



**Minutes of the Academic Council Meeting
Thursday, December 4, 2025**

Mark Anthony Neal (Chair, Academic Council): Good afternoon, everyone and welcome. Thanks for making the time for the last Academic Council meeting of the fall semester.

I'll start with the acknowledgement of the passing of **George Christie**, James B. Duke Distinguished Professor, from the Law School, who died last month at the age of 91. George retired from Duke in 2013, but for 40 plus years prior to retirement, was considered a renowned expert in tort law and jurisprudence. My colleagues in the Law School tell me that he still showed up fairly regularly to the Law School after retirement in his crocs. However, for many of us outside of law, and who have served on the Academic Council through the years, George was known for the **Christie Rules**, widely considered the North Star for faculty governance at Duke if not amongst all of our peers. George chaired the 1972 committee that issued the report with these rules regarding shared governance, and they have held steadfast for 53 years now for Duke faculty and administration in terms of basic decisions affecting academic affairs. On behalf of the Academic Council, our condolences to his family, friends and colleagues.

We have a full agenda today. As you know, we did not meet last month, and that was

primarily because I traveled to DKU with the Provost and his team for the Board of Trustee meeting for DKU. We plan to have a full debrief, Provost Gallimore and I, will debrief about DKU specifically at the January Academic Council meeting. And we'll have a broader conversation about the Global Initiative at Duke going forward. I will just say, very quickly, that I was disabused of many thoughts that I had about DKU before I went. Without getting into details, let me say that the students who choose to go there are mavericks. They choose to align with what is essentially a startup. I met a young black woman from Cary, North Carolina, who had chosen to go to DKU. I have a current DKU student, another black woman, in my class from Britain. It's just one small example of the kinds and quality of students who are there. The other thing that I will say is about our colleagues who are there. I'd often believed some of the rhetoric that suggested that for many of the faculty there, DKU was a choice of last resort. That is not the case. Faculty are there because they might have partners who live in China, or because they have family who live in China, or because they have research that exists in China. Even some colleagues chose DKU because the quality of their pedagogical life had become boring. They like the challenge of going someplace else and doing new work

perhaps. But we'll talk much more about this next month.

APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 16 MEETING MINUTES

Let us move on to the approval of the minutes from the October 16 meeting which were posted with today's agenda. Are there any corrections or modifications to those minutes?

[minutes approved by voice vote without dissent]

Attendance sheets, as usual, are circulating. As you ask questions or make comments, please make sure you do so from one of the microphones, and tell us where you are from and what your name is.

[The meeting moved into the Executive Session for a presentation on changes to IT security practices and an update on AI projects underway to support faculty and the broader campus]

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

2030 TEACHING & MENTORING EXCELLENCE REPORT PRESENTATION

Neal: We'll now move to the next part of the agenda, which is the 2030 Teaching and Mentoring Excellence Report presentation. Our colleagues Bridgette Hard (Psychology & Neuroscience) and Jerry Reiter (Statistical Science) will talk about the report from the 2030 Teaching and Mentoring Excellence Committee. Both the report and the resolution from the Academic Programs Committee were posted with today's agenda as background.

Jerry Reiter (Statistical Science / Co-chair of the 2030 Teaching and Mentoring Excellence Committee): Thank you very much for the invitation to present our committee's work. The committee was constituted by the Provost with four main charges. The first was to develop a set of rubrics that would characterize good teaching and mentoring. The second was to make recommendations around how to factor those rubrics into promotion and tenure decisions. The third was to think of ways and recommendations to enhance the career pathways of regular faculty such as Professors of the Practice, Research Professors and lecturers. In the report, we refer to them as Career Track Professors, which Bridgette will talk more about. Then the fourth was to come up with ideas for enhancing the culture and opportunities around teaching and mentoring at Duke.

The committee had faculty representation from across the university, as well as some ex-officio members who lent their expertise. The committee's work is done. You have the report which is 70 pages long. I'm sure you all read every sentence of it before the meeting. That's essentially our work. Why are we here today? There are a number of recommendations in that report that closely relate to the purview of the Academic Council. What we wanted to do was to give some highlights of those recommendations, take questions about them, with the goal of hopefully getting an endorsement towards turning those recommendations from a report eventually into a policy. So, it's really seeking endorsement to get this started essentially. Because of that, we'll necessarily be brief. We'll hit some highlights and try to have as much time for discussion as we can.

With that in mind, let me turn to the very first bullet. (refers to slide) The committee

spent a lot of time talking about frameworks for teaching and mentoring. We dug into the scholarly literature. We looked at other institutions and practices. We talked with lots of faculty, the Senior / Associate Deans, APC (Academic Programs Committee), AP&T (Advisory Committee on Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure), Arts & Sciences Council, ECAC, Directors of Undergraduate Studies, and the Graduate School. We talked with a lot of people to try to learn from everybody's collective expertise. One thing that we clearly learned was that there's no one size fits all framework for teaching and mentoring for every single unit. Everybody's context is different. So, what we decided to do was to try to put together, if you will, a baseline set of principles, a framework that units could adapt and customize to their particular contexts. You'll see here, a graphic that shows the teaching effectiveness criteria. We have three main criteria that we've put as this baseline. One is using an effective course design. That is, for example, your course has learning objectives, assessments and lessons which are planned around meeting those objectives. There's creating and promoting an engaged learning community. The courses are designed so that, for example, students get timely and useful feedback and that they feel comfortable in participating in the class and asking questions. The third one is reflective teaching to drive continual growth. We recognize that teaching is an ongoing process, and there's AI and new innovations that come in. Trying to think how we can incorporate those into our teaching should be something that we regularly do and should be recognized and rewarded. Mentoring is analogous to that. It also has three sets of main criteria. There's academic and career guidance – helping students get through their degrees, creating a supportive mentoring environment, and again,

practicing that reflective mentoring for continual improvement – how do we keep getting better as mentors? The basic idea with these frameworks is that we're hoping that faculty can use them for self-assessment and self-improvement. That's our real big picture that we've designed these for, particularly for new faculty who might come in not really knowing what ingredients are needed for having an effective and efficient classroom. So, this could provide some guideposts for them, same thing with mentoring. But it also could be used for evaluation, not only self-evaluation, but maybe department chairs and certainly promotion committees and the like could use these for evaluation. The report also includes a number of sources of evidence that faculty as well as chairs and promotion committees, can use to try to assess how effective faculty are at meeting some of these criteria. Speaking of evaluation and assessment, again, we had a charge to try to make recommendations about how to take these rubrics and put them into promotion and tenure decisions. The report has a lot of detail about that. We're just putting some big picture highlights of those on this slide. For example, there's discussion in the report around chairs writing plans for assistant professors to improve their teaching as part of the promotion packet. There're example instructions for chairs to write letters for promotion committees – drafts that could be built on. Here we've just put up some core issues for promotion from assistant to associate on the tenure track. And we do have parallel guidelines for what we're calling the Career Track. Being an assistant professor is hard, so we don't necessarily expect people going up from assistant to associate to be effective teachers across the board right away. It's a learning process, so we want them to be rated as effective in most of the teaching criteria. And if there are areas they need to keep getting better,

that's part of what the chair writes about and develops a plan for. Going from an associate to a full is a higher bar. So there we have an expectation of at least rated as effective in all teaching criteria. The Faculty Handbook says you can have high quality or good. You have to have high quality or good in two out of the three – high in two and good in the third, although we all know research is one of them, even though it doesn't say that. So, it's high quality and two out of three. What does high quality mean? Here's the definition of high-quality teaching. For example, typically rated as effective in all the criteria with some evidence of exemplary performance that we lay out what that looks like. What we envision this process being is sort of a parallel to when departments had to come up with research standards in 2018. You might remember, if you were here at that time, we were all asked to write down what effective research looks like for promotion. And we went through that process. We're visiting a similar process here for teaching and mentoring, where units would basically get instructions from the Office of Faculty Advancement (OFA) and some initial skeleton ideas. For example, they could adapt these frameworks and tune them to what their teaching context is, what makes for excellent or effective teaching and mentoring in their context. Those would be approved by deans, and then, essentially, that would form the basis of writing about teaching, mentoring and promotion and send on to AP&T. So, that's the process that we basically envision in a parallel for mentoring as well. With that, I'll turn it over to Bridgette to talk about the next part of the report.

Bridgette Hard (Psychology & Neuroscience / Co-chair of the 2030 Teaching and Mentoring Excellence Committee): As Jerry mentioned, one of our charges was to create defined career

pathways and consistent titles for what currently at Duke we call our Regular Rank Non-Tenure Track faculty. Importantly, this was the same charge that was taken on several years ago by the Academic Council. A number of years ago, the Academic Council had an ad hoc committee on Regular Rank Non-Tenure Track faculty designations. This was led by Sherryl Broverman (Biology) as well as others. In their excellent [report](#), it identified that Regular Rank Non-Tenure Track faculty make up a pretty large proportion of our faculty, have really significant responsibilities in teaching as well as administration. And yet they noted that there is tremendous lack of consistency in how the roles of such faculty are defined across schools and even sometimes within the same department, as well as lack of consistency in standards for reappointment and promotion. They also did some valuable work in laying out some recommendations for how we can improve that problem. So, what our committee did was to build on this work that's already been done by that Academic Council committee with a few changes in some of our recommendations. But our goal was to try to breathe life into this work that was already done. One of the things that we've proposed is to come up with a different umbrella term for describing our Regular Rank Non-Tenure Track faculty, because you know that the umbrella term describes what people are not, as opposed to what they actually are. We discussed many possible umbrella terms, and what we settled on was the idea of calling them Regular Rank Career Track faculty. Again, there are many other possibilities. They're all imperfect in different ways. But this was a term that we felt we could settle on, because it really highlights Duke's commitment to the continued growth of such faculty. It highlights expectations for continual growth and professional development for such

faculty. We also worked to develop clear definitions and titles for faculty who we would classify as Career Track faculty. And one of our proposals was to restore the definition of Professor of the Practice to what it traditionally means, which is faculty who teach and do service, but who have clear roles and engagement outside of academia, often in industry. So, faculty who still fit that role would continue to be called Professors of the Practice, but other Professors of the Practice, like myself, don't fit that definition at all. Some of us are focused on teaching and service, but we also do scholarship, although importantly, the scholarship is often focused on teaching and learning, or if it's not, often prioritizing undergraduates, it is sort of teaching undergraduates about research through our scholarship. We propose to call such Career Track faculty Teaching and Scholarship Professors. We've described faculty who are currently PoPs (Professors of the Practice), but also lecturers, who focus exclusively on teaching and service but not scholarship, as Teaching Professors. And then, of course, we also have Research Professors in the mix, who focus on research and scholarship exclusively, although some can also teach, making sure that they are correctly titled as Research Professors. And as Jerry noted, we've outlined possible criteria for reappointment and promotion for each of these tracks. We've also noted that all of this needs to be figured out by schools and departments. And we generally have the idea that faculty should have titles that fit them and serve their career goals. We are also proposing that although internally, we have these different tracks and titles, we would use these often to describe ourselves to our colleagues, but outside of Duke, externally, colloquially, we would encourage faculty to simply call themselves Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Full Professor, because often these special

ways that we mark each other differently create additional obstacles to external funding and other professional development opportunities that we have out in the world. And we do expect many faculty who are Career Tracked to develop national reputations for the work that they do, and we want to make it as achievable as possible for them to do that. All right, so I think that is just to remind us of what our goals are here today, we want to make sure we have as much time as possible for discussion. So, let's hear what you're interested in.

Kerry Haynie (Political Science / African and African American Studies): I was the Chair of the Council when the Broverman committee was appointed. The reason why we appointed that committee was that Duke Legal Counsel came to me and suggested it was problematic to have the same title but different responsibilities, as you mentioned, different criteria, sometimes in the same department. How much leeway will schools and departments have to vary from the criteria you set out for these titles? Has Duke Legal Counsel been involved in the review of the report in consultation?

Hard: I don't know that I could say that Legal Counsel has been. I think it's very sensible that there needs to be as much consistency as possible, and if there was no consistency, there would need to be very good reasons for not having consistency. This will be something that we'll have to figure out as we try to implement this process.

Tom Blodgett (School of Nursing): Would you mind going back to the slide where you have the table of the different job titles and career titles? If Tenure Track has teaching, scholarship and service required as an expectation, and the Teaching and Scholarship Career Track Professor has

those same requirements (you mentioned that they're different because the Career Track folks have a different area of scholarship, which is typically focused on teaching and learning or other forms of research), why wouldn't that count towards Tenure Track?

Hard: This is a question that comes up a lot when we discuss this. There are a lot of differences between Teaching and Scholarship Professors and Tenure Track Professors that are obviously vastly oversimplified by this table. I'm a kind of prototype of what would be a Teaching and Scholarship Professor. My teaching responsibilities are greater than my Tenure Track colleagues. I teach more and I teach more students. My scholarship expectations are lower. I'm not expected to publish in the most prestigious journals or to get a lot of grant funding. So, I think there are some differences that are occluded by such simplicity in this table. Part of our charge was to consider whether we would recommend a tenure or a parallel to tenure for Career Track faculty. In our recommendations, we thought we're not ready yet to recommend tenure, because there's so much that has to be done to sort out consistency in these titles, as well as to clarify what we're expecting from all faculty in terms of teaching before we'd be ready to make that move. But we also recommended that in five years, we revisit some kind of a security of employment option for some Career Track faculty, or all Career Track faculty, to try to address an issue like that. A metaphor that we've often used in our work, is that Duke is an ecosystem. All of our faculty play important roles within that ecosystem of nurturing the success of this community. We're all important. We want to create a system that feels less hierarchical or valuing some people more than others, while recognizing that we're different, and we

bring different things to the table that are valued in different ways. So, I don't know if that entirely answers your question, but I think there's more difference than we're seeing in this table, and we're not ready yet to completely blur the lines between Tenure Track and Research and Scholarship teaching folks.

Blodgett: My point is that this was an opportunity to clear that up, and it wasn't. This was the opportunity to even things out a little bit, and it seems like it wasn't done here in a meaningful way.

Hard: Do you mean to even things out between the Tenure Track and the Career Track?

Blodgett: Yes.

Hard: I think this is a whole lot better than what we have now. I would argue that. Are we at the level where we're saying everybody's exactly the same? No, we're not, but this is a lot better. And I will say, as a person who would fit in here, I like this a whole lot better than what we have now. We've talked to many faculty who feel the same. But you're right. There are still some differences and inequities. I appreciate that.

Jocelyn Olcott (History): I have two questions. One is about the way that we're assessing our own efficacy as teachers. The principal way that we use right now is course evaluations. First of all, we don't really have a system set up at Duke that encourages students to fill them out. So compliant rates are quite low. A lot of our peer institutions require them, or they don't release grades for a while until students fill them out. There're a lot of things you can put in place, at least to encourage greater compliance from the student side. These course evaluations are famously pretty racist

and sexist. I'm not sure they're a great proxy for how effective teaching is, so I would see an argument for dispensing with them entirely, but at least maybe complementing them with something else. I'm wondering if that's part of the report. A lot of universities have mandatory course observations. Twenty-three years at Duke, I've never been observed in my teaching. It would probably help me if I were. The other thing is at the risk blurring agenda lines, the most challenging thing for me in terms of assessing whether or not I'm effectively teaching is that I don't know if the work I'm getting from students is from them, or from ChatGPT. So, on a question about assessing our own efficacy, I think we do need to think about how that's complicating that process.

Reiter: The report does describe and recommend that evidence about teaching and mentoring effectiveness come from multiple sources, not just course evaluations, which arguably is the case. Well, you can get a teaching observation, but for the defaults, probably just course evaluations. It also recommends rethinking some of those. For example, there are three legs of this teaching stool. Suppose a unit says, we like these three and these are relevant for us. You can imagine that students might be really well positioned to tell you about the learning community. So thinking about refocusing some of those course evaluations to make sure those kinds of questions get asked, whereas maybe thinking about effective course design, they might provide input on that too, but you can imagine that having fellow faculty members look at a syllabus or learning objectives, things like that, or the teaching observation, might provide some input. That is part of what we recommend as well. I also want to say that you can see, while being sensitive to faculty workload, we thought about that a lot. The

vision here is not every faculty member every semester being evaluated in every single one of these dimensions. That would just be too much. So, there is sensitivity to that in the report. But yes, we totally agree. Honestly, if this gets implemented, we hope that it's kind of a living document in some sense, that gets reexamined and reevaluated every year. As new technologies and new issues come into play, we have to rethink what it means to have an effective course design, when you've got AI and how does that intersect with some of the sub criteria, if you will, for that. So, hopefully, when it's substantiated, it has that adaptable component.

Steffen Bass (Physics): I'm a current member of AP&T. I'm not going to voice an opinion, but I'm going to pose an open-ended question, and that pertains to the matrix you showed – Tenure Track, Career Track, and then subcategories of Career Track. Could this lead to a future where, for example, a tenure review of a Tenure Track Assistant Professor leads to recommendation for not promotion with tenure or denied tenure, but promotion into the Career Track, say, for Teaching and Scholarship or just Teaching? And there are many different variations in how you can play this, right? Ultimately, you would burden AP&T, of course, with doing the reviews, and also for all the Career Track faculty, in order to be able to use that switchboard in the maximum flexibility that I see there. Is this something that was thought about? Is this something that we want? I don't expect an answer, but I think this is something that needs to be addressed as we think about this.

Hard: We don't have an answer to that. But it is something that we're aware that it could be a problem. I will note that although sometimes there could be very specific and good reasons that a person should switch

tracks at Duke, we do want to be careful of not ever treating these other tracks as the booby prize for not getting tenure, because that devalues the other tracks. That's something that has come up in discussion that we should be aware of and be very cautioned against. School of Medicine is different, because, as we understand, School of Medicine faculty are like stem cells and we're not sure which way they're going to go. In the other schools, that's less the case. We're not ready for that now. But I think that's a very interesting possibility.

Tracy Jaffe (School of Medicine): I am a tenured professor and I'm a fully clinically practicing person, and I don't think AP&T belongs in the School of Medicine anymore. I think that the institution has messaged those of us who are physicians that our biggest contribution is science, that's the Tenure Track. But everybody else who's taking care of patients is not going to be able to get promoted the way AP&T works, because their responsibilities and churn are to patient care and volume. So, my question would be, is there a point for schools (School of Medicine being a good example of how this is becoming hard to encourage people to go down the path that I once went down) to opt out of the idea of AP&T and tenure? I'm not suggesting we're Mayo, but there are academic institutions that have a more egalitarian approach to jobs that are different than scholarship.

Reiter: I don't know if this is a satisfactory answer, but that wasn't our charge. But I hear you.

Mine Cetinkaya-Rundel (Statistical Science): I am a Professor of the Practice. I really appreciate this report. I have to say it felt like a wonderful read with a disappointing ending. It was disappointing for me to read the word "premature"

associated with Duke considering tenure for Professors of the Practice. I reviewed the Broverman Report from 2021, and the minutes from the Academic Council meeting. I wasn't in the room at that time, but the minutes reflected a lot of nodding heads. And then a couple of the bullet points that were recommended got followed through, which is great, but not all of them. And then they appear here. If it is premature, I think the report needs to define what will make it mature enough to have this conversation, because when other recommendations around tenure have gone up to vote here, they have passed. So maybe it is time to free that vote to see what the faculty think. The other thing is, by coupling these two things, I don't know why this is controversial, but for some reason, it seems like considering tenure for people primarily doing teaching, like patient care, student care, a lot of it seems controversial. When it is appended to the rest of this fantastic report, I feel a little conflicted. It's like I want to say yes to so many of these things, but why does it have to come with that piece as well? I understand that's how committees work, but this was a little bit of a comment. My question is, what will make it not premature to have this conversation?

Hard: My answer to that is that once we have clear standards across schools for a promotion for each of these tracks, and we have people appropriately put into these tracks, so that we know who goes where, and what's expected of them, once that is in place – which we're hoping, if everything goes the way we hope, will be in five years – things should be in place. Then I think it's mature enough to reconsider the conversation, which is why that's the time point that we indicated we should revisit it. We're a mess right now. But I get it. We have many PoPs on our committee who feel the same way. But there's a lot that we are

trying to put forward here that is a change and a lot of work for all of us to do. We worry if you make us do too much at one time, the whole thing can sink. Is that a satisfying answer?

Reiter: Just a little note on the timeline – this question was not asked, but maybe in some people's minds – if these changes happen, the idea would be that they'll be phased in and they would not harm any current Regular Rank faculty who are in that cycle. They can be promoted or considered, I should say, under whichever set of guidelines that best favors them.

Charlotte Sussman (English): I have two related questions about the Professor of the Practice category. You said that those are professors whose research falls outside of traditional academic standards. And you mentioned that most of the people in that category are in industry, but in Trinity, there are a number of departments where most of the Professors of the Practice are in the Arts. So one question is, did you discuss that? How did you think about that in terms of research, and how that research might be evaluated? Related to that, there was a report a couple of years ago from a committee headed by Dean William Johnson (Classical Studies) that recommended that we start tenuring people in the Arts. That report, I believe, was approved by the Academic Council, and then moved on to the Provost's Office. I don't know what happened to it, and I don't know what happened to that recommendation. It's a very pressing concern. A number of the "Arts Departments" have very talented professors in the Arts who do not have tenure – despite the fact that they would have tenure at our peer institutions – so it is hard to hold on to them. I wondered whether you've considered the relationship between your report and that Johnson Report.

Hard: Regarding that, there certainly are some faculty in the Arts who seem to potentially fit in the Professor of the Practice category or the Teaching and Scholarship category. This is why it is going to be up to departments and those faculty to figure out what is the title that best fits our professional needs, and we want faculty to have the title that's going to be best understood within their discipline outside of Duke. In some of the Arts, maybe Professor of the Practice is what's going to really make the most sense. And others, it may be the Teaching and Scholarship Professor. We laid out recommendations, but definitely some departments are going to have to figure this out in terms of what makes the most sense for them. Regarding the Arts Professors, I'm trying to remember what was decided.

Reiter: I think we wrote a line that basically says we recognize that there is this previous work and we're not recommending that work be forgotten. That work is still there. In some sense, for example, Trinity could say these Professors of the Practice can get tenure if that's approved by the Academic Council, whatever mechanisms need to happen. I don't think our committee would say no, not that we can anyway, but I'm not sure we would disapprove.

Neal: We're going to take all the next questions together and allow them to answer at once.

Stefani Engelstein (German Studies): I have a brief question. It has to do with the clarity of the language in these categories. I was also noticing, like the very first person who asked a question, that Teaching and Scholarship Professor is naming two things that are also true of people who are Tenure Track. I'm wondering if it is true for most of the people who might put themselves into

that category, that the scholarship is related to the teaching, that it's pedagogical scholarship, and if so, whether, you know slightly different terms, like "Teaching with Scholarship", or something that would connect the scholarship to the teaching with a little bit more flow, might actually not create the double take of thinking, in emphasis from the perspective of the people in the category, how is that different from a tenure track position?

Merlise Clyde (Statistical Science): I'm on the C-School Initiative Committee. One thing that I was wondering is that whether or not you'd considered whether it is a career path in terms of Tenure Track, faculty who might have focus with a split between research and industry as a potential different track which doesn't appear in this kind of matrix of options?

Hard: So, research and industry, as opposed to teaching and industry, that is what I have not thought of. I don't have a good answer to that. I will say, regarding the scholarship piece, (Language is a funny thing. The words have such multifaceted meanings.) we spent a lot of time talking about research versus scholarship, and gosh, they're the same thing. We settled on this language because it felt to us, intuitively, that the term scholarship felt broader than research for many Professors of the Practice. Some of my scholarship is that I write textbooks. It's not really research exactly, not the same way that the experiments that I do or research. So, scholarship felt broader. But it is difficult. We can always pick at each of these terms in different ways. This was the best that we could do in the year that we had. But again, this is hopefully a living process, and it's not like this is something we can never revisit or change. If we come up with better language, we can use better language. (applause)

Neal: As the Academic Council Chair, I don't have an official opinion on this report, but as a former two term Chair in Trinity, I think it's important to think about ways in which those folks who are PoPs. I had two folks who were PoPs in my department, who did just as much research and teaching and service, in some cases more than the Tenure and Tenure Track faculty. They are disadvantaged in numerous ways, including the fact that they do not have a regularized leave policy. And the second thing is that they also disadvantage departments, at least in the context of Trinity, because they can't serve on Tenure Promotion Committees. So, it's a disadvantage in many ways that I think has to be obviously addressed.

[Executive Session requested by senior leadership to address the anonymous questions listed below for them to address during the meeting]

ANONYMOUS QUESTIONS

Recent changes to Duke's housekeeping organization required long-time staff members—some with decades of service—to reapply for their positions. Following this process, several employees have been reassigned to different parts of campus. From what I have observed, these moves appear to have disproportionately affected Black staff members, creating the appearance of a large-scale reshuffling of Black labor possibly without consent. Housekeeping staff are unionized, so my questions are:

- *Was this reorganization—and the resulting reassignment of workers—driven by Duke University administration or by the union?*
- *What principles or policies guided these decisions, and how does the University ensure that such actions*

do not perpetuate racial inequities or reinforce a lack of agency of certain demographic groups in the management of staff?

And a related question:

- *Was any demographic analysis conducted following the implementation of the VSIP and RIF programs? Specifically, did the University evaluate whether these programs had a disproportionate impact on any particular groups of employees?*