Duke University | Academic Council

Minutes of the Academic Council
Thursday, December 1, 2022

Erika Weinthal (Chair, Academic Council / Nicholas School of the Environment): There are seats down front, but I thought today might be standing room only, because of our distinguished guest. Hello everyone, welcome! Thank you for being here today. I hope everyone had a good and relaxing Thanksgiving holiday. I'm going to begin with some congratulatory announcements. One of which, I don't think I see here yet, but I will still congratulate him. That is, Gary Bennett, who is our current Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education since 2018, has been selected as the next Dean for the Arts & Sciences. *(Applause)* He brings to his new role many years of experience at Duke. He has been a faculty member in the Department of Psychology & Neuroscience and has a PhD from Duke that he received in 2002. Next, I want to extend our warmest congratulations to a number of Duke faculty who were recently promoted to full professor in the past few weeks – a couple of whom are here as members of the Council – Paul Magwene from Biology and Christine Payne from the Pratt School of Engineering. *(Applause)*

I don't know how many of you have looked recently at the Academic Council website, but please do because it has a new look. I want to thank both Sandra and Mariah, who have worked with Duke's Web Services team since the beginning of the summer to get the

Academic Council site revamped and transferring over all of the relevant content. So, thank you Sandra and Mariah.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 20 ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING

We're going to move to the approval of the minutes that were posted with today's agenda. Are there any corrections to the minutes? May I have a motion to approve? A second? All in favor, please say aye. Any opposed or any abstentions?

[Minutes approved by voice vote without dissent]

Lastly, before we turn to our first agenda item, there are attendance sheets circulating as always. Please initial that you are here, and for those of you on Zoom, we will note that you are in attendance.

PRESENTATION FROM TRACY FUTHEY, VICE PRESIDENT FOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY & CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

Today, we have Tracy Futhey, who is Duke's Vice President for Information Technology and Duke's Chief Information Officer to present an evaluation that she and many others have been involved in over the last several months regarding IT needs for research conducted at Duke. In many ways this builds upon the last

presentation we had at Academic Council from Jenny Lodge [Vice President Research and Innovation]. Tracy has been the Chief Information Officer since 2002. She has also presented to the Council in the past, so she is not new to us, but we are very pleased to welcome her back today.

Slides used in presentation.

Tracy Futhey (Vice President for Information Technology, Chief Information Officer): Thanks so much. I might start out by observing that the standing room only…I knew before you referenced it that the distinguished guest was not me. *(Laughter)* I appreciate all of you being here and suffering through what is the warm up band. *(Laughter)* It's great to see all of you in person, and I'm really glad to be invited to share with you some of what we've been working on this calendar year in regard to research IT needs throughout Duke. I have a couple of notes at the outset. First, that I hope this will be a conversation more than a presentation, although I'll start out with about 15 minutes of remarks to kind of ply the room, and then turn to any questions you have. Also, I want to note that I really need to hear your feedback. This is still a work in progress, and as you'll hear it's the first part of an ongoing process.

The other housekeeping note I would make is, as mentioned by Erika, this is a study that was undertaken by ITAC. ITAC is the Information Technology Advisory Council. Some of you are current or former members of ITAC, who are in this room. It is a faculty led body. Dave MacAlpine joins me here from Pharmacology and Cancer Biology. He's the chair of ITAC this year and Sunshine

Hillygus is also here. She was a member of one of the working groups, and as punishment for the great insight she gave she was invited to join ITAC. So, she now serves on that committee. I would say, we also want to stress that although this was undertaken by ITAC, it fits within the President's strategic framework for thinking about research and the goals, activities, and implementation that's now under way for the Strategy Team 2030 efforts. And the fact that we're all aiming to provide as much support as we can for the research needs of our faculty. We hope that the recommendations we will eventually make in this process, and that's not today but eventually, will really prove to be both flexible and effective in meeting the varied needs, and also be adaptable and coordinated across the institution over time.

We started the assessment focusing on IT, but we recognized very quickly on it wasn't just about IT or not narrowly about technology. It was as technology related to all aspects. And so, as I describe the findings and the recommendations - one thing I'll say is, a lot of this has been talked about over time. You're going to say, "Not all of this is new," or "There's not much that's ground-breaking," or "This is old news, nothing earth shattering." That may be true, but we haven't ever collected information together in a comprehensive way like this before. I've been here twenty years now, and through my tenure there's never really been that kind of a comprehensive look of what does the research enterprise actually need as it relates to information technology. Also, I would note that timing was ideal to do something like this. We've got the new Vice President for Research and Innovation, as Erika mentioned. We also have a new University Librarian.

2

These are two new people who bring fresh perspectives, different ideas, new approaches, and new partnerships. They help us remember that even though many of us have been here a long time and have lived through hearing about issues for a long time - new people who come in and ask, "Well, why is it like that?" make us want to take a fresh look at whether some part of our approach isn't quite right.

So, we'll go through a little bit of the aims of this study. We were trying to look comprehensively across faculties in different disciplines. We didn't try to take a school by school approach. Rather, we tried to think about the areas of need that roughly the disciplines and the research that related to IT in particular. I mentioned here, again, that ITAC was the governing body, the guiding body throughout this process and ITAC is faculty led. The process also engaged faculty, about 40, from all different disciplines across Duke. Although, it was not approached on a school by school basis, through the process, we think we covered the range of needs across Duke and across all schools. The exception being we didn't address clinical issues in this one.

Throughout, we also sought to document the process and be as transparent as we could. And I think that's really an important aspect of this. If you have 40 people you ask about an issue, you want to make sure the 2,000 who weren't asked can look and understand who said what and how that came out in the process. So, this idea of transparency was essential.

Earlier I mentioned, we will not talk about solutions today. Where we are right now is what I would describe as phase one of

this process having just concluded. So, the report today isn't about either solutions or structures. It's about what the assessment of need described, and then getting some feedback from you - if we got that about right, or if there are other things to add.

Two key process points around this first phase. First again, it was faculty driven, meanwhile phase two is what I've described here as service partner driven. Service partner here, meaning not only IT but the library, Office of Research Innovation, and others. We've got this idea of feedback loops to make sure as we move from a faculty intensive effort into a service partner intensive effort, we don't lose sight of the fact that the faculty are really the ones we're trying to serve. So, we need feedback groups in that process. Then the third phase of the process, once we have some solutions to propose will really be at the university level. Thinking about funding, philanthropic goals that might arise out of this, structures, organizational placement of services. I want to stress again - the feedback moves throughout. I also want to point out the reason we're trying to keep these as distinct items is so that we don't conflate the needs with what we anticipate today might be the resources available or what would be the best organization to deliver. Rather, we want each of these three phases to be a bit stand alone, so that we can eventually come back if we need to do the building equivalent of value engineering for this process. This phased approach lets us consider that explicitly later in the process rather than sort of compromising at the outset.

So really quickly, this first phase is the assessment. We conducted a study over about seven months, plus a couple of

months of synthesis. We started in February of this year. We involved about 40 faculty over seven different working groups that were domain focused. We incorporated more than twenty-four hours' worth of feedback. About half of that was in individual faculty meetings, and about as much time was spent in ITAC meetings where the dedicated group of ITAC faculty really probe the individual working group members. "What did you mean by this? Tell us about what solutions you need there." It was a pretty involved process. At the end we came up with three thematic areas that had six common findings and ten associated recommendations with those.

In terms of the 40 faculty, just so you can see them and see whom you know, some who are in this room. I've shown the list of faculty in the light blue boxes, and above each is the list of the Deans, Divisional Deans, Institute Directors, who helped to identify those individuals. And then down here in the darker blue, are the faculty who are members of ITAC and their affiliations and, who again, were instrumental in identifying the findings and recommendations and in consolidating the work.

So, what did we find? This is a sort of one-page summary roll up of everything. The six findings were in three thematic areas. The people area shown in blue, here in the upper left, had a couple of recommendations about needing teams of domain specific technical personnel to support the faculty in the areas. The second set of findings, B and C, are around the process. Those have one recommendation each. And then we had three findings around the technology itself, and six recommendations in those. So, if we drill down just a little bit into

each of those, finding A is presented first intentionally. It was the most widely expressed need. It was heard through every single faculty group. And I will tell you, I had expected this from the humanities and the social sciences, but what I had not expected was to hear it so intensely expressed by the basic sciences and engineering. Basically, every group in this study. I had naively thought that higher levels of extramural funding in those other more science traditional units would mean that they had a little less of a burden on this front. But, that was absolutely not the case. So, this is our first and most essential finding, and it's also the one that we acknowledge is perhaps the most expensive to solve, and not just an OIT or IT issue in terms of that solution. But some of it depends on how we solve it. So, thinking about some of the considerations - the first is when you have something that you know is a pretty audacious goal, how do we get more people to support the disciplines all throughout Duke? The first problem we're going to have to think about is how to make sure that we can solve it in a way that's tractable. We don't want to suggest something that's so impractical for us to implement that we can't really move forward and we paralyzed. I mentioned here that as an example of a very rough, lower bound proxy estimate, there are about twenty subject librarians. So, if you think about how you approach Duke by disciplines, that's kind of a lower bound of you'd need at least twenty of those people, but maybe more, right? The task might be bigger. So, you start to think pretty quickly that this could be an issue that's tens of millions, if we approach it in the domain by domain basis. And then it could be even more as we think about the audacious goals we have with respect to science and technology, and what that is

likely to lead to in terms of additional need that could be down the line. Beyond thinking about how we make it tractable, the question is how can we make it scalable and sustainable? And here the consideration is whether instead of slicing the resources at each domain, we could slice them a different way at the need of those domain paths. So, nearly every domain has a need for data analysis support. But you all need it in slightly different ways, and in slightly different amounts. One department is looking for somebody who spends 10% of their time on data analysis, and another department needs somebody who spends 40% of their time helping with data analysis. So, those get to be, as we think about them in the IT space, what they call unicorns. You're just trying to find people that don't exist or that are hard to keep or retain. So, we think about slicing them in a different way, and think about potentially how we could share them across those units. That starts to feel like a more tractable and scalable solution. The issue and key there will be, can we or how can we do that in a way that they still feel like they are your people, your local people in your research domain, not a random person whose name I don't know that I need to call in, and they won't understand my needs.

Moving beyond people - the next set of findings were around process, which also include structure and policy. Here the biggest issue was what you would think of as the so-called divide between the campus and the School of Medicine and School of Nursing. That is a result of the fact that we've got two different IT organizations, two different security profiles, two different sets of risk that we're addressing. Even though this wasn't the thing we heard most often from every group, this was the thing we heard most

vehemently, most assertively, and most painfully from a great deal of the faculty. It was clear that this wasn't just an issue for a few, but for many. One of the most worrisome stories I heard was somebody describing at her last institution, her closest collaborators were in the School of Medicine, and since getting here and trying a few times, she doesn't even try anymore, because it's just too hard to get the collaboration going. The issues described here manifest in both how people locate and use the research infrastructure, how they navigate the compliance and the security environment between our organizations, and the fact that we've got two different organizations. We collaborate like crazy and work together. You can't believe how closely we work with our Health System partners, and yet we're two different organizations. And that comes across as two different sets of services. So, this not only frustrates the faculty, but inhibits collaboration.

So, thinking about how we address that, but one of the most fundamental things I want to point out is, we've talked about this with ITAC very explicitly, because questions arose, "well just move the basic sciences over to campus. Why can't we do that?" Well, if I'm the Dean of Medicine, the last thing I want to do is bifurcate support for my faculty within the school. So that sounds great on paper to some, but in practice it's probably not a tenable solution for us. So, we've really got to work to figure out how we can do that. There are ways technology can help, but it may have a cost, and there are also the organizational and political issues that that relate to it. We have to work on addressing that as one of the issues and considerations.

The other consideration is for finding C, which talks about how do we take a holistic risk-based approach to research security and compliance rather than what, to many, is considered to be a sort of one size fits all approach. There are two big issues - One, is we've got to get to a point of being able to balance between what is the obvious in your face risks that we see and read about every day, because there are always security failures, there are always compliance failures, and that is a risk that we all know. It's obvious, it's clear. But there's the other risk of the more we lock things down in ways that faculty consider to be counter to their ability to do their research, then the more frustration we create and the more likely that it might manifest itself in other undesirable ways. Like faculty leaving and saying, "I don't want to be here. It's too hard for me. I can't collaborate with people I need to." So, there are two sets of risks to balance on finding C. The other thing important around finding C is, we have to avoid, what I would say is the misperception, not perception, but a misperception, that if we move to a more risk-based approach that that would somehow weaken our security stance. It certainly could, if we do it wrong. But I'm assuming that we can find ways that would not do that.

Finally, the last of the three thematic areas is about technology. This one's our bread and butter. This is indicative of what we thought we would hear through the whole process. And so, it really relates to how we provide our IT services, where we need to tune them or tweak them. Also, where we may need new services. Finding F talks about, for example, services that we don't necessarily have in the way we should. Which are storage solutions that span the life cycle of the research use. From an active analysis during a project all the way to long term archival options at the end of a project. We don't have good solutions there, and that's an area where we need to work. These are not areas that, although they do relate mostly to IT, are solely IT's to address. I mentioned Jenny [Lodge] a couple of times and the people she's bringing to R&I [Research and Innovation], including a new person with broad responsibility over data. These will be welcome changes, and great opportunities for us and tangible examples of how our functions will work together toward solutions. Likewise, the library and Joe Salem's arrival gives us a chance to work with them closely also on findings E and F. Perhaps most importantly OIT and DHTS will need to work together, on services across all of these findings. Right now, as I mentioned, we collaborate a lot, but the different implementations that often have to be navigated by the faculty are seen as suboptimal, and so figuring out how we bridge that environment is going to be key.

As I close, talking about technology, I would note that beyond the conduct of research itself, we do have technology gaps in the research administration and system support. Areas like the IRB on the campus not being, I see heads nodding already and teeth gnashing, not being as fully electronic as it should be. We know these are areas, but they were not explicitly areas addressed in a report. Those are known issues that we will resolve. We didn't need to ask the faculty to know that that was a problem area.

So, as we think about these findings, what I would note is, beyond the considerations for the findings, we have a

real clear set of interdependencies across these. Sometimes they're one-way interdependency, sometimes two-way interdependencies, and this is meant to be illustrative. It's not meant to be exhaustive, but in some cases what we do in one area will impact the sense of accomplishment or need in another area. So, I put this up here as an illustration simply to point out the reason why we aim to address this in more an ecosystem, than simply each of us picking off one different area of activity and dealing with it.

Just to remind you, as far as that ecosystem we're looking at a three-phase process. Next, we're going to launch into the solutions proposals. I've already talked about some of the partners in that. We're already starting early exploration of what some of the approaches would be, but I don't want to talk about approaches yet until we make sure we've had the full feedback around the assessment. We do know part of the process will be to establish some teams across our organizations and engaging with others to be looking at these things on a finding by finding level, but a lot of check in and check back and forth with faculty and others. This next stage is going to be a real balancing act, because we want to be the incorporating and encompassing of other organizations, other structures, but not so much so that we have one hundred people in a room and can never get to a solution. This will be key for us. In the past, I think too much of Duke solution has been somebody hears there's a problem, and decides to go be the superhero and solve it, and then we end up with fifty superheroes providing fifty solutions that are disconnected and disjointed. So, we're hoping we can avoid that as the approach this time. I'd also

stress as we move into the proposal solution that we're connecting with the Strategy Team 2030. They have particular areas that they've recommended for implementation that are similar to some of these IT areas. So, we aim to address those and incorporate them.

In closing, here you see the URL for the report. *(Slide referenced)* We have an executive summary, one page, as by law they are required to be. *(Laughter)* And then we have a short summary report, which is about six pages, that goes through the recommendations and cites some of the reasons that we heard from faculty for making those recommendations. But most transparently, we have thirty-three pages worth of appendices that much more explicitly go through the process, group by group, meeting by meeting, summary by summary to document exactly what we heard from which groups and how these arose to be the highest priorities from many things that were described.

With all that said, I hope to hear your feedback today. I also hope to invite people to email any of these two addresses here at the bottom. The generalized one, or you can reach out directly to me if you prefer to. I'd like to take your questions and answer them, I hope, with the help of my two colleagues. If you two want to come up here so I can have safety in numbers. I would also provide a public service announcement. You notice the Duke URL at the top of the top is https:// Duke.is/72sjn. Duke.is is our local Duke URL shorter. So, if you don't want to send out URL's this long to somebody, go to Duke.is you'll authenticate to it. You'll give it a long URL, and it will come back with a very short

URL that starts with Duke.is. So, that was your little technology tip for the day.

Weinthal: Are there questions?

Futhey: Dave or Sunshine, if you think there are things to add maybe you can come up here.

Sunshine Hillygus (Political Science): I guess I would just say that, I think this has been a fabulous exercise. Because there have been conversations, had at SSRI and various departments, in the IRB about complaints that a number of faculty have had about oversight and lack of support. And I'm happy the conclusion is this is not actually an IT problem. This is a university wide problem, and so the hope is that this is not just limited to IT solving it as well. And so, any complaint that you have with respect to research support, Tracy gets things done. *(Laughter)*

Futhey: Jenny has been a great partner.

Don Taylor (Sanford School of Public Policy/Director, SSRI): I really like this and appreciate Sunshine saying university wide and need for cultural change. Probably the most painful part of directing SSRI is dealing with some of these things. And I think if I were going to summarize, what we need to do is we need to shift from a... we have security, like faculty, exist to have security, but this is a research university. So, we facilitate research within compliance, and that may sound like semantics, but it's not. I don't think anybody should underestimate the profound nature of the culture change to get to that, especially if you're trying to get it where the medical side and the campus side collaborate. So, this is important, but faculty are going to have to lean up into it.

Futhey: I said a few times through this process, and I'll say to you the solutions we design always work. It's just that they only work, perhaps for the person who designed them. Right? *(Laughter)* So, if our solutions are designed to protect the institution from risk - which is often what we, as administrators, view our primary role as - they do that. The problem is those secondary consequences if we do it so well that it creates a different set of risks.

Cam Harvey (Fuqua School of Business): Thank you Tracy. This is super important. I wish we had that report before the meeting. Maybe we did, but I didn't see it. I'm sorry. My question has to do with how we assess Duke-wide risks. I worry that we don't know some of the risks. So, faculty are not thinking about the possibility that a server is compromised, and the research data is basically ransomware. One thing I find unusual, at Duke, is that there doesn't seem to be cyber-training for the faculty. Many institutions and corporations I am affiliated with, there is required training. We do RCR training for research, but we do not do the sort of training that is standard about cybercrime and faculty might be naive, clicking a link and leading to a problem. So, I worry about the risks that we have not realized yet, and faculty are not really used to.

Futhey: Great and relevant points. I think we could monitor more, we could train more, and we are moving towards some of that. I would also acknowledge we could monitor too much and train too much and it could lead to some of those other problems. I see my colleagues shaking their heads. I hear that in some parts of the campus and the institution where the expectations around training

8

and regulating, what can be done on a computer actually inhibit the research. I don't know Dave or Sunshine if you want to give me an assist on this one?

Hillygus: One of the things that I think is a real risk that I've seen in the twelve years I've been here, and as the Associate Director of IRB is that we have added additional layers of oversight from other places around the university that we can run the risk of people going around. People thinking, "It's going to take too long to get protocols approved." We have already seen it. It's not that we are just adding more risk, we're actually creating risk by having more oversight. The layers already are ones that Jenny Lodge is working very hard, I think, to resolve. I think that we need to look at that comprehensively in terms of thinking through risk that it's being evaluated, not by the one little committee or the one group that's thinking about just security, but it's being thought about in terms of our research needs, the university's needs, of working together.

David MacAlpine (Pharmacology and Cancer Biology): I'll just echo. I've got students that are undergraduates at Duke, graduate students from both campuses - School of Medicine and Trinity - in my lab. Yet, they are all confined to the School of Medicine security standards. So, they do find ways around the network in ways to get their work done and to collaborate. And that's, again, something that we should be able to negate.

Futhey: I would just say, Cam, on the point about phishing - we've been working to roll out voluntary phishing within the campus, and we had good uptake on that. We will probably push that further in the coming year. Again,

transparently with everyone. So that you know that we're starting phishing campaigns, so that you know that those phishing campaigns are not intended to be identifiable or punitive for anyone. Hopefully, you all know what those phishing campaigns mean. It means we pretend to be the people who want to fool you and if you fall for it we just let you know, we don't tell anyone but we let you know. And then we measure over time. This has been done in the Health System for a few years. They can show over time the improvement in the reduced number of people who click on things, and the increased number of people who report on it. The reason that's so important is the first report we get, we can shut it down. We can pull it from all the mailboxes once we get a couple of verified reports that there's a phishing message out there. So, we can eliminate it from all your mailboxes. Once Sunshine tells me, but if nobody clicks on it, nobody reports it, then it might linger out there until a few people do click on it and do fall for the phish.

Nan Jokerst (Pratt School of Engineering): I got a phishing message a couple of weeks ago, and I'm like, "Oh God! It's phishing!" So, I sent it to Jim Daigle, who's the engineering IT head, and he said "Good job!" and taught me how to click on the little warning. And I'm like, "Yeah! I did it!" So, instead of just telling us when we're bad, tell us when we're good. A little positive feedback made all the difference to me. So now I'm reporting all kinds of stuff. *(Laughter)*

Futhey: It's all on you. If you suspect something report it. See something, say something kind of thing.

Tim Reddy (Biostatistics and Bioinformatics): This is wonderful, I really appreciate it. One point, and I thought it was really wise, the comment you made around aligning the cost models between OIT and DHTS. And I can say, sort of from my perspective as a researcher, I don't really care what the model is I care what the price is. So, the models are different, I don't really care. But if there's giant inequities, and how much computing costs. I think it's going to create a lot of these risk scenarios where people are going to find the cheapest solution, whether or not it's approved. So, I think it's really important to align those at that level.

The second question was, you mentioned that one of the biggest conflicts is that OIT and DHTS running side by side, running parallel, working together. And then it seemed like there was a suggestion that maybe there'd be some merging, but that would be right off the table. Could you elaborate on what you'd see as the path forward? What you're thinking on those comments? I didn't quite understand.

Futhey: I think these questions go to the organizational structures, the identities of groups, and it makes them more politically charged or more personally charged. So, that's why we're really trying to do this process in a stepwise way. We hear what all the needs are, we talk about them, we figure out what could solve them, and then we can worry about where it lives. And I don't in any way feel like everything has to be an OIT thing at all. But at the same time, when I hear frustration, I want to get us to a solution, whatever that solution brings. The merging of the organizations has not ever been anything that we've really discussed, and I don't know if it is particularly

practical. But, it's not my decision. I put those last set of decisions off to be at the university leadership side. And, the clinical world and the health care world, introduce complexity relative to the campus, because the school of medicine is an academic medicine center, and because the faculty are also in many cases, clinicians. 25 years ago, before we had technology that could virtualize the environments and make it so that a person could in one minute and for one set of services look like a faculty member, and in another minute for another set of services look like a clinician. Those virtualization approaches didn't exist 25 years ago, and so that divide came into being. Those technologies do exist now, but we've already got a lot of history behind us and so the organization issues become the difficult ones. I'm not suggesting that we merge the organizations. I'm not suggesting that we can't consider merging them. I'm just saying that we're not at that stage yet.

Reddy: Yeah, it's just interesting. I know what students can do in my lab. They'll use whatever computing they can get their hands on. So, they're often on one side or the other side of the med school firewall. So, they're almost treating it as if it's one environment anyway. But then when it comes back onto me it's a giant headache. Maybe that's an irrelevant observation for this community.

Futhey: No, it's really relevant. I mean, what we're really trying to do is realize that the issues that were created 20 years ago, that maybe set the School of Medicine and Nursing off separately and cordoned them off worked for a while, and if there was pain it was localized pain. But now the thing this process pointed

out to me, this pain is widespread. It ripples all around campus.

Kathy Andolsek (School of Medicine): My question is somewhat stimulated by Tim's comment, and it's - as you looked around for user groups - thank you for doing that to sort of get more voices from faculty. I wonder if there will be opportunity to get some voices from our doctoral students and post docs, who will be our faculty in 2030, and they may have different perceptions of some of this or some of the pain they figured out other ways to mitigate. But, I wonder whether we would get maybe some ideas from them as well.

Futhey: Great suggestion. Maybe a phase two.

MacAlpine: I will add there are graduate students and undergraduates that serve on the ITAC Council.

Futhey: Yeah, they did assist with this process. We know how to do the process now. It's time consuming, but we could do it again if we needed to for different populations.

(Applause)
RECOGNITION/HONORING OF PROVOST SALLY KORNBLUTH

Weinthal: So, for the main event. Our final item for today's meeting is to honor Provost Sally Kornbluth at her last Academic Council meeting. As all of you know by now, or at least I hope you know by now. Sally is leaving Duke later this month to assume the Presidency at MIT at the start of the New Year. This is an incredibly bitter sweet time for those of us who have known Sally throughout her years at Duke. She began her career at

Duke in 1994. So, many of these relationships are very deep and very long standing. For some of you, your connection may only be from when Sally became Duke's first female provost in 2014. During this time, she spearheaded the development of a strategic plan, called Together Duke. She also created Duke's first Office for Faculty Advancement. For others who are here today, it may be that you first became acquainted with Sally when she became the Vice Dean for the Basic Sciences in Duke's School of Medicine. And then there are those of you who have known her since she was a faculty member, when she was studying cell proliferation and program cell death, areas of importance for understanding both carcinogenesis and degenerative disorders. And lastly, there are some of you here today, some of Sally's colleagues here, whose children have grown up with Sally's children. So, these ties are really, they're very emotional, some of these long-standing ties. What few of you may not have known is that Sally once was a member of ECAC, the Executive Committee of Academic Council. That was before she became the Vice Dean of the Basic Sciences. But, she only served one year because she had to forego her second year once she became the vice-dean. As members of the Executive Committee of Academic Council, many of whom are in the room today and many of you who have served on ECAC over the years, we interact with Sally on a more frequent basis. We meet with her several times throughout the academic year. These interactions are really the basis of our shared governance, and they have been critical for guiding Duke through the pandemic and for navigating a wide range of issues regarding academic life at Duke.

So, while Sally can be really down to business - like we're going to get things done, I think many of us can also say Sally has brought at times much light humor to these meetings and a lot of kindness. Ultimately, when I try to summarize the importance of Sally's legacy for Duke, it is really that she has touched so many parts of the university, and also of the medical system in her own distinctive way.

We have a couple of gifts for you today. We have nothing to commemorate that stint on ECAC. But, we do have a nice copy of the meeting agenda from your very first Academic Council meeting as Duke's Provost. This is from the September 2014 Academic Council meeting agenda. And this is where we had our first conversation with Provost Sally Kornbluth about the strategic planning process. But, I will also note there are other topics there that are of great importance to academic life at Duke.

Sally Kornbluth (Provost): You know what, most people don't know that I spent like the twenty minutes before that meeting lying on the floor.

(Laughter)

Weinthal: And our other gift is hopefully something that will prompt you to think of the Council, and Duke, with much fondness, when you wear it.
We wish you all the best and are going to miss you.

Kornbluth: I'm glad to say I did not have to spend the hour before this lying on the floor this time. *(Laughter)* Especially looking around the room, and also thinking I've been here so long that I think I could probably name almost everybody in the room. There might be

one or two exceptions, but that's going to take a long time at a new place.

It's really not easy after all these years, as Erika indicated almost 30 years to say goodbye. I was tempted to use all of this time to say thanks, because if there's anything I've learned in this role you don't get anything done if you don't have fantastic people to work with – faculty, staff, administrators. It's really not possible to accomplish anything in administration without all of the help of your colleagues. So, to the extent that I've been able to do anything at Duke, it's been because of a fabulous team and really great colleagues. I wish I did have time to mention everybody by name, but as I made a list it would have been in the hundreds, and it would take up the rest of the meeting, possibly the next and, as you said it's my last meeting, so that wouldn't work. Suffice it to say I'm incredibly grateful to each one of you who has helped make Duke a better place, and who has help me personally. I'll call out Vince [President Price] for being such an incredible partner. I'd say partner in crime, but that doesn't really sound good. *(Laughter)* All of the Deans and Vice Provosts, particularly Jennifer Francis, who will be taking the reins, because she has been part of everything that I've done in the Provost Office. Hallie Knuffman, my incredibly able Chief of Staff and Mary Greenway, whom I've known so long she was actually the one who prepared my tenure dossier when she was the secretary in the Pharmacology department. We've known each other a long time. I'll thank Laura Brinn, who came to our office more recently, and who quickly learned to put words in my mouth way better than I could - though this particular speech is all my fault.

If you'll indulge me for just two minutes, I'll take a very short walk down memory lane. My husband Danny, whom many of you know, and I arrived at Duke in 1994. I remember the incredibly warm welcome we received, and this was warm in every sense of the word. I distinctly remember standing on Research Drive in August with the steam coming off of the pavement and Danny looking at me and saying "Where on earth have we moved?" *(Laughter)* The chair of our department left 3 months after we were hired into the department of Molecular Cancer Biology, which was later merged with Pharmacology, but for 2 years we had no chair, no faculty meetings and I have to say it was pretty fun. Which I shouldn't mention when I talk about the importance of departmental leadership. *(Laughter)* We then spent years moving up the ranks and even with a young family we spent a huge amount of our time in the labs. In fact, when our son was at Lakewood Avenue Children's school - as Erika said, I met a lot of you through that - and was asked what he wanted to be when he grew up, he said, "I don't know, doesn't everybody get a lab?"

After becoming a full professor, and serving a term on ECAC, I was lucky enough to become the Vice Dean for Basic Science in the School of Medicine. I have said many times, this was neither for altruistic reasons nor because I had any great leadership aspirations, but because I wanted better graduate students for my lab and because I was desperate for a good proteomics facility. Well, I had the opportunity to work on those things and many others, again with an awesome team under Nancy Andrews' leadership with the incredible partnership of Scott Gibson, who many of you know in the School of Medicine. There were some very

challenging times along the way, but overall, it was an amazing experience.

Some of you know the fact that I then accepted a Vice Provost role. Similar to what Jennifer has now, but narrower in scope, under Peter Lange. And then changed my mind at the last minute. That's a conversation for another time – after a few glasses of wine - and a testament to Peter's graciousness because we managed to stay friends despite this. Suffice it to say, I talk to students about this fairly frequently when they express the idea that any decision they make now has to be their long-term life decision. They think that they make a decision to stay in the same career forever and it's just not true.

A few years later Rich Schmalbeck, who was on the Provost search committee, encouraged me to throw my hat in the ring. I was a little dubious about my chances, particularly since I had accepted and then declined a job in the Provost's office before. As you know it worked out, though Dick Brodhead did say, "You know if you take this job, you can't change your mind." I have to say, that I think Dick took a leap selecting someone from the School of Medicine who had limited experience with the other schools. Although he did say to me at the time, "Everyone has to come from somewhere!" So, I have to thank Dick for his faith in me.
Lest you think I'm going to now walk you through every moment of the next 8.5 years, fear not. I just want to say that I am so proud and happy for the great work of the team. Whether it be in faculty advancement, science and technology, building a more diverse and inclusive environment, addressing climate change, improving student life, and of course,

strengthening our core academic excellence.

Since we are at Academic Council, I'll close with a comment on faculty governance. Erika already alluded to the fact that the Chair of Academic Council and the Provost have to be on speed dial, joined at the hip, etc. And Erika has been a terrific partner, as have her predecessors, several whom are here. I've now seen a little bit of other institutions, and I talk to Provost's all over the country and I have to say the faculty governance at Duke is a true gem. It's a partnership between the administration and the faculty in a way that's rare, if not unique in higher education. When I first became the Provost, I inherited this sign "Did you consult your colleagues" and later also got this sign from my team "High road sign." Admittedly the back says, "The barer of this award has performed heroic acts of restraint and dignity in response to extreme provocation." *(Laughter)*

I have to say though, from day one, the Academic Council and other faculty governance bodies committees - APC, UPC, and others have helped me keep the mission of the university in firm view through some difficult moments, through some fun endeavors, and in making many decisions, both tactical and strategic. I'll admit, in faculty governance – the governance directions, I have not always got it right, but I think on both sides there have been a lot of goodwill that has helped through a lot of thorny issues. So, I want to thank all of you, again, for participating so actively in this governance, and along the way for sharing your ideas, your incredibly cool work, which has made the job endlessly

interesting. I've learned about all kinds of fields, which is part of the huge fun of being in the Provost Office and I'll do a little advertisement for APT if you're ever invited by Jennifer. It really is fun to learn about what everyone is doing. So, thank you for your dedication to our mission, and your friendship.

(Applause)

Vince Price (President): I'll be very brief. I'll just say two things. One is, it's fitting that Sally's first celebration is here at Academic Council, and I share her observations about faculty governance here at Duke. It's so very important. We're not just losing a treasured Provost, but a member of our faculty, a distinguished member of our faculty. Two distinguished members of our faculty. We're also saying goodbye to someone who is just a lot of fun, you all know this, and someone who's been an incredible partner to me. So, knowing that I'll have other opportunities, this is really Council's moment, I'll just say, we're all going to miss you terribly.

Weinthal: I'm going to thank everyone for coming out and sharing this moment with Sally. This is our last Council meeting of this semester. I will see everyone back here in January, and I'm just going to forewarn everyone, spring semester is going to be very busy. Have a great rest of the semester and a great winter break.

Price: We will have a faculty wide reception next week. Another opportunity to say goodbye to Sally. I want to encourage everyone to come out next Thursday. *(Applause)*