee, and we created a new committee to help us think about DKU. In fact, over the summer, a subset of the Global Priorities Committee is looking at administrative structures and central coordination efforts that are needed to support their recommendations, as well as those that emerge from our activity with the Board of Trustees. The DKU Advisory Committee I referred to just now is helping us prepare for the renegotiation of our operating agreement that starts this fall. Another area of focus this year is Duke Science and Technology, which we call

Duke DST 2.0. This is going to be another year-long strategic engagement with the Board to think about the next phase of science and technology at Duke. It'll help us identify, shape and even evaluate transformative ideas. And here are some ideas that we're thinking about and focusing on: One, of course, the future of medicine, but the future of medicine in a technologically rich area, especially with AI. We already have a lead in quantum technology and innovation. How do we continue to accelerate that lead? How do we make quantum technology something that's available to everybody? And then the notion of transforming, not only our research in competition in AI, but our education, something we've described earlier as the C-School initiative. Speaking of our superpowers - talk about interdisciplinary, which is Duke's superpower. Last year, Duke was ranked number five in the world for interdisciplinary science, according to the *Times Higher Education*, and we're continuing to invest in that. And I want to talk about two programs that will enhance our already incredible superpowers in this area. In June of this year, we chose three faculty-led projects to receive multi-year interdisciplinary upgrades. You can think of these as big bets that were starting to germinate early on through significant funding over three years that we hope will lead to major efforts. We're doing these big bets in critical minerals technology, rural health, and the use of data science and AI to accelerate drug discovery. We're also making a big bet in terms of interdisciplinary PhD graduate education, thanks to an \$8 million gift from the Duke Endowment. In these areas, what we're looking at is, how do we train PhD students to be true interdisciplinary scholars? And we're focusing in areas like trustworthy and reliable AI, the intersection of climate and global health and data science and AI for the

public sector. And then there's our new center for community engaged research, which is a great model for Town and Gown relationships, as it allows us to work with our local community and ramp up community-based scholarship and research like never before. Oh, did I mention we're looking for two new deans? So, we have important searches in Fuqua and Sanford, and these are critically important that we get right as well. And then finally, thanks again to the Duke Endowment which provided a \$2 million gift, we have a major program that we're continuing on Pluralism, Free Inquiry and Belonging which is aimed at expanding opportunities for constructive discourse across the campus. You'll be seeing we have new leadership in those areas, and also that we'll be launching a number of very exciting programs for our faculty, students and staff. And I would be remiss if I didn't mention an amazing hire that we brought to Duke University. Deborah Rutter, the former President of the Kennedy Center, is starting September 1st as the new Vice Provost for the Arts. She's going to have an amazingly large vision of not only, Arts at Duke University, but in the Triangle area. So, I hope you get a sense that we are continuing to accelerate Duke's vision and take advantage of Duke's ethos as a university grounded in liberal arts with an exceptional student experience, a university that is tackling the toughest challenges of our time through research and collaboration and authentically engaged with each other, our local community and our world. And I also want to make sure that you get a sense that we are not shrinking Duke's vision whatsoever, no matter how challenging these moments are.

Finally, let me end with an important topic, which is the role of faculty governance. I firmly believe that we can emerge from this moment as a stronger institution, but I also

firmly believe we won't do it without partnership with faculty governance as being our North Star. That means continuing to have conversations like this one, and regular meetings that members of the leadership team have with Mark and ECAC. It also means engaging with other faculty governance councils and bodies. For example, the Arts and Science Council, who I met with twice in the last few months. And even the small dinners that I have with faculty members are an opportunity to interact with faculty members and understand their needs. These conversations absolutely have to be two ways. I would invite faculty members not only to let their local leadership know what's not working, which is feedback we know is vitally important, but when you think of ideas for saving, scaling back or doing things more effectively, those are things we need to hear from you equally well. Don Taylor (Sanford School of Public Policy) put me in touch, and I think Mark Anthony Neal as well, with the work from Professor Kevin McClure, a scholar at UNC-Wilmington, who studies higher education, and he did a podcast on the notion of shared faculty governance as a democratic process, frankly, that more workforces should emulate. And he describes that governance as a practice. There are pressures from the outside of getting rid of faculty governance in higher education and I say at Duke University, we're more committed to faculty governance than ever, but it's a practice, and if it's a practice, that means, if we're going to do it well, we have to commit to working together and engaging in it and practicing it as much as possible, and recognizing that through shared faculty governance, we have an opportunity to collaborate on shaping the future of this institution.

Let me close by saying, as your Provost, I'm grateful for the commitment we have to

effectively share what we're thinking about going forward, and the commitment we have collectively for shared governance. I look forward to continuing Duke's long tradition of faculty administrators working together as we navigate these choppy waters that we have in front of us. And with that, I'll close and turn it back to you, Mark and see if there are any questions or comments.

Neal: Thank you, Alec, for those introductory comments, and I will now open it up to my colleagues for specific questions to the Provost.

Cam Harvey (Fuqua School of Business): I'd like to pick up on the Provost's last point about shared governance, which I think is very important. Many have heard me say this before, but I want to repeat and pose a very specific question. In relatively good times, the decentralized model of university governance works fine. In times of crisis, its shortcomings are revealed. Realignment largely involves resource allocation and strategic choices need to be made, and those choices are largely made at the university level. For example, it would be problematic to fully delegate to the divisions. University leadership in collaboration with the faculty needs to develop a plan, relay the realignment decisions to the divisions, and then the divisions can optimize given the constraints and opportunities. I've been critical in Council about the 2030 strategic plan which failed to identify and address the major risks facing Duke. My specific question is whether the President and Provost will strike a new strategy committee in the fall to reimagine Duke? Given our tradition of shared governance, I hope the development of a new strategy would involve a partnership of the faculty and the administration.

Price: I'm certainly open to any high-level conversations. I want to make sure that whatever we do, we operate through the mechanisms we already have in place, ECAC and Academic Council, for example. And can I take your point that decentralization perhaps operates more effectively during times where you have less stresses on the system. But I do believe, very strongly, that overly centralized decision making has its own challenges. The realignment process itself, I think, stands as a model of how we attempt to balance that centralized decision making against the strategic interests of each school, because the interests of each school vary dramatically. And what we did is develop financial planning models, shared those with ECAC and this body - Academic Council in the spring, arrived at targets and handed those over to the leadership of the units, not just the schools, by the way, all administrative units, and asked them to think about how they, in light of their priorities, could best achieve those reduction targets, rather than prescribe those directions from on high as it were. We didn't stop there. Those plans were shared back with Alec and his team, with Daniel Ennis (Executive Vice President) and his team. So, I think it's this constant interplay between highly centralized strategic planning and planning at the unit level, that is the school level, that makes this work. I'm certainly open to this, happy to have a conversation about whatever bodies make sense. That being said, I don't want to reinvent the wheel, because we do have bodies. We have the University Priorities Committee. We have a number of vehicles that have demonstrated over time here at Duke that they do very good effective shared governance work. Yes, I'm certainly open to Cam's suggestions. And more than anything else, what I want to do is channel as much of this activity through the existing organizations

and structures of shared governance as possible, so that we don't run afoul of overly centralized planning. And Alec, I'd be happy to have your comments, Daniel, and any others. But I see a number of hands are raised. And this is meeting of the Provost, not a meeting of the President.

Gallimore: I'll just reiterate what you said, I think actually, the process that we've engaged in to get at this point was extraordinarily interactive and collaborative with the academic units. And I won't say it was centralized by any means, but there was a lot of central guidance associated with vast amount of input from the academic leaders.

Terry Oas (Biochemistry / member of ECAC): Thank you for that explanation. I just like to point out, or really ask the question, what role does faculty governance play in decentralized decision making? Given the role that you, Alec have emphasized for the units that the schools and the institutes in this process, that seems to imply that a body like Academic Council and ECAC, which are both advisory to the central decision-making process may not be the effective faculty governance tool that is needed at this time. So, I'm wondering what you think the school level faculty governance bodies should play, and to what extent each of the schools have such a body that functions in an effective way?

Gallimore: Arts and Sciences, of course, has a Council as an example. At least in the Provost's Office, let's just focus on the college and schools for now, we worked with the deans. And our expectation working with the deans is that they were engaging with their leaders and their vehicles of faculty governance that they have at their disposal. When we have found examples in which that process was not as robust, shall we say, that we feel it should

be, we have given that feedback to the deans. And Terry, I think you're aware of a case when we were able to do that. In my discussion with ECAC very recently, it became abundantly clear that there was probably a need to double down and reinforce that discussion with the deans, because if you think of this Academic Council, ECAC, and other bodies that we have, they support the University writ large in general, but each of the academic units need to have some sort of engagement with the faculty to make the best decisions for their units that feed into the overall collective decision making for the institution. So, when we find opportunities to enhance that capability, and I look towards you, the Academic Council, and ECAC in particular to let us know when we have those opportunities. I'll be working with Mohamed Noor (Executive Vice Provost) and others to make sure that they act accordingly, like what we have done so far.

Jocelyn Olcott (History): I wanted to follow up on these questions about faculty governance, since that's what I understand to be the main focus. I'd like us to hear the Provost dig down a little deeper on the process of faculty governance. I'll give you three examples that are top of mind. One was the kind of near elimination of the Center for Latin American & Caribbean Studies (CLACS), where the entire staff was VISPed, just kind of folded into be a small program within Romance Studies. It had been quite robust, with folks from Nicholas School and across the Trinity and other schools, and has its own endowment, very successful getting major grants, very successful in training graduate students and undergraduates. So, what was the process in deciding effectively to eliminate that program or to make it into this tiny thing? The second about the libraries. I served on

the Library Council, and the Library Council meetings were canceled for months, and so all these decisions being made with huge effects on the libraries, and as far as I can tell, faculty weren't consulted on those. The third and perhaps most pressing one is this question about how the AI program is being developed and rolled out. And part of my concern about that is that I think the way that a lot of teaching faculty are experiencing that is not as a labor saver, but as a huge cause for concern about what that means for how we teach students in disciplines where we don't want them to be leaning too heavily on AI. And I think it has huge implications for the STEM disciplines, which is basically all that Provost Gallimore talked about. But in those disciplines, students who only are learning about AI as a way to do things run the risk of becoming easily replaced by AI if they're not engaging with some of the more humanistic questions that I think we want them to bring to the table. So, on those three things, if you could just give some more sense of the process. I think a lot of faculty are feeling like it's very obscure how these decisions were made, and nobody's really taking responsibility for some of the bigger decisions. Thank you.

Gallimore: Let me answer the third question first. I really appreciate that question, because I think there's a bit of a misunderstanding about what the AI initiative is all about. The AI initiative is certainly not to go into your classroom and say this is what you should be teaching or forcing you to use AI. It's never been about that. The role of AI pedagogy is still an open question. People do not really understand what role AI should be playing. So, it'd be inappropriate for the Provost's Office to say you have to use AI. What we're trying to do is we're trying to provide as many resources and tools as possible through faculty-centered activity committees, such that if

you're an instructor, if you're a faculty member for research or instruction, if you want to use AI, we're providing the tools. We're providing not only in terms of the software and things like that, but the knowledge associated with how to integrate it. That's the activities that we have engaged and that's solely what it's about. The training program I talked about was for the Deans and the Vice Provosts and leadership, so that they have a better understanding of AI, warts and all, the capabilities, but also the limitations, so that when they think about utilizing AI in their units, not only for administrative functions, but also supporting their faculty members for teaching and research whatever, they have a better understanding of what AI is capable of doing. So again, you decide what's in your classroom. All we're trying to do is give you more options of using AI.

Mohamed Noor (Executive Vice Provost):

Thanks for the question, Jocelyn. Let me start on CLACS. By the way, I should say I love CLACS. Liliana Paredes (Faculty Director of CLACS)'s work has been phenomenal there. And yes, it's done a lot of wonderful things, and I hope it will continue to, because to be clear, it is not going away, although it is being downsized. Let me go back to Alec's point from earlier on, that generally speaking, we were trying to take a bigger hit in the central area and this is central because this was under the Office of Global Affairs. We're taking a bigger hit centrally, because we're trying to preserve those mostly front-facing academic units, like academic departments, like Romance Studies and things like that. So, that was the reason that even came up as a proposal that we would need to downsize a little bit more heavily there and in the other places. You're right, CLACS does have several endowments, things like that. So, in terms of process, you asked about the process piece.

There were multiple conversations internally, what we call these strategic cross cutting groups among the administration to identify what areas that could be cut. We did actually go through various faculty governance process. I spoke with both ECASC (Executive Committee Arts & Sciences Council), as well as with ECAC, before anybody got any VSIP announcements, and just said, look, I think this is what I have to do, I'm running this by you, and I got some feedback. To be clear, I'm not trying to put the blame on them. The decision there, this fell to me ultimately, but there was definitely a lot of consultation before the final implementation on that. Finally, in terms of the actual implementation. It's true that everybody got the VSIP offer, but as you probably know, multiple staff are continuing on, and some of them continue to be funded, even by the Provost's Office, as a significant transition period, just to make sure the programming can be continuous. Unfortunately, some of the endowments we have can't actually apply to salary. That's one of the issues we've had with that. So, it'll still be continuing programming, things like that, but we're trying to make it as seamless as possible. It is going to be smaller, which is sad, and it does truly break my heart that's the case, but unfortunately, that's the hand we've been dealt, not internally but by external forces. But I hope that answers your question. Feel free to ask more on it.

Gallimore: Thanks Mohammed. Let me just briefly jump on to talk about the library as well. That was one of the subjects that Joe Salem, our librarian and I, talked to the Trinity Arts and Sciences Council, because we've gotten feedback from the faculty that there was some concern about the continued effectiveness of the library to be able to conduct its research. My understanding, based on that interaction, was that people

were satisfied. If you're hearing otherwise, please let me know, and I'll work with Joe on this. But we did make an effort through meeting with the faculty, the Arts and Science Council to talk about what we're doing with the collections and other resources in the library. And the library took a smaller cut than other elements in the Provost's area precisely because we want to preserve the ability of the library to serve our faculty members.

Neal: Thank you, Alec and Mohammed. Question from the Q&A queue: "I am curious how much of the cost savings from the VSIP and comparable faculty opportunities will be offset by the cost of 1. new faculty hires; 2. new deans/packages; 3. recognition for staff, taking new roles/potential enhanced HR levels and reimbursement; and 4. new programs (three faculty projects) - perhaps not as much cost savings as we might have hoped necessitating more involuntary separations?"

Gallimore: That's a very complicated question with a lot of different elements. I would say, all those things are part of the mix that we're looking at and we have pretty elaborate plans for each of the academic units, the centers, the institutes, etc. There are different buckets that we're looking at. Most of the goals are attained through reductions and expenditures. Some are actually in enhancements in revenue generations, things like enhance the number of transfers to Trinity College, more master's students and things of that nature. So, I would say it's a mix and match and a lot of different things. It's a dynamic process. And I want to reiterate, the schools and the college have about two or three years by large to achieve their goals, and as we get more information, we will be making adjustments accordingly.

Harvey Cohen (School of Medicine / member of ECAC): Thank you for the comments. I'd like to return for a minute to follow up on what Terry Oas mentioned, as well as some other things that have been said subsequently, and it has to do with the faculty governance at the unit levels. Because, as we've discovered in recent weeks, as ECAC has been discussing this, while it is true that the faculty governance bodies do exist at many but not necessarily all of the units. They have tended to act very reactively, as opposed to proactively. And this is a message to the rest of the faculty on the call, not necessarily to the leadership, that if we expect there to be effective faculty governance, we need to be sure that each of those councils is given the message that they should be active participants in decision making in their units, and that they shouldn't necessarily wait for things to be ruled for them, but they should be actively seeking discussions with the unit leaders about issues that they find important, like reorganization or strategic realignment, etc. So, I think we, as faculty, need to take some role in this and encourage those units to be proactive in that way. I know the example you gave to Terry, the Basic Sciences group in the School of Medicine had been a group largely reactive and with some prodding, with issues happening, became much more active and proactive. And I think that's something I would hope, Alec, that you would talk with the leadership to have them understand that you support the idea of these councils being proactive and really interacting, and not just be bodies that people run in a few things by occasionally, and that the faculty talk with people in their units to make sure that those councils operate that way. Thank you.

Neal: Thank you, Harvey. Another question from the queue: "I realize there are different funding sources. I am curious about the

“look” of incoming football player with NIL deal to incoming quarterback of \$8 million over two years while offering faculty (at least some with tenure) to take early separation, with “potential” to move to non-voluntary separation?”

Gallimore: These are all very complicated situations, and Duke does not operate in a vacuum. Duke operates in the context of higher education at large, in terms of how athletics works, etc. So, I understand the challenge with the optics and I’m not the head of Athletics here, and I’m not saying that out of a defensive posture. It’s just that all of us in leadership are trying to operate as effectively as we can to advance the various missions, including the athletic missions of Duke University. There are multiple sources of funds that support those things. We have to operate in the context of our competition. And I will leave it at that. I see the President may have some things to chime in on that.

Price: I recognize the optics are challenging. There are a number of optics associated with what higher education is going through today that present challenges. I’ll just say a couple things about Athletics. One is that it is a very significant part of Duke’s overall brand as it were, our positioning, support of alumni, etc. We are fortunate actually, to have very significant flows of funding into Athletics that make it, particularly given the size of the Athletic program, less expensive than most institutions. So, the things that look problematic that are associated with “big time sports” have one benefit, and that is that there are actually revenues associated with big time sports, that are generally not associated with the larger enterprise. We had a faculty committee, a joint committee of members from the Athletic Council and members from UPC (University Priorities

Committee) help think about how we should navigate in this go forward world after the house settlement. I don’t want to go into details, but their guidance was very helpful, with focus on increasing scholarships, rather than the envelope of NIL funding. I will also say that this is a moving target. It just continually changes, and we’re currently competing at a high level with far less by way of a resource envelope than most institutions. So, I grant it is challenging. We’re doing, I think, extraordinarily well in that particular marketplace. And as we do everything at Duke, we channel this through our own internal sense of our values, what drives Duke’s commitments to excellence. We have engaged the Board of Trustees as well as the faculty. So, it’s another example of an attempt to lean on shared governance where we can, to make these decisions. But they are separate forms of revenue. I wouldn’t say they’re entirely separate. Our colleagues down the street actually have different allocations that come from the legislature. That’s not quite the situation at Duke. But we are working to manage those funds very well, so that they do not impinge in any way, shape or form, on the quality of the academic enterprise. The final thing I’ll say is Athletics was and has been part of our strategic realignment, and they have been making cuts as well. So, within Athletics, we have optical challenges, because even as student athletes are receiving these NIL deals, the Athletics areas are rolling through VISPs, Reductions in Force, etc., at the same time. Just a few comments on that front, but I appreciate it. It is challenging.

Noor: I think, Mark, in the last two sentences, you said something like faculty retirement incentives to be followed by involuntary reductions, to be clear, I just want to make sure everybody hears, there is no plan for involuntary reductions of the

people who received the Faculty Retirement Incentives. I just want to put that out there.

Neal: Thank you for that clarification, Mohamed.

Josh Sosin (Classical Studies): Thanks everyone for this opportunity. I had in mind to ask about what kinds of conversations we're having with our peer institutions, potential avenues for collaborative solutions especially in the light of recent, frankly terrifying, news out of University of Chicago about what realignment looks like there. But I feel like the governance question is not yet quite done, to my satisfaction. The opportunity for consultation, sometimes collaboration in the context of APC (Academic Programs Committee), UPC (University Priorities Committee), ECAC is precious. Anyone who has sat in those rooms here knows this to be true. One of the things that we heard in ECAC and UPC last year from Daniel Ennis (Executive Vice President) repeatedly, was that the exercise that we're doing now is not a short fix. You know this is why what we're doing now is different from what we did under Covid, because we think that, like the fundamental rules of this enterprise are changing, not for a year, not for four, but will have more lasting impact to that. And these committees - APC, UPC, even ECAC, are mostly charged in this way to respond to plans that are underway, rather than to do the laborious creative work of imagining a new future. It's not obvious to me that these committees, excellent though they are at their work, are ideally suited to the project of imagining where we're going to be 20 years from now. For all that it might not have done, this to Cam's point, that the work of the 2030 Committee was nonetheless squarely in the hands of faculty. We've been saying a lot about settings that are very often consultative, and that is excellent. We can't

live without those. But that's not necessarily the same kind of process as go away into a dark room and do the hard work of imagining something that can serve us for the future. So, I continue to think that the existing mechanisms that we have, APC, UPC, ECAC, the school councils and all of that, are invaluable for the work that they do, but the scope and dimension of the project that's in front of us is bigger than they alone are going to be able to sustain.

Gallimore: I appreciate that. I'll echo what President Price just said, food for thought. And let's take that back and process what we've heard. But I understand your point and appreciate it.

Victoria Szabo (Art, Art History, & Visual Studies / member of ECAC):

Question from the Q&A queue: "Within the current environment, does Duke Kunshan with its location in China, create more of a target than an opportunity?"

Gallimore: We're doing a fair amount of work, both internally with the DKU Committee I just mentioned, as well as external consultants, managing that process as best as we can. We are spending a lot of time investigating scenarios, gathering information about how pockets of the federal government views DKU. Fortunately, unlike other institutions that have been recently shut down, DKU is not an engineering technology focused enterprise. It's essentially a liberal arts, undergraduate focused college. But we are gathering input based on our external consultants and also taking in as much information as possible - both internally to Duke as well as what's going on nationally - to try to guide our decisions as we enter these negotiations starting in the fall for the next phase of DKU. We have to incorporate all that information and all that information

assessment into that going forward. But it's a dynamic situation, without a doubt.

Stefani Engelstein (German Studies):

Thank you both to the Provost and the President for being here and talking to us about these questions. I have to admit, I'm not sure that this is the perfect forum for this, but since AI has come up so much, I wanted to follow up on Jocelyn's question about AI, because the suggestion that people can do what they want in their classrooms would seem to presuppose that we had the option of ignoring that AI is there and we obviously don't. I have spent more time on my syllabus in the last few weeks than since I was a new faculty member 20 years ago, trying to figure out how to continue to teach students who have access to this technology. I'm not going to speak for any other discipline, each discipline approaches different kinds and methods of thought, and my own branch of my discipline that is done through reading, slowly and figuring out how text works in the order in which it's presented. Because we live in a world where there are lots and lots of cultural production of texts and images, and if we can't understand how they function, we can't be agents in that world, right? But now students can simply ask AI to provide them a summary, right? So, they will not digest and think thoroughly. They won't learn how to do that. They won't learn how to be agents in the world. They'll just be subject to its manipulation. The same thing is true of writing. Writing is not a way of summarizing results that you've gotten from an experiment. Writing is how you tease out what you actually believe, why you believe it, and whether you can support it. And without writing as a tool, it is very hard to figure out how one can teach that. It feels like I'm trying to answer questions that are much bigger than me. And I wonder if this is part, I guess I'm suggesting that I think it

should be part of any AI initiative to think about the institutional supports for still being able to do that kind of teaching, not being a Luddite, right? I'm not saying no one should use AI. I'm trying to say, how can we still teach students to be reflective agents in the world. Things that have popped into my mind are very comfortable rooms with couches and coffee where students read in community. So that it is normed for them to still read slowly and with no internet access. We had computer labs when I was in school, because not everyone had their own computer, but computer labs with no internet access so that we can write. These are institutional level things that it's not clear to me who is thinking about them on campus, other than each individual teacher staring at their computer and wondering how I design a class this semester.

Gallimore: Yes. So, the initiatives I was referred to, the initiative on AI, these are precisely the kind of problems that we're trying to tackle with those faculty committees. To go one step further, you can even imagine having a shielded classroom that you can't even get cell phone access to and things like that. We've been thinking about exactly how to integrate AI into everything we do. I want to make it clear, one of the reasons why we provided ChatGPT to all students is a couple of things. One, students were using and misusing AI. It was not equitable. And AI is here. There's just no doubt about it. So, what we're trying to do with this initiative is to do precisely what you talk about, a couple of things, one, how do we assist faculty members in terms of recognition that AI is a part of their being, doesn't matter if you're studying engineering or you're a historian or in another field of the liberal arts, what's the best way of utilizing AI, what are the best practices of utilizing AI. The only thing though, is we want to make sure that as

much as possible, we also educate faculty members themselves on the use of AI, so that AI is not treated and looked at as a black box, that there's a better understanding of how to use AI. And out of this work, there may very well come the need for specialized facilities, specialized testing methods and things of that nature. I have these discussions. I'm sure my other counterparts have these discussions across the country. Everyone is still struggling trying to figure out how best to use AI, because in any new technology, you have foundational information that was gleaned and you developed before they added this new technology, and then this new technology comes, and it builds on that foundation. We're at a time now where this new technology is replacing that foundation and unequally, and we're trying to get our arms around that. I'm so glad you asked that question, because this is something that we are literally wrestling with, and have been wrestling with for the better part of about two years, trying to figure out how to support you all in this new world that we live in.

Neal: Thank you for your question, Stefani. Thank you, Alec, for your response. We're a little past time. And I want to be respectful of everyone's time, particularly in the last moments of our summer. If Victoria could read the one last question about VISPs, and that'll be it for the afternoon.

Szabo: Question from the Q&A queue: "Last Thursday, some extraordinary talents walked out the door as a result of the VSIP. I understand that there is a three-year embargo on staff reapplying. Is there any wiggle room on that? Could exceptions be made to recruit truly excellent talent back in other positions?"

Gallimore: We've thought long and hard about this process, and I think the answer is no, as of now. There's no wiggle room right now. What we're looking at is the notion of for staff members who do remain and have to back fill and support others, we're looking at the possibility of recategorizing them, reclassifying them. We're looking at providing other resources. We may need to do that. But unfortunately, that is just the reality that we have. And we designed this process with the three-year time horizon, and we see no evidence that we're going to change that at the moment.

Neal: Thank you, Provost Gallimore. Thank you, President Price. Though he did not speak, thank you, Executive Vice President Daniel Ennis. I'm sure many of you obviously have more financial questions and concerns. Daniel Ennis and his team will be addressing us at our first in-person Academic Council meeting in September, and hopefully we'll have some clarification, particularly as the RIFs will be finished by that point in time. Thank you to my colleagues on ECAC who have been working and meeting throughout the summer and thank you for the Academic Council members who joined us this afternoon for this conversation with Provost Gallimore. Thank you all, and have a good and safe rest of the summer.