



**Minutes of the Academic Council Meeting
Thursday, November 16, 2023**

Trina Jones (Chair, Academic Council / Law School): Good afternoon and thank you for being here today. ECAC and I hope that you are all as well as circumstances allow and that this beautiful fall weather is bringing you some joy. We are going to spend a lot of time together in November. We have another meeting scheduled in two weeks on November 30th. So, we look forward to seeing you then. The reason we have two meetings in November is to make sure that we get all necessary business handled that requires our approvals before those go to the Board of Trustees who meet in early December. As you can see, we have a full agenda today.

APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 19 MEETING MINUTES

So, let's get started with our most pressing item, which is to approve the minutes from our October 19th meeting. Are there any corrections to the minutes? May I have a motion to approve those minutes? A second? All in favor, please say yes. Any opposed, say no. Any abstentions? Thank you.

(Minutes approved by voice vote with no dissent)

VOTE ON THE PROPOSAL FROM THE DUKE MARGOLIS CENTER FOR HEALTH POLICY TO TRANSITION TO AN INSTITUTE

Next on our agenda is a vote pertaining to the proposal from the Margolis Center for Health Policy to transition to an Institute. The supporting materials that were posted for last month's presentation were posted again with today's agenda along with two questions that we received from faculty after the October 19th meeting. And your questions were excellent and I thought I would share them with you. It may be a little hard to read them, but the first question goes to whether the Institute anticipates providing primary appointments for faculty. And you see their response here and I'll just give you a few seconds to absorb that response in case you didn't see this on the agenda. Then the second question relates to the interaction between Margolis and Sanford. Will Sanford continue to have health policy or will all of their health policy move to the Margolis Institute? How will decisions be made on which program? Faculty might go to each entity - would an alternative opportunity be as a division within Sanford? If both will continue to work in health policy will this potentially adversely impact Sanford's efforts in health policy? Then again, the Margolis leaders gave a comprehensive and thoughtful response to this question. Are there any additional questions for Mark McClellan, Director of the Margolis Center and Gillian Schmidler, Deputy Director, who are here with us today. Okay, then let's proceed to the vote.

(Proposal for the Duke Margolis Center for Health Policy to transition to an Institute approved by voice vote with no dissent)

PRESENTATION OF A PROPOSAL FOR AN EXECUTIVE MASTERS OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS DEGREE FROM THE SANFORD SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY

Jones: Moving right along, the next agenda item is a proposal from the leadership of the Sanford School of Public Policy for an Executive Masters Degree of Public Affairs. The related supporting materials were posted with our agenda and Asher Hildebrand and Marc Hart are here to present the request. Dean Judith Kelly is also here as well. This proposal has made its way through the Academic Programs Committee [APC] and now comes before the Council to consider. We will vote on this item at our November 30th meeting.

Asher Hildebrand (Assistant Director of Graduate Studies in the Sanford School of Public Policy MPP Program):

Thank you, Madam Chair and thank you to everybody for your time and attention today. I'm Asher Hildebrand, an Associate Professor of the Practice at Sanford and the designated faculty liaison for the development of this proposal. I'm going to lead the presentation and then I'll ask my colleagues, Mark Hart, the Director of Digital Learning and Judith, our Dean, to join me up here during the question and answer period.

We're going to hit, kind of, some of the highlights of the proposal; what we consider to be the most important aspects. This won't include every single section of the report that you've seen, but if we miss anything that you feel is essential, please ask us during the question and answer.

We'd like to begin this story with a letter from Joel Fleishman to Terry Sanford in 1970 outlining Fleischman's vision for the Sanford School. And in this letter, he talks about the value of a rich program for mid-career students from the world of public affairs, not just for those students, but also for other students in other programs. So, this is an idea that is literally older than the Sanford School itself, but in its modern history it dates to 2019 when a faculty task force, convened by Dean Kelly, conducted a top to bottom review of Sanford's Graduate and Professional Programs and identified, as its main recommendation, taking immediate next steps to create a hybrid mid-career program. Subsequently, a series of faculty and staff ad hoc working groups have met to develop that recommendation into the proposal before you today. This has been a broadly inclusive and organic process that has collectively involved more than 50 Sanford faculty and staff, as well as many others from units across campus, including units with missions that are similar or aligned with this one, such as the Fuqua School, the nonprofit Leadership Program, and the Office of Learning Innovation. Of course, that wasn't the only thing happening over the last few years. The COVID 19 pandemic both accelerated trends toward digital and online learning, and also gave us all a dose of what it's like to teach online and some early experience with this. In addition, Sanford launched its own first foray into the hybrid midcareer space, with a small program targeted to mid-career national security professionals. And our early experience with that program has fundamentally informed the proposal you have before you today.

So, what is the rationale for the program? It's essentially fivefold. First, it would advance our core mission by training an important population of public servants not reached by our current programs, as the letter from Fleishman to Sanford indicates. Second, it would enhance the school's relevance and competitiveness in an evolving market, as we'll see in a moment. This is an area where Duke has fallen pretty far behind some of its peers. Third, it would generate new revenue for the school. And we would not be here if this were the only case, right? We believe the mission case has always been there. We also believe that the financial case is stronger today than it's ever been. Both because of greater needs, but also because technological advancements allow us to offer a high-quality degree with lower risk and higher return than we could have, even, ten years ago. Fourth, it would deepen and complement our core strengths and allow us to do what we're already doing better, but also to do some new things that we're not currently doing. Especially in areas of management and leadership. Finally, it would broaden the community of Sanford alumni to include these mid-career practitioners, who would be not just a valuable part of the community while they're here, but prospective employers, internship advisors, research supervisors and, yes, donors once they leave school.

I mentioned the market for this type of degree, and this is the top ten policy analysis rankings from U.S. News' latest report. You see, Duke is the only school on this list that offers neither a mid-career generalist program nor an online or hybrid version of its flagship masters program. So, this is an area where we feel like we're playing some catch up. You also see on this list that there are a lot of

different degrees in this space. That's in part because the accreditors make no distinction among public policy, public affairs, public administration. Even so, we put a lot of thought into this and chose the public affairs designation intentionally. We believe it combines policy analysis and evaluation strengths from an MPP program with the management and leadership focus that you see in many public administration programs. There are other reasons to why we chose it. We believe it distinguishes us from local peer institutions, while also aligning us with national programs like Berkeley, Michigan, and Indiana that compete in this space. And it gives us flexibility in modality and in time to degree that we wouldn't have if we were just offering an e-version of our MPP degree.

What would this degree look like? We see five essential features. First, a target student population that would include government, nonprofit professionals, as well as select private sector professionals with at least seven years of experience. It would combine a generalist core curriculum and public affairs with an initial concentration in leadership, management and ethics, but would also give us the flexibility in the future to roll out additional concentrations, certificates, modalities in response to evolving demands and needs. Third, it would be a purpose-built hybrid modality, by which we mean not just a camera in the back of a classroom, but a combination of intensive in-person residencies and both synchronous and asynchronous online learning, reflecting the latest pedagogical advances. It would be an accelerated program allowing working professionals to earn their degrees in as little as 15 months, and it would start relatively small at a target size of 25, but grow

eventually over time to a steady state of 50, pending program evaluation. I mentioned the target student population. I want you to think here of the rising star at a federal or state agency, of the deputy director of a nonprofit, of a consultant doing public sector focused work who started their job after undergraduate and has kind of risen through the ranks but has not gotten around to getting a graduate degree. These students would come from all over the country primarily, but concentrated in the eastern seaboard, southeast, mid-Atlantic. We would not turn away international students if they had the appropriate visas, but based on our consultations with the visa office, we don't believe it is practicable for us to sponsor visas for the program with this modality.

This is our curriculum - sorry for the size of the font here - but the basic take away is that all students in the program would take four courses core curriculum in public affairs shown on the left here. They would take three courses from the leadership management and ethics concentration, and then they would take an additional three electives, which could be, initially at least, additional concentration courses but it could also include other electives that are either purpose built for this program or offered by other Duke units or by Sanford to all programs. Those courses would be sequenced across four terms for full time students with no more than three courses a term and intensive residencies at the beginning of each term. Part time students would simply return for a fifth term and take no more than two courses per semester. If a student needed to continue beyond that, that's something we could work with them on. It might have implications for their financial aid.

But we don't want to force them to graduate if they're not ready to do that.

I mentioned earlier Duke's current peer institutions. This is a table of our peers in this space for hybrid or online mid-career programs. And you see the proposed tuition would be roughly middle of the pack. This is actually...we're proposing 25% financial aid allocation. So, net of that, the tuition would be about 45,000. On size, months, credits, you see a lot of variation. Generally speaking, it would be middle of the pack there on the lower end in terms of credit hours, again, to maximize the flexibility we have to get students to their degree faster. We conducted a similar analysis of local institutions which, with the exception of the UNC MBA online program, may not be direct competitors but are certainly important local stakeholders and so, we wanted to be attentive to distinguishing what we're offering from the very well-established public administration programs offered by our neighbors across town and nearby. Then finally, we have put a lot of work into, and I had a lot of discussion around, projecting the faculty needs for this program. We believe a mix of both regular rank, adjunct, senior adjunct, or visiting faculty will be essential both to meeting the program's quality goals and to providing institutional sustainability. We're currently working to secure commitments from our existing faculty to teach in the program. Based on the results of that effort we'll incorporate any unmet needs into the hiring plan Sanford will have for next year. So, the exact ratio...as you see, pretty wide ranges. The exact ratio of regular rank to adjunct is yet to be determined. But, our sort of NorthStar for determining this will be quality, right? We're going to look to every course and

ask who's best suited to teach this. Is it someone who's here now or is it someone who's out practicing in a senior practitioner role in the field? Then make the determination based on that.

We're happy to talk more about that during question and answer. So, let me invite my colleagues up here and we'll take any questions that you have.

Victoria Szabo (Art, Art History, Visual Studies): I have a question about the credit differences between this and the MPP, and I know you talked about it in your responses to APC, but there was a statement that it would be impractical to do as many credits in a hybrid modality. I'm wondering why it's impractical and then also, are you thinking in terms of the 7 to 10 years of work experience as being kind of the equivalent of credits or something like that? Because it does sound like it's off.

Hildebrand: On the second question, I'd say yes, at least informally, and some of the programs that show they have more credit hours, like Indiana, for example, let students credit up to nine credits toward their degree. So, they're actually lower than they show here. By impractical, we mean to have a student undertake 51 credits in 15 months or even in 24 months. Right? It's asking a lot of a working professional. We believe that would be prohibitive for a working professional. And we have some experience here from our MNSP. We have a 12 and a 20-month variation of that, and we've seen a number of students start in the 12 months and find that a little too demanding while they maintain their jobs and switch to the 20. But 51, based on our calculations, it would just be really hard to do in an accelerated program.

Szabo: So, you're also saying that the peers are giving credit for work experience. So, they're not forcing people to do that number. Like 42 as opposed to 51.

Hildebrand: Well, in some cases they don't have an outer limit on the program. So, some of these that say flexible, they're allowing students to come to classes in person or watch them online. It's not, what we're calling, a purpose-built program. So, students might take four or five years to finish that degree, in which case doing 48 credits is manageable. Since we're building ours from scratch and we're very intentionally doing it in 15 months, again, just very hard to ask of a working professional.

Roxanne Springer (Physics): I apologize because I haven't been here in a while, but it used to be the practice that when a new master's program was proposed it would address the issue of diversity and equity.

Hildebrand: So, our proposal certainly does that, and we see diversity, equity, and inclusion belonging as essential at every stage of the administration of this program. Right? Starting with recruitment and admissions and going right through curriculum, design, development, faculty hiring, and then student services. The approach in the proposal, we believe, is authentic. It's not trying to advertise externally this, but we also think it draws on Sanford's core strengths, including its history of commitment to teaching ethics, which would be a core part of the concentration, including its current focus on analyzing and addressing structural inequalities across the curriculum in all of our

programs, and including some well-established relationships with employers, alumni, community stakeholders representing lots of diverse populations. So, that's kind of baked into the program proposal. We also think for this student cohort, that we have an opportunity to really add value by teaching and training public managers and leaders how to lead their organizations more equitably, looking at things like hiring practices, strategic planning, decision making. Some of the classes focus on participatory decision making, for example, in ways that try to improve the inclusiveness and equity of public organization decision making. So we think, in addition to our kind of baseline commitment to diversity, equity, inclusion, belonging, that we're adding something new here with the program as well.

Karin Shapiro (African, African-American Studies): Do you see these students being separated out from the rest of the student body in Sanford, or do you see a way in which they will interact with others, either, masters programs or even undergraduates?

Hildebrand: Mark, maybe I could...we've wrestled with this a lot in the context of our national security program, which Mark helps direct. So, maybe I could ask you to answer that one.

Mark Hart (Director of Digital Learning): Thanks for that question. I mean, first and foremost, our commitment would be that we would want as much synergy as possible. We think our students in this program would benefit from being with our campus students and certainly vice versa. The structure of the program - one of the things that we've done is we have a

summer start, as we've done in the National Security Policy program. I think that's a better time for people to start a program that have jobs, and especially we have a little bit more time where we ask for them to come on campus for the campus immersion periods. So, with that in mind, the summer time isn't where we get that as much, but in the fall and spring, we are bringing them back on campus. We're actually not doing Saturday - Sunday, we're bringing them in on Friday, as well, to where we can do things. We're also making sure that if we have a great guest speaker in this program, that we're opening it up to the campus students. I would say one of the things that we've done most to address this, especially as you get in that list of classes, when you get to the electives, we're actually opening those up to our MPP students and MIDP students. So, they're having the ability to be in the same classes and to be with those who are practice based faculty members as well.

Kathryn Andolsek (School of Medicine): I have two questions. One is I'm just not clear how much residential time on campus these students will have and the impact, if any, on services beyond Career Center, like student health or Capture, that kind of thing. The second question I have is, I'm curious about the engagement of your current faculty and if you're making a new program, it seems like faculty are your most important asset. And I understand you're going to be doing or completing a survey of your existing faculty to see whether or not they've got capacity and interest in being part of this, which would help determine your recruiting needs. But I guess, I'm curious why you haven't done that as part of this proposal.

Hildebrand: The proposal includes a pretty detailed analysis that looks at how many faculty we currently have with expertise in each course subject. Again, we talked to over 30 in the development days and got some early commitments from a few to teaching it. We're just now going through systematically. But, I want to ask Dean Kelly to address the faculty question more broadly, if you'd like.

Judith Kelley (Dean, Sanford School of Public Policy): Thank you so much for that question. I think in the spring, we did have consultations with individual faculty members who were interested in teaching in the program and just talking with them about what their interests might be. I think from that - heading into this, we had a list of some, you know, 10-13 folks who said, "Yeah, I might be interested." So, what we're doing now is just saying, "Okay, are you ready to commit or not?" We did do that, that piece of the work, but you know, what we really will be driven by is not just getting commitments to teach in the program, but as Asher said earlier, we really want to get the right people teaching the courses.

Andolsek: I'm just trying to get a handle on how many new faculty you're going to need to recruit.

Kelley: When we did our Masters of National Security program, we had a committee that had an open call, so we could fit and think about all the courses at once. And that worked really well. Mark, how many folks are you thinking that we would probably go out for adjuncts? We'd do it at a stage. Request by semester probably or, you know, wouldn't necessarily be able to do everybody at

once...but how many folks do you think we would...

Hart: I think that we want to fill as many spots as possible with our regular rank faculty. I think we have three, four or five people...but I think that as you get into this type of program and these students get more specialized we also get to take advantage of the opportunities that not only the students get, but definitely also bring in faculty from different locations as well.

Hildebrand: I'll be happy to answer more questions about faculty. I'll address the question of time on campus. The balance we're trying to strike here is to capture the benefits of cohort development from being in person while also providing students the flexibility to otherwise be wherever they're working, whether that's in Washington, or Durham, or San Francisco. Right? So, we don't want to ask them to come to campus too frequently. That's something we're going through with our MNSP as well, figuring out what's the right balance of asking them to come to campus. But preliminarily, at least we're imagining at least a seven day, maybe longer, intensive for the summer. There'll be somewhat shorter intensives for the spring and the fall. Long weekend perhaps. And then, in the second summer, it would be another longer intensive, but based in Duke and D.C. Based in the Washington, D.C. office, just to allow us to take advantage of our presence there, but also of the practitioner community there. I think this is an area that we want to track and evaluate pretty closely and if it feels like too little; and some signs of that would be, you know, if the reflections of student cohort development, participation in online classes, survey feedback; those sorts of things. If it

doesn't feel like it's jelling, we might want to increase that. If it feels like it's too much and we're losing attendance or losing students there, we would go in the other direction. But, I don't expect that one intensive a semester will be too much. If anything, it might be too little.

Springer: Another historical best practice is that rather than treating each individual masters program in isolation, we would consider it in the context of having kind of an overarching goal and vision for what these master's programs look like at Duke. Also, kind of correlated with that is the impact on the infrastructure. Every student who comes to Duke needs resources. Health, library, bureaucratic, graduate school, etc. Can you speak to the resources and the way in which you would be able to compensate for or in some way fulfil the needs of these students?

Hildebrand: Sure. I'll say just a quick word on the coordination that's happened in the development of the proposal, and then I'm going to ask Mark to address how the national security program is meeting the sort of campus infrastructure needs of its students, which are unique because they're not here all the time and there are some services they need and others that they opt out of or don't need.

In terms of coordination, we conducted our own analysis, to begin with, of all the programs in this space that might be either hybrid midcareer or might touch on public affairs, public policy. That included the executive MBA programs at Fuqua, but also things like the MEM program at Pratt, and the political science masters program, the Law and Nicholas schools, as well. And then we also consulted with the Office of Learning

Innovation pretty extensively, under the assumption that they have visibility of, sort of, the type of program happening across campus, and what the impact on campus infrastructure would be. I'll ask Mark to address specifically the needs of our MNSP students, which I think would be a good proxy for the needs of the EMPA students as well.

Hart: I think to this question, I mean, I think Asher did well in talking about synergy and opportunities and how we're affecting infrastructure across the campus. I think one of my favorite parts of this proposal, which was new and different - we come here today having done the master national security policy, you know, over the last few years. So, we really learned a lot of lessons there. But, we also did an internal examination of this, as well, for faculty and for staff. We were able to say, "We feel strongly. We need point two of this person or point four of this person." As we talk internally for admissions or for career services or such. I also think in our masters of national security policy program, as we continue to grow maybe potentially in this space that we're innovating across campus, we're solving problems. As we bring students on we've had a lot of discussions about, you know, what are the vaccine requirements. We've had a lot of discussions on, they all have their insurance, how does that factor in? And then the health and rec fee and how can we get the gym turned on for them when they're on campus? A lot of these logistics are things that we've been working out for the last few years, and we've been working with all sectors across campus to do that. Often we're finding solutions that haven't been there prior to that program starting.

Hildebrand: And I would just add, only very briefly, that I think the balance we're trying to strike here is that, of course, we want to make sure that any new students are not placing additional burdens on campus infrastructure that they're not paying into or paying for. On the other hand, we really think it's essential that students in this program feel like they're fully part of the Duke community and get to experience the amenities, get to share in everything that makes the campus vibrant. I know in MNSP and again in this one, we would really go out of our way to say, "Despite the fact that you're not here all that much, we want to make you feel like you belong here." And part of that is making sure that they have an opportunity to take advantage of the resources that are on campus.

Springer: Trina, maybe you can answer the question whether or not there exists an over-arching mission and goal for the masters programs on Duke campus?

Hildebrand: I guess that question's probably above my pay grade. *(Laughter)*

Springer: But surely someone is looking at it?

Jones: That question may actually be for the Provost office. And if you'd like a response, we can certainly tee that up for a future meeting.

Kelley: I was just going to add that the 2030 committee is still going strong. Going...going...*(laughter)* Some of the things we are talking about are different modalities, and I think that is reflected in some of the different professional program developments we're seeing across campus as well.

Jones: Any final questions?

Hildebrand: Thank you all. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Jones: If the Council has any additional questions before we vote on November 30th, please submit them to acouncil@duke.edu and we will do our very best to make sure that they are answered before you vote.

ANONYMOUS QUESTION REGARDING "PASS THE HARASSER"

Jones: We have another anonymous question. We've had quite a few this fall. This one deals with the question of "Pass the harasser." And this question is for senior leadership to address.

"Pass the harasser' is a well-known phenomenon in higher education, where a professor or administrator commits some form of inappropriate behavior (mostly sexual harassment), resigns quietly (or under some pressure), and gets a new job at a different institution where they are none the wiser regarding previous conduct. Duke has been guilty of this offense, and I know of one case in 20xx that has repercussions to this day, as some of my colleagues at xxxx (where that faculty member ended up) are still refusing to engage with my department given what they had to suffer through as a result.

My question to Duke leadership is whether they have undertaken steps to make sure this doesn't happen again – both ways, in terms of hiring and in terms of passing on the problematic faculty/administrator."

And the person who sent the question referenced a Chronicle of Education

article that addressed this phenomenon in April of 2022.

So, I invite anyone from the Provost or the President's office to respond to this question.

Abbas Benmamoun (Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement): Thank you very much for the question. It's a really good question and a very timely question. And we fully support the points and concerns raised in that question. As you know, as the article in the Chronicle of Higher Education, that Trina mentioned, there has been a long overdue nationwide movement on this issue recently. So, while the faculty members, here at Duke, while their personal records are considered confidential there are exceptions that we make at Duke. One exception is that Duke can disclose to individuals on a need to know basis the outcome of an investigation. An example would include disclosing to the complainant so the complainants can get...if their investigation is by OIE they can be appraised of the decision. Secondly, certain federal agencies, and many of you know this if you are a PI, certain federal agencies who sponsor research require Duke to disclose outcomes of investigations. This has become a requirement for some federal agencies, which is a good development. And third, Duke can disclose the outcome of an investigation when it has a signed release from the faculty member. This is a faculty member from another institution that signs a release for us to disclose findings of investigations to those institutions. And I will talk more about that. So, as a result of this requirement to hire, let's say another institution outside Duke is in the best position to require disclosure of proper findings of sexual

harassment or other misconduct from both the candidate and the candidate's current institution. The higher institution has the leverage to request such disclosure and consent as part of the hiring process. And the current institution, let's say Duke, can then disclose this information with the candidate's consent. To that end, we have the current practice of disclosing disciplinary history of findings and sanctions, not allegations to a requesting institution upon request with the candidate's permission via signed consent form. Here at Duke we have also been working on regularizing our own process for requesting this information as part of the faculty hiring process. It is our understanding that the interim provost, Jennifer Francis, had a meeting with ECAC in early 2023 to discuss the possibility of Duke doing something like this that is more robust than what we have now. Some valid concerns were raised during that meeting, such as where to draw the line, how far to go back, requesting information about prior misconduct, etc. Apart from this, we are now in the process of convening a committee on faculty professionalism, and that's a provisional title for the committee and then for the committee with multiple charges, including to craft a proposed protocol for such requests. The proposal and suggested committee members were sent to ECAC earlier this week. We need to ensure that the process is centralized and consistent, so that we are consistent with how we approach our requests with vetting candidates that we consider hiring here. Free of bias, to the extent possible, and the process that leads to decisions based on clear criteria. We also need sufficient infrastructure to review the information received and again, make sure that the review is fair and consistent.

Other universities are leading the way on this, such as UC Davis. UC Davis actually was one of the first institutions to start this, and no other institutions are doing this. I have been in conversation with some of them to see how the process works at their institution and can learn from that. So, those institutions that have done this require candidates to sign authorizations, allowing prior employers to report on their history. And they have found that they do not have cases where faculty members past history is problematic. They believe that those faculty members simply don't apply to their institutions. That was also in the Chronicle. So, we hope to work with ECAC on this, and they're committed to implementing similar changes here at Duke. So, this is an active discussion here at Duke to make sure that we vet people properly before we hire them.

Steffen Bass (Physics): But if you read that Chronicle article, I think you know, what needs to happen is twofold. One thing is, of course, to require release forms upon hiring, but the other thing is for Duke to actually make sure that if there is an investigation on some faculty member who chooses to leave, that you have to finish that investigation. Right? Because you're only allowed to report on an investigation that has finished. And I think the loophole has been in the past, at various institutions, that the person leaves and there's no interest in finishing the investigation. You just closed the books and then there is nothing to disclose.

Benmamoun: The Chronicle [of Higher Education] piece mentioned that the federal government is looking into that because they agree with that.

Vince Price (President): And that is our current policy. To complete an investigation.

Benmamoun: Yes, that is correct. That would be grossly unfair to the people who alleged harm, to make sure that we look into it thoroughly and come up with the findings and then share them with the complainants and with others as appropriate.

Springer: What is the estimated timeline for the committee? When do you expect the policy to be implemented?

Benmamoun: As soon as we hear back from ECAC and we finalize the committee, our plan is to have recommendations to the Provost in late spring that we hopefully have something in place by next year, by the next hiring cycle. Having said that, my office does training for such committees and we really stress and try to impress on people who serve on search committees to make sure that they do proper vetting, as well as ask questions about climate, culture, and things like that. That's not going to get you disclosures about prior misconduct or ongoing investigations, but at least to not just focus on teaching, research, and service, but to look also on how those individuals treat colleagues, treat students, and just conduct themselves as members of their communities.

Alec Gallimore (Provost): The only thing I'd like to add is that the charge is somewhat broad. One of the things that we want to do with this committee is we want to develop processes and perhaps structures in the Provost's office to support faculty colleagues, especially Chairs and Deans, so that if there is a challenge they know where to go and

what kind of procedures they would have. For example, the Ombuds would be on this committee, etc. It's a pretty comprehensive study that we're looking at, but this is one of the motivating factors that we have, is to make sure that we address this properly.

Shapiro: You sort of hinted at an answer, but you mentioned it's mostly sexual harassment, and I'm asking what is the language of harassment? Is it sexual harassment or is it something broader than that?

Benmamoun: No, it is broader than that. The same thing with other institutions. It's basically discrimination, harassments, bullying, and things like that. And of course, there's also research misconduct and other things. This is why the committee that we're trying to put together includes people who have different portfolios so that they can weigh in on that. We really want to have as exhaustive and comprehensive vetting of candidates through the interview process, but also through this process here. We can go to another institution and ask for disclosures. On everything - like bullying, for example, which is also a significant problem.

Jones: ECAC did receive materials from the Provost office on Monday with regard to a committee on professionalism, which talked about some of these procedures. We will thoroughly look at those materials and come back to Council with our thoughts, if necessary. If you have any additional questions that you weren't able to ask today please, again, send them to acouncil@duke.edu or reach out to any member of ECAC and we'll be more than happy to make sure that those questions are engaged.

Okay. Our remaining two items today involve Duke Kunshan University and Appendix L, formerly Appendix Z of the Duke Faculty Handbook. These discussions will be held in executive session.

[Remainder of the meeting conducted in executive session]