

**Minutes of the Academic Council and the Annual Faculty Meeting
Thursday, March 21, 2024**

Trina Jones (Chair, Academic Council / Law School): Good afternoon and welcome everyone. Thank you all for being here for what is also our Annual Faculty Meeting, according to Chapter 2 of the Faculty Handbook. We look forward to hearing from President Price in a few minutes and to gathering for the reception after our meeting today. If I or ECAC have not had an occasion to interact with you, we really look forward to doing so after the meeting today during the reception.

Just a quick note - the Academic Council's annual election has concluded, and on behalf of ECAC I extend our congratulations to a number of newly elected members. Although their terms do not begin until the fall, perhaps some of them are here today or will be joining us for our next two meetings of the year. We would also like to extend our warmest thanks to those Council members whose terms will continue into the next academic year and to those individuals who are rotating off of the Council. You can find next year's roster on the AC website under the Committees and Members tab.

APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 15 MEETING MINUTES

Jones: Our next item is to approve the minutes from our February 15th meeting which were posted with today's agenda. Are there any corrections to the minutes?

Harvey, did we get it right this time? *(Laughter)* I'm teasing you. Any corrections to the minutes? May I have a motion to approve? Second? All those in favor say yes. All those opposed say no Any abstentions?

(Minutes approved by voice vote with no dissent)

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE SELECTION PROCESS

Jones: On to our next agenda item, which is about the university committee selection process. Chapter 2 of the Faculty Handbook provides that ECAC is the committee on committees for the Academic Council and for the university faculty. What this means is that ECAC spends a fair amount of time discussing potential faculty members to suggest for the numerous committees across the university. We not only consider replacements for people who are rotating off of a committee, but throughout the year we also propose names for committees that are being constructed for searches for university administrators, deans, and for other purposes. We are always striving to be as inclusive and as broad thinking as possible, and not just fall back on suggesting those people that we might know from our schools or departments, or from our individual experiences through university service. What many faculty do not realize, and believe me, I and many members of ECAC

did not know this until we served on ECAC, is just how many university committees there are. So, I thought I'd put this up just to demonstrate some of the committees, and this is not a fully inclusive list. So, there are Provostial committees, there are Presidential committees, the Office of Research and Innovation has committees, there are Board of Trustees committees, the Academic Council has committees, there are other ad hoc committees that come up during the course of the year. So, there are lots of committees. What we want to do is to broaden the committee pool and to be as inclusive as possible. We had the thought to ask all of you if you could suggest yourself or other colleagues that you may know who might be interested in university service or who might be particularly experienced in a particular area. What I'm going to ask is that you look for an email from the AC Office within a couple of weeks or so with a request from you to either suggest yourself for committee service or colleagues who you think might be interested in this service. Keep in mind that you do not need to be a member of the Academic Council to serve on one of these committees. And finally, note that if you nominate yourself or a colleague, that doesn't necessarily mean that you or they will be assigned to a committee. ECAC nominates faculty members for committees, but we ultimately send those names over to the Provost's Office and the President's Office, and they populate the actual committees. So, we're asking for your assistance. If you know of people who you think might be interested in committee service, please let us know because we want to be as inclusive as possible. Any questions?

Roxanne Springer (Physics): Two things. One, what do you think about the idea of every, I don't know, two or three years charging each of these committees to decide whether or not they should end themselves. Which is to say whether or not there should be a sunset clause on these. The other thing I'd like to ask is when you do send out this invitation, that it's organized so that the responsibilities, goals, and potential impact of each of the committees is listed so that people can really look at that. You can ask somebody, it's important that we all serve for the greater good of our community, "Just pick one of these that you have an interest in." But in order to do that, we have to know what it is the committee does and what its scope is.

Jones: On your question of sunseting committees, we [ECAC] have been, during the course of the year with all of our free time, looking at the operation of some of the committees and asking whether they are functioning as we might expect or desire for maximum shared governance. So, we are in that process, but you saw all of those committees. ECAC can only do so much of that. I hear what you're saying, ask the committee to do an evaluation of itself and maybe ECAC will follow up with that idea. I think it might be a really good one. But we are thinking about whether the committees are in fact a good mechanism for shared governance given the evolution of the university over time.

On the second question, we spent a lot of time thinking about how to solicit information from the Academic Council. We thought about a Qualtrics survey with all of the committees and their descriptions. Nobody...if I got that email or that survey with 30 or 40 committees with a description...I don't think I'd make

it to the end. So, we actually decided not to proceed in that direction and to leave it a little bit more open ended. But there will be a link to all of these committees that faculty members can access and read and review them to the extent that a faculty member desires to do so. But a Qualtrics survey with 45 committees and descriptions. How many of you would get to the end? Are my instincts correct? Okay. But thank you so much. Any other questions or feedback? And Roxanne, if you have another suggestion for us, I'm happy to hear it during the reception. But again, the idea is to be as inclusive as possible.

ANONYMOUS QUESTION FOR THE PRESIDENT TO ADDRESS

Jones: Our next agenda item is an anonymous question. And let me just say, our tradition of receiving anonymous questions from faculty for submission to senior leadership is alive and well this year! *(Laughter)* We have another question that ECAC received for today's meeting. This question was posted with the distribution of the agenda per our usual practice. I will read the question:

In light of the February 2024 ACIR (Advisory Committee on Investment Responsibility) report to the President recommending that DUMAC (Duke University Management Company) not be required to divest from fossil-fuel investments, will Duke at least commit to accounting for the carbon emissions associated with its fossil fuel-related investments in the context of its carbon-neutral-by-2024 pledge?

President Price, I invite you to respond to this question.

Vince Price (President): It's my day at the podium...*(Laughter)* Well, thanks for the question. I'd also like to thank Professor Emma Rasiel, who is here as Chair of the Advisory Committee on Investment Responsibility, and her colleagues on the committee for their thoughtful February report and for the work, more generally, of that committee. As part of their work, back in 2019, the committee suggested that we investigate the feasibility of creating a carbon tax on selected investments. And that recommendation was considered then and remains under consideration. However, it's presently not practical for DUMAC to account for the carbon emissions in its portfolio, and that is for two primary reasons. The first reason is that data bearing on the allocation of carbon to selected investments are generally not reliable. So, the accounting itself is highly problematic. DUMAC has over 12,000 companies, private and public, represented in the portfolio. Data are not available for many of the private companies and in the case of the public companies what data are available are generally incomplete or inaccurate. The second reason is that while DUMAC could conceivably do their own accounting, in house, for the sake of reliability, it would be incredibly labor intensive to do that work. Estimates are that it would require hiring considerable additional staff, more than 20, which would amount to almost doubling, frankly, of the DUMAC staff to faithfully represent carbon emissions across the entire portfolio. What is practical and in keeping with our climate commitments is what DUMAC has undertaken since 2019. First, DUMAC has invested in positive impact companies, those that are promoting U.N. sustainable development goals and does their own due diligence on this by using machine

learning and artificial intelligence. At present, \$2 billion in the portfolio are invested to have these positive impacts. It's not a perfect accounting, I will tell you, but the attempt is made and this represents about 15% of our long-term pool. So, by directing investments to these positive impact companies, there's an attempt to make a positive difference in line with our climate commitment. This approach has been judged to be more feasible and frankly, more impactful than deployment of an internal investment carbon tax, which would also likely have a negative impact on our long-term returns. I, and I'm sure my colleagues at DUMAC, remain open if others are able to present DUMAC with a more developed and implementable version of a carbon tax recommendation.

Second, DUMAC has also divested from direct Cash Equity Holdings, meaning that we have divested of the carbon 200 companies. And we do have exposure through indirect holdings and derivative positions that are held for risk management purposes. And those do not necessarily represent either direct or indirect investments in fossil fuel companies. It is very difficult to divest or extract ourselves from these just because of the embedded nature of energy and energy services companies associated with fossil fuels. Now, we could claim from our direct investment management that we have divested optically at least, but that would be disingenuous. A thorough, complete divestment of all investments connected to fossil fuels would limit discretion among the managers for investment choices. Without either the requisite confidence in the data or the confidence that we're actually having the desired impact. Complete divestment would also

significantly reduce the pool of available investments related to clean energy, transition, and production, since investment managers in the energy space are often invested across the spectrum of clean, transitional, and fossil fuel energy.

And finally, such a complete divestment attempt would be a serious impediment to sound financial returns. And that is the primary charge for DUMAC. So that is our response. And I'll step away from the podium before stepping back.

Jones: Are there any questions for President Price?

Price: And again, I do commend you. The report, I don't know if it's yet publicly available, but we post the reports and responses on the ACIR website. I encourage you to go through those reports. They're very thoughtfully constructed and very well done.

Jones: The next item on our agenda is the President's annual address to the faculty. And here's our President. *(Laughter)*

PRESIDENT PRICE AND ANNUAL ADDRESS TO THE FACULTY

Price: There you go. It's an annual address, not an anonymous address. *(Laughter)* Thank you, Trina. And let me begin by expressing my thanks to you and to ECAC for your leadership, and to every member of Council for your dedicated service to the university's academic mission. This year, as you can no doubt tell from the banners across our campus, we are celebrating Duke University's Centennial. Nearly 100 years ago, that was in December of 1924, James B. Duke signed the Indenture of Trust that created Duke University out of Trinity College. In

his indenture, Duke made clear that he saw higher education, and especially the advanced professional training a research university can provide, as critical to the social and economic development of this region, as a means “to develop our resources, increase our wisdom and promote human happiness.” Though he could not have foreseen then the great advancements and possibilities of the next hundred years, and certainly nothing like advanced Biomedical Engineering or Generative Artificial Intelligence, James B. Duke’s vision of the university as a catalyst for societal progress was forward-thinking. North Carolina in 1924 was primarily rural, with rigid racial segregation enforced by Jim Crow laws, and one or two of every ten adults residing in this state were not able to read or write. Fittingly, our Centennial Celebration is also forward-thinking. Following the recommendations of a trustee strategic task force that included students and faculty, including Trina and other faculty, thanks to the work of that committee we have three goals in mind. We seek to deepen our understanding of our history through informed self-reflection. We hope to inspire our community by honoring the people who have contributed to Duke’s growth and success over those one hundred years. And, looking forward, we seek to build on our momentum and advance our strategic vision for the future. These three goals are now being brought to life through a yearlong series of events and activities being organized by individuals and units across campus, in coordination with our Centennial Executive Director Jill Boy.

First, we have the opportunity to engage this year with our institutional history, in candid reflection as we learn from our past. Examples include the “Our Duke”

historical exhibit in Perkins Library; or the bilingual exploration of the history of Latiné students at Duke that is currently housed in the Classroom Building on East Campus. Both exhibits were curated by students under the guidance of faculty and the Duke Archives. This year, as well, several Bass Connections project teams are studying defining features of Duke’s first century. In addition, an oral history project, a book, and documentaries—including a history of the Blue Devil that was just released this week—that will explore and preserve the achievements as well as the struggles of our first century. These are but a few of the many different ways our community has embraced our Centennial as an opportunity for teaching and for scholarship about our own history. And I hope you will generate, promote, and take full advantage of these resources.

Second, we have the opportunity, this year, to honor and recognize some of the many people who have made Duke’s accomplishments possible, as well as the people, including you here now, who are currently shaping the institution today. Throughout the year we are shining a spotlight on both well-known and under-recognized individuals who have contributed to the university’s growth and success. These include, to name just a few: Alice Mary Baldwin, who was named Dean of Women 100 years ago this month and who worked to advance opportunities and recognition for women, students, faculty, and alumni. C.B. Claiborne, Duke’s first Black student-athlete, who went on to build a distinguished academic career, and will be receiving an honorary degree this year at commencement. And, as we announced last month, we are recognizing two of Duke’s most dedicated

early staff members with the naming of the George and George-Frank Wall Center for Student Life.

Third, and in some ways most importantly, we have the opportunity to frame these past hundred years as the foundation for advancing our strategic vision for Duke's next century of excellence and leadership. Just as James B. Duke, William Preston Few, and the faculty, staff and students of Trinity College together set this institution on a path to realizing all of our current success, we now have, all of us, the ability to ensure that we are on a path to an even brighter future. Yes, we face the challenges of an incredibly turbulent and rapidly changing world, one that seems unusually unsettling for higher education, for academic medicine, for intercollegiate athletics, indeed for much of what we do today. But the 1920's were unsettling in their own ways, as the world transitioned out of the Great War and a deadly flu pandemic and within just decades would face the Great Depression and the Second World War. They found opportunity in their moment. We will find opportunity in ours. How do we do that?

I think we start by recognizing that our success, like their success, derives entirely from Duke's people. At our core, we are in the business of identifying and developing human talent. It is through our people—our faculty, staff, students and alumni—that we make a positive difference in our region and in the world. James B. Duke clearly recognized this, calling on Duke University, in his Indenture of Trust, to recruit people “of such outstanding character, ability and vision as will insure its attaining and maintaining a place of real leadership.”

And that is precisely what we're doing. Through the Duke Science and Technology Initiative, we've hired 35 new faculty members, significantly building on Duke's strengths, in areas spanning computing, materials science, and brain and body resilience. We're also enhancing the infrastructure that supports faculty research, and beginning the long-overdue process of renewing key academic facilities to ensure that they will support 21st century learning and scholarship. The result is an increasingly diverse and talented faculty, with more members than ever before in the national academies, a faculty that last year enabled Duke to spend \$1.4 billion on research and launch 15 new companies. And as we announced earlier this week, we have the pleasure of recognizing 32 members of our faculty with Distinguished Professorships. We are investing as well in our students and in our alumni. Student financial aid remains among our very highest priorities, reflecting our commitment to equitable access to a Duke education with enhanced financial support for undergraduate and graduate students alike. Last year, with the support of the Duke Endowment, we launched our new initiative for students from North and South Carolina. The proportion of students in the undergraduate class of 2027 who come from Pell-eligible families rose to an all-time high of 17% and we are launching new initiatives to help graduates from HBCUs and other minority-serving institutions in our region to attend Duke's graduate and professional schools. We're transforming teaching and learning for our students as well, leveraging experiential and team-based learning opportunities, and working through our faculty, I know many of you have been enlisted in this project, of better fusing our educational

and research missions as we pursue creative solutions to the challenges of our day. And recognizing the critical work of our staff and Duke's role as a major employer in our region, we're focused on ensuring pay equity, and this July we will raise our minimum wage to \$18 an hour. We do this because we know the deep and transformative value of bringing to Duke an ever more diverse collection of people that truly reflects the society we live in. But we also know that, to realize the full potential of Duke's people, we must cultivate and maintain a campus community where every person, especially those whose viewpoints or backgrounds may be in the minority, feels a strong sense of belonging and support for their work. We must create a culture that clearly reflects our core institutional values of respect, trust, inclusion, discovery, and excellence in everything that we do.

To that end, we have just concluded our second Campus Culture Survey, which seeks to understand the ways our students, faculty and staff experience Duke. The results of this survey will be used to identify areas where members of our community may not feel included, supported or valued for the work they do. And it helps us introduce and share new practices to address those areas of concern where they exist. In the first such survey, we learned that staff members felt an acute need for clearer pathways for career advancement, and in the time since we've been working to address those needs as well as others that we identified through the survey. As a university community, we seek to advance discovery and excellence through honest, open inquiry while maintaining mutual respect and trust. As the world around us becomes even more polarizing, it is

imperative that our Duke community be one in which we foster open and civil discourse, express our differences in productive ways, and build mutual trust and respect for others in all that we do. We've seen the intense need for this on a global scale this year, as the Israel-Hamas war has caused profound suffering and conflict, both for those directly affected by the violence, and for countless others worldwide. Although our campus has not been immune from the conflict surrounding that situation, our response throughout has been guided by an attempt to remain committed to community, and by a desire to ensure the safety and well-being of every member of the community. Provost Alec Gallimore has launched an Initiative on the Middle East to foster constructive dialogue, leverage academic expertise, and enhance learning opportunities for our community. I'm grateful to Professor Bruce Jentleson for his leadership of this initiative, as well as to the many other members of the faculty who have already engaged with this work. So, investing in people, and investing in community are two fundamental ways we position Duke well for the future. To this list, I will add a third: investing in purposeful partnerships. The challenges we now face—from divisive politics and souring international relations, to threats to human health from natural and man-made factors, to the existential threat of climate change—these all require unprecedented levels of interdisciplinary collaboration and coordination, both within Duke and with external partners. We enjoy a well-deserved reputation for interdisciplinary collaboration. That is thanks to your work as faculty and traditions established over the years, and now we're building on that in quite significant ways. A few notable examples

include our work on advancing racial and social equity, supported across campus by every one of our schools and our Racial Equity Advisory Council; and the Duke Climate Commitment, which is mobilizing all aspects of our operational, research, and educational assets to seek sustainable and equitable solutions that will place us on a path toward a resilient, flourishing, carbon-neutral world. We've also renewed our commitment to Duke's hometown of Durham and to our neighbors throughout the Carolinas, as we thoughtfully draw on our educational and research missions to advance our Strategic Community Impact Plan. That plan is designed to help address our city and region's most pressing challenges. At Duke Health, we have proceeded with an historic integration of the Duke University Health System and the Private Diagnostic Clinic, our former physician practice. While our new Duke Health Integrated Practice is still very much a work in progress - and I know many of you in this room know this quite well - it promises new opportunities for our academic medical enterprise. Through Duke Health, we've recently partnered with Durham Public Schools and Durham Tech to establish an early college high school that will prepare local students for careers in healthcare, while simultaneously addressing critical workforce shortages here at Duke but also more generally in the region. At the same time, we are also enhancing our connections to Duke's global network of alumni and friends by leveraging our centennial to deepen alumni engagement through personalized experiences online, on-campus, and around the world. All of these reinvigorated forms of local and regional engagement are complemented by our exceptional global presence, through Duke-NUS in Singapore, Duke

Kunshan University in China, and through the worldwide scholarship and engagement of our faculty and students. Over the course of the next year, the Board of Trustees, the Provost, and I will be engaged in regular conversations with you, regarding our global presence and our aspirations for global impact and how we can leverage all of those qualities I just described to extend our impact around the world. Indeed, as we consider the challenges and the opportunities of artificial intelligence, climate, and global health, I believe no other university is as well situated as we are, as James B. Duke hoped we would be, to serve society and uplift mankind. As we celebrate this first century, and approach the second, I'm confident that our strategic vision to invest in people, to strengthen our community, and to promote and multiply our impact through purposeful partnerships these will build on our remarkable past and ensure an extraordinary future.

I thank you, my faculty colleagues, for supporting the Duke we have always been and the even more remarkable Duke we are destined to become. With that, I would now be happy to take your advice or any questions you may have.

(Applause)

Jones: Any questions? No? I'll be happy to start. Vince, I like the way in which you think about community both within the institution and focusing on all aspects of our community; faculty, staff, and students, and then thinking about those relationships with the Durham community, then the region, and then internationally. It's just really wonderful to see you thinking about a community in such a nuanced way. But as we think

about the strategic vision for the future, for the next 100 years, I know you were the Chair of a Faculty Senate at a previous institution. How do you perceive shared governance and the role of shared governance as we move forward? Because you're talking to faculty members of the community, and so what is our role as you think strategically about Duke's future?

Price: It's a great question and thanks for remembering that I was the Chair of this body at another institution before I migrated into a Provost's Office. I feel very strongly that the heart and soul of the academic enterprise is clearly the faculty of a university. We think of the word faculty, it describes an ability or a capacity. The fundamental abilities and capacities we have as an institution are represented by our faculties across these ten extraordinary schools. And so, success in this enterprise, I think, requires two things. One, we recognize, as I said before, we're investing in individuals. So, each individual member of the faculty has an obligation to think about how they can best deploy their unique talents and move their field, their discipline, their areas of scholarship forward. In some ways, one would say the job of the university is to ignite that propellant and then, sort of, get out of the way. But we are also an academic community. And so we do have obligations to each other and obligations to the university, Duke University, our departments, our schools to make sure that the collective enterprise is healthy. And that requires balancing some of our individual goals and objectives as a scholar, but frankly as a human being, against some of the Commonwealth and the interests of the larger institution. And I think it's time for universities to re-embrace, in a deep way, rights and responsibilities of being a faculty

member, particularly in a place that is a world leading institution. We are being roundly attacked...I'm sure if you just open a newspaper to see that this is going on...a wealthy institution with a strong sense of entitlement, kind of, oblivious to the Commonwealth. I don't believe that, I think it's a caricature. But a caricature also does capitalize on certain real features of institutions and of people. So, I think that what we need to talk about, collectively and not just at this level, I think most importantly at the departmental levels, is how do we take common responsibility for everything that happens - for the curriculum, for the welfare of our students, supporting each other. And it means stepping in to teach that really unpopular class. That's just a really big, hard to do thing. And not saying that it is someone else's job. It means owning not just the rights, but also all the responsibilities and obligations. That's how I think of shared governance. It's not principally between you and me, you as the leader of the faculty, me as the head of the institution or Alec [Gallimore] as the chief academic officer. It's fundamentally shared governance. It's going to work when it works...where the faculty live, and that's typically down in your department. I think we just need to think about that. I am a little concerned, frankly, that so many things that happen on a college campus today almost get transparently communicated right up to the President. I'm in receipt of petitions on a regular basis. I'm currently in receipt of petitions numbering in the thousands telling me what we either should not be doing or what we should be doing. *(Laughter)* Whatever I know, that is not shared governance. That's not even democratic governance. That's just taking advantage of channels of communication. But shared governance is different. It's

dialogue, it's conversation, it's handling hard questions. It's actually going to faculty meetings, and not thinking of those as an obligation or a waste of time, but actually where the hard work gets done. So that's just my view and I think now is a great time for a place like this, which frankly is sounder than other institutions that I've been, lives and breathes community and in ways that I think are more vibrant and more vital will be a leader in that respect. I'm confident we'll do that. But those are my thoughts.

Cam Harvey (Fuqua School of Business/ECAC Member): You mentioned the 26 faculty that have been hired in the Science and Technology Initiative and in your strategic...

Price: 25. I want to give full credit to our colleagues who have done all the hiring.

Harvey: That's great. In your strategic vision, the kind of model research university of the 21st century features prominently. But when you look at the numbers over the last ten years, the number of tenure track faculty at Duke has decreased by 8%, including a decrease in each of the last three years. Over the same time, the number of non-tenure track faculty has increased by 62%. So, my question is, will there be a change? Will we start to rebuild our tenure track faculty to achieve this vision of being a great research university?

Price: It's a great question, Cam, and it's principally a question, to be honest, for our Provost and the Deans of the schools, because that's where the hiring takes place. And for you, this is another case of shared governance. How we have conversations about the size, the shape, the contours of our faculties, and think in

deep ways about how it promotes the great work that we have to do, teaching and research. I would start by saying that our non-tenure track faculty do a lot of phenomenal research. So, we should not confuse ourselves that tenure equals productive research faculty. Non-tenure track equals like teaching or something else. In my experience, if you look in domains where you're talking about applied fields of research, for example, I have been at universities where the non-tenure track faculty, both in terms of average numbers of publications on promotion and impact of the work, exceed on average those of the tenured faculty. I just want us to step back and not make these sorts of premature, easy distinctions. That being said, the structure of the faculty is among the most critical things we do because we have to create incentives to do the great work, to make sure the teaching and the research happens. And I think, honestly, some of our problems have to do with a desire for those faculty members who are more research oriented to have their cake and eat it too, by doing less teaching and then saying, "Well, it's the Dean's problem to solve the teaching demands of our department, school, university." No, it's everybody's responsibility. So, some of this starts with just thoughtful allocation of effort. Teaching, research, service across all those ranks and just make sure that we're not doing things that are insidious in their own ways that suddenly shape the faculty in ways that are at broad scale suboptimal. But that's a conversation that just, again, has to start at the departmental level, work its way through the Deans and the Provost. The quality of a faculty is and at the end of the day, resonant in so many ways in the tenure track faculty. But, you know, in a modern research university, we're not the

only university that has, by the way, experienced the trajectory of those kinds of numbers, it's a pretty common trajectory. Is it good? Is it bad? That's the question. Does it serve our needs or fail to serve our needs? Does it put us on the right trajectory or the wrong trajectory? Those are the questions, but they're important questions, Cam, and I'm glad you raised them.

Karin Shapiro (African and African American Studies): Thank you very much for your remarks, President Price. I did appreciate the previous question. This is not my question, but particularly pointing out the growth of the number of non-tenured faculty and the questioning that emerges about how to support those faculty in the research that they do as well. But my question to you is, I saw many of the positives that you have laid out for us and the kind of vision of where you'd like to go. But I'm really interested in what you think requires real course correction as we think about Duke going forward. What now? At this point, Trina has perhaps suggested some...previous speakers, some others but are there other issues that you are thinking of?

Price: I would nominate a couple of things. I do think that we have a lot of work to do to restore and regain public trust and confidence. And we're not entirely responsible for this. There have been concerted efforts to undercut what universities, like Duke, do. But we also are not entirely free of blame in the sense that we have tended to occupy ourselves with what we want to do and be less concerned with how that plays more broadly. What the impact of our work is in the world. These kinds of things. One course correction, I would argue, is that we do need to take seriously some of

these criticisms of the academy when it comes to complaints about viewpoint diversity, when it comes to complaints about entitlement, how one translates the rights that we have as faculty...just to parts of the world, it looks indulgent. It doesn't look like an honored profession. It looks a bit indulgent. And that's incumbent on us and the way we behave to make sure that we shore up that level of support, because it surely can be very corrosive. Our endowment is already being taxed by the US federal government and there are people lining up because they don't buy the view that we ourselves buy, and that I articulated here, that we deploy all these resources for a very positive mission and positive impact. They read something different. So, we need to be more open to those critics, not push them aside and not greet them principally as opponents outside the city walls trying to topple the enterprise, but actually sit down with them and understand what their concerns are and address them in an honest and sensible way. I just think it's a posture correction. So, I'll say that's one thing that I think we do. I do think we need, to Cam's question, take a hard look at how we deploy resources. And make sure that they are always consistent with our highest priorities. We're viewed as institutions that, again, are overly indulgent and build up enterprises that are sort of consumer facing and don't support core mission as effectively as we might. And I think we always have to step back and ask ourselves, are we doing the right things? I do think the pricing model of higher education...it's not so much that it's broken, but it's very complicated and it is very hard to communicate to people how our list price is actually fair pricing, better than fair pricing. And I don't know how we remedy that, but we either have to

change that model or put it on a very different footing so that people can appreciate the fact. And the fact is that if you just take this institution and you roll back 20 years, we're not more expensive for most families of students sending students to our campus. For some we are. But for many, those students who don't receive financial aid, their family incomes have risen greatly. So, if you look at the cost of this institution as a proportion of family income, it's actually flat or slightly declined, you know, in aggregate. For aided students, it's declining, again, either flat or slightly declining. So, you can think of this as a fair pricing model, but it looks pretty strange because people focus not on net price but on total price. So, we either alter that model, the pricing structure, but I'm very fearful. It puts a big target on our backs. And affordability, if you listen to what is undercutting public trust, a big chunk of it is the sense of affordability.

A third thing I would nominate, and this is also in the area of trust, but convincing public entities that the way that this nation has historically invested in higher education, public and private, has been a tremendous source of economic value, social value, cultural value, because of the disinvestment from higher education is truly frightening. At the state level and now at the national level. As I sit here speaking, research budgets are being held flat. There's talk about restructuring federal aid programs for students and making us pay for it because the federal government just wants to find someone else to pay. As a private institution, we can kid ourselves and think that we're unaffected by those trends, but we're all affected by those trends. We have to shore up that commitment to making infrastructural investments in human

beings, because without it as a nation, we will fall behind economically. But it's reflective of the broader reluctance to invest in infrastructure of all kinds, whether it's highways or human beings. Those are three things that I would nominate. They are all critical. They are big, right? These are not like easy...sit down with Alec [Gallimore], sort it out, run it by Trina, away we go. And they're not one- or two-year challenges but I would say over 5 to 10 years, these are the big challenges that we're going to have to navigate through as an institution. I apologize for that long-winded response, but these are very significant problems for Duke, and I'm glad you asked the question.

Polly Ha (Divinity School/History): I just appreciate how you mention the sort of agility and vision that has always been crucial to Duke's success, and going forward will continue to be in the unprecedented levels of interdisciplinarity that's also going to be re-imagined. And I wondered if there are specific ways, building on what Trina mentioned, of catalyzing that existing energy among faculty through thinking about what might seem to faculty as perhaps not necessarily inviting that kind of collaboration. So, I'm thinking of coteaching across departments, which might not necessarily be seen as opportunities unless through specific programs. I'm just wondering if there's ways that that unprecedented level of interdisciplinarity on the ground level across more faculty going forward will be supported, whether it be through investment, whether it be through flexibility with coteaching, because sometimes the singularity is that there's an error of retraction, reduction, and saving instead of an expansion through

those collaborations. And so I wonder whether you see opportunities for faculty to be catalyzed in that interdisciplinarity through specific pathways through the campus culture as well as through the global?

Price: I definitely see opportunities. The question for us all to contemplate is what are the most effective opportunities to seize? I do believe, and this has been my personal experience, if I compared my experience here at Duke to other universities where I've been, it does feel as a place where there are lower barriers to cross school and cross-departmental collaboration. But that's not to say there are no barriers. And I think the challenge for a complex organization, like ours, is that the structure itself, while it's adaptive to change, feels in the moment very real and very rigid and sort of set in stone. It should never be viewed that way, right? Departments are made to come and go. Schools were made to come and go. Whole fields and disciplines, in a way, made to come and go. But in our lives, we tend to think of them as givens. And that's probably the biggest barrier to interdisciplinary collaboration because we use what is essentially an artificial projection of these structures on the world to allocate resources, to hire faculty, to give appointments, to grant tenure, to make teaching assignments, to incentivize, all these things. So, we have to be clever about thinking that some of the traps are of our own making and how can we pull down a barrier here or there without damaging the whole enterprise because if it is functional, you can't just have chaos. It's the simulation of generative chaos in experimental ways that I think would be likely most productive.

Some examples, you mentioned coteaching, we do quite a bit of that now, but the university courses are a good example of how we're trying to launch initiatives by putting together interesting combinations of faculty across multiple schools and disciplines. Bass Connections is a powerful integrative device. We have such things around. How can they be scaled? It's an open question. I think when we dig into artificial intelligence, in a serious way in computing, we will be forced to confront the fact that it's everybody's problem and it's everybody's opportunity. And so, you don't want to create a new department to do these things. You have to create a new structure that allows every part of the institution to both be part of the solutions, but also to derive value and opportunity from what's going on. We've already done this. Those are the big moves, but on a smaller scale within schools, rethinking teaching assignments is a good example. I think recognizing that our students are oftentimes far more generative of these connections than faculty are, because they're not fully developed as scholars. So, they'll go anywhere, talk to anybody. When you move to a new city with a young child, not to compare our graduate students or undergraduate students to young children, but as a matter of social interaction, if I now move...my children, they're not children, they're in their thirties...but if I moved to a new community, I'm missing a huge asset compared to someone who moves to a new community as someone who is in fourth grade, sixth grade, whatever, because there are powerful connectors they get out and about and I don't talk to anybody, do anything. They're all about ideas. Our students, undergrad and grad, are better at that than we are. So, we need to mobilize them, frankly. It's just having

a more humble posture and saying, "We don't have all the answers. Let's get together." But I do think Duke does this pretty well. We tend to get to, yes, a little more easily than other places. And I think under Alec's [Gallimore] leadership and I know the Deans are thinking through these challenges with leaders like Toddi Steelman in the climate space, we're better equipped to come up with some interesting ideas than anywhere else. And in the medical domain, our Health System and Medical School, Nursing School and Engineering School are sitting there cheek by jowl with faculty who are really well disposed to talk to each other and the ability of those faculties to lift the health care enterprise is extraordinary. We've got all the ingredients, it's a creativity challenge.

Adriane Lentz-Smith (History):

Children and puppies, they are what connect communities. *(Laughter)* If it was bad to talk about undergrads and grads as children throwing in pets is probably not...*(Laughter)* This is a big abstract question, but if part of our role as intellectuals and scholars is to enter public debates or public conversations and not accept the terms, the language, or the frames in which they're being had when those frames are reductionist. How do we then connect with people who are already inclined not to hear us? And I asked that question, in part, inspired by the question over here and some of your responses to Karin, which is that even in this sort of question about non-tenure track versus tenure faculty, what didn't come up was intellectual freedom and the way that tenure was born in the McCarthy era to protect people who are saying unpopular things. And as a black woman who teaches histories of white supremacy, so often claims that I'm

stifling, say, viewpoint diversity are actually attempts to silence me. So, I see that very clearly. The response is clear. It's not always the most productive response, right? In your position as president of this university, who has to be then an emissary for scholars as well as a person who opens up or projects space for the institution, how do you strike that balance?

Price: It's very challenging and that struggle for academic freedom, while it reached a critical point in the McCarthy era, it has long roots, right? And you go back to the Bassett affair here on this campus some years ago. And the promulgation of the 1940 AAUP [American Association of University Professors] statement on academic freedom and responsibility is actually a rewrite of a 1925 statement. And as I shared with ECAC recently, the last time that statement was actively reviewed was in the seventies and it's time for us to take another look at it. My own view of this is it's very difficult to do. It does require an institutional posture that is as much as we can manage apolitical and non-judgmental. When we talk about university values, we have to work at making sure that we articulate those in ways that are not read as, "Here's our political position." That doesn't mean we don't advocate for policies that support higher ed and what Duke is trying to do and support academic freedom, for example, but that there's a responsibility to reserve judgment as much as we can, as a general posture, and speak with authority when we do speak in part because we've earned a degree of trust. So, the kind of noisiness of the enterprise in a way, undercuts some of our public trust. That's always going to be difficult to manage. And the way I would like to think

of this, personally, is that the tolerance of opposing ideas itself has to be exercised in strictly apolitical terms. If we want to have the right to stand up and say, "I have this position and I deserve to be heard, and it's critical." We simultaneously, and this is hard to do, have to give ground when someone else stands up and says something that we find deeply objectionable. And that's just very hard to do. Doesn't mean you can't criticize. You have to criticize. You have a perspective and you move forward. But I think we as a community have a lot of thinking to do about this, because I think we have lost a lot of ground in public support. The AAUP, which is the organization that promulgated those procedures itself, is interpreting...I mean, I read those documents. It's a pretty lopsided reading of some of those documents. They're kind of focused on the rights side of the equation, not talking all that much about the responsibility side of the equation. I would just say there's a little bit of a course correction...but it's a bedrock of what we do, and it's hard to do it in an environment where you have lost the trust of the public. You know, we haven't lost it entirely. I think people want to have institutions they can look to as expert third parties. But to occupy that role, you have to demonstrate a capacious view of the world that gives you the credibility to make those statements. If you're read as having a pretty narrow view of the world, collectively or individually, it's just harder to do.

I've talked with students about this, on the viewpoint diversity question and they say, "Why didn't you think about recruiting students who have conservative political views?" And it's not a great idea. One, because they're not immutable. They should change and they

actually do. We know they changed dramatically in young adulthood. So, if we select on that and then we just do our job, it's going to change over time. But recruiting students from parts of the country where world views just are different. Absolutely we should do that. And then within our disciplines, I think viewpoint diversity comes down to the theoretical range of viewpoints within the discipline. And I think departments sometimes do develop schools of thought where they're not particularly hospitable to colleagues who come from this perspective or that perspective. It takes a great department to say, "No, let's go out and hire these people even if we think that they might be a little bit off kilter." It's big and small things, but we all have that obligation. I bear that obligation more than the rest of the faculty for sure, because what I say and do is read as speaking for Duke. And I'm sure I've misstepped here and there. I try to do my best, but we all have that responsibility, every single one of us because all of you in this room also read as Duke based on what you say and do. It may sound simplistic, but just making sure that we are thoughtful about it, clear about what we say, and more than anything else, because we're academics, give reasons. Not just express things or issue demands, but give reasons for why we're thinking what we're thinking and maybe just lay out reasons and not even state our opinions. Because the world could use a lot of that kind of behavior. It's in short supply. But Adriane, it's a tough question, it's very hard. I am concerned about what you see right now, which is a willingness, particularly of public governmental bodies to intrude. But what worries me is that things that we might be doing, not intentionally but unintentionally, are giving them strength and support for

what they're doing as opposed to fighting them. And I think if we just stand up and try to stiff arm and say, "Go no further." If that's the way we defend academic freedom, it feels to me that it's a losing strategy as opposed to a conversation, if you will, so we can better articulate this as the long-term value proposition. I hope that helps. These are not answers, these are thoughts. And I should go on the record saying I am speaking now as Vince Price faculty colleague, not as a representative of either the Board of Trustees or the corporate entity as Duke University.

Harvey Cohen (Clinical Sciences – School of Medicine): My comment turns out to be somewhat of a segue to the last couple of comments. I was thinking about, as you talked about, some of the areas in which we need to move. And in particular, it struck me that there are many challenges that we receive from outside the university with respect to moving in some of those directions. And one of them I became aware of today and it relates to diversity, which you mentioned several times. The School of Medicine has been particularly committed to the idea of increasing the diversity of the student and trainee body with the idea of hopefully helping to increase the diversity of the profession at large. It has been quite successful in doing so and we're very proud of it. I learned today from my favorite reading material, the Duke Chronicle, that we had been roundly challenged, I might say even attacked, by outside bodies, one of them being a representative and another being a very visible person in technology for that accomplishment. And it made me wonder how do we respond to things like that? My initial reading, and I haven't gotten into it much, seemed like our response

was not very powerful and seemed like we needed to do more. And I'm just wondering how we handle those kinds of attacks, not only for this but for other areas which may have the same problem?

Price: What's referenced here is essentially outsiders who are pointing to our success in diversifying the student body in our School of Medicine as somehow evidence of relaxed standards, we're no longer committed to academic excellence, etc. And I think what we need to do is fight against this as a trope. It is a trope that the search for diversity is somehow a forced compromise with excellence, or that it's a relaxation of high standards, whatever the case may be. And the substance of the school's response to this is along those lines. We are, by any metric one would want to examine, one of the top Schools of Medicine in the nation and in the world. And it's actually laughable to argue that we have compromised on the excellence front. So, the first thing is we do have to marshal, be alert to assertions that are made that are questionable, not factual assertions and counter those. Then the next thing to do is internally articulate to ourselves those very same ideas. That is to say, we are ourselves, as a collective community of faculty members here on this campus, are arbiters of excellence in their disciplines. That's what you do. You're experts, and if you have a capacious view of what it means to be excellent, that's a good thing in my book. I mean, we're laying a bet on the future. I think it is demonstrable that narrow minded visions of what constitutes excellence generally do not propagate excellence over the long haul. They reproduce conventional thinking, a lot of other things. Being able to dig through the success of our alumni, and point in ways that are compelling and

would be read as compelling to establish that we are excellent. And not only are we excellent, but our commitment to diversity, our commitment to an inclusive community is a route to that excellence, in fact, necessary to that excellence. So, not easy to do. But that's across every part of this institution, the argument that we're having because the attacks on diversity, equity, inclusion are essentially if you just pull them apart, oftentimes built on this false assertion that it's a kind of compromise on excellence. And I think we have to push back on that. If we're doing things internally that we think compromise excellence, we need to have a conversation about that internally and just make sure that we can move forward with confidence, that we can defend what we do and not just defend it, but celebrate it. A good example would be our climate commitment. My colleagues in the Nicholas School of the Environment will know that field as an academic enterprise is not nearly as diverse as it ought to be as a community of scholars. And the risk profile for communities around the world is, not surprisingly, disproportionately distributed so that there are many communities with a lot at stake who are just not part of our academic conversations. That's a problem. We've got to address that. That's the kind of diversity challenge...it's not only a good thing to do in the name of diversity, it is a necessary thing to do because we want to make a difference, a positive difference with respect to our environment.

Again, there are public relations reasons why terse statements are issued. But I think we can't rely on any one event to carry the message about consistent messaging across incidents is what we're after. Final thing I'll say on this front is, this is very hard. Frank Trambel, who is

our Vice President for Communications and Marketing, is here. It's a tough call as to whether you dignify the noise out there with a response. Because oftentimes you don't mean to lend credence, but it's provocative with the aim of extracting a response to keep the story going. The first story is the outrageous statement. The second story is outrageous statement and rebuttal. And then the third story is outrageous statement, rebuttal and next outrageous statement. But if you just didn't rebut you deprive the story of oxygen and the fire burned itself out. That's a tough call. So, a full-throated defense of things in the public sphere, it always has to be thought about carefully in those kinds of tactical terms.

Don Taylor (Sanford School of Public Policy): Harvey, could I ask you, are you talking about the bill for medical schools? The Greg Murphy, is that...

Cohen: No, I forget the name of the representative, but Elon Musk was involved in the response – criticizing and saying that our recruitment...our diversity attempt to broaden diversity of the profession came at the cost of lowered standards and less experts.

Frank Tramble (Vice President for Communications, Marketing and Public Affairs): It stems from a Ben Shapiro tweet.

Cohen: Some of the statements that were made were frankly ridiculous, but they're out there.

Price: The good news is...I was informed by Frank that out there in the Twittersphere is actually a very nice thoughtful, data based rebuttal by someone who's not a Dukie. That's the

ideal thing, right? Because it doesn't look like a defensive PR posture, that kind of thing.

Paul Jaskot (Art, Art History, Visual Studies): You talk, Vince, about making these arguments and of course, you're on the front lines. I can make my own argument. You're the one that has to make it, especially the kind of critique of indulgent and entitled. Well, some of us are in fields like Art History, poster child for indulgent and entitled, at least from the kind of public perspective. I can make this argument in my world, but what can we do for you? How can we help you to make that argument that parts of our world are not indulgent and entitled, but actually serving critical purposes? Is there anything or do we just keep doing what we're doing?

Price: I think that in a way the traditional work of the university, that is in a powerful way, I'm not talking in a political context, but in a cultural context as conservative. That is, they reach deep into our historical roots and seek to understand the full scope of human experience through the arts and humanities, etc. are actually defensible on numerous grounds. We kind of gave ground through this not very productive discussion about whether they prepare the workforce to take jobs. And again, here at Duke, we can demonstrate powerfully that our graduates do very well because they are well-rounded. I've been spending time talking with people in tech fields about their hiring of a Duke grad, as opposed to a grad who comes from the schools that are considered top ranked peer institutions producing technically competent graduates and they will say the Duke employees in their organizations are the ones who become

managers. Because they have a human capacity to work in teams, understand each other, etc. So, there is instrumental value in this but I think the more we trade on that instrumental argument, the more ground we lose, to be honest. I'd say let's shift gears and let's talk about the fact that the world of museums, library collections, all manner of preservation of cultural experience has had demonstrable value over millennia. And let's remind our colleagues who are attacking us the demonstrable value of that enterprise. I don't think that's a particularly politicized thing, to be honest. And so turning it in that direction and just saying that we as a university, yes, we do critical things to prepare the next generation to take jobs and so on, but we do a lot more than that. And our research preserves our understanding of the human experience and has been doing this over millennia. And we are here to promote human happiness, as James B. Duke put it. I think there's common ground there, politically, that's pretty easily achievable. But my own read on this, and again I'm not an expert, but my read is that because we've worked so hard to get in this tussle of who gets the best jobs, the high paying...that's a losing proposition as a defense because that's actually not why we're in that business. Universities did not get into that business originally for that reason. But over the course of the 20th century, we basically became an enterprise identified with workforce development. And once you're in that world, you take on all the logics of that world. That's a part of what universities do, but it's not the principle part of what we do. There are historians and classicists who are experts like you, and there are others who are amateurs and they understand the value of it and they, I think, are pretty well distributed across

the entire political spectrum, but if we're not talking to people on the parts of the political spectrum that we see as inhospitable to higher education we'll never build those bridges.

Lee Baker (Culture Anthropology): I've got a question in terms of this new landscape we're in where students can bet on their fellow students. How many baskets they'll win in that one day. Faculty can bet on their students, whether they're going to win or lose. Do you see this as negligible risk or is this something that we should be dialed into in trying to mitigate a risk?

Price: It's the latter. It's not a negligible risk. It puts student athletes in very precarious positions. It is a big industry. Betting generally is a big industry and it is moving, as you say, in the direction of making minute to minute bets through different apps. And there's a lot of desire to grow that industry, not surprisingly, by the industry. It has to be managed. It's not even principally a collegiate problem. It's a problem for all of athletics, including professional athletics. So, I'd say here we join in common cause with colleagues who run professional athletic ventures to learn how they're managing through all this as well. I don't see any good that comes of it...maybe that's because I don't bet on things. *(Laughter)* It's not something I've ever personally enjoyed all that much. But the other problem we have right now is that it's a very convoluted, complicated landscape. It's being regulated state by state very differently. So, you get these weird worlds where you can drive right up to the border of a state and bet on athletic events in that state, but the people in that state can't bet on athletic events in that state, it's just a mess. The U.S. federal government

ultimately is going to have to step in and regulate these industries. But I think we've seen evidence from the way they've done a bang-up job regulating artificial intelligence and a number of other things that, it's sadly another sign of dysfunction of the federal government. But when you have this propagation of very different programs and procedures state by state by state, North Carolina just tipped our toes in this water. But other states have been there for a while. It makes it even weirder and harder for everyone to navigate. Most of all, the student athletes themselves. Can you imagine if a student athlete....well, let's not go there...*(Laughter)* I just don't want to ever see a student athlete sitting on the bench looking at their phone. Because my mind would go to very dark places about what they might be doing on their phone.

Allan Kirk (School of Medicine): I've enjoyed this session. I enjoyed your comments, which I think were forward thinking and inspirational. I've enjoyed the questions that are targeted and difficult and the civil dialogue that has emerged in just the last hour. What I'm not thrilled about is that none of our faculty have heard it. This is the faculty meeting, and we as representatives of the faculty, need to model civil discourse about difficult problems. And I'm wondering if there is some way to take this event and aspire to actually have it be a faculty meeting where a much larger proportion of the faculty can witness that there is a way to discuss difficult problems and engage with the administration and the faculty. Can we do better, do you think?

Price: Yes, I think we can. I mean, how is the question. But I'll say a couple of things, one is, you don't have to have

Vince Price standing at a podium to have these conversations. I'd be happy if it's viewed as productive to join faculty meetings around the university to have this or similar conversations. Alec [Gallimore], I'm sure would be more than happy to do the same. The challenge with communication, generally speaking, is there is an inverse relationship between the intimacy of the gathering and the quality and nature of the exchange. One thing I do know is it's very difficult to achieve these goals by leaning just on mass communication, but we'll do what we can. These are themes that I do try to communicate broadly. They don't always find fertile ground, but where the magic happens is when there's consistency between what's being communicated through these sort of mass channels and then what's reflected in smaller groups. Ideally...it's sort of almost a breakout group logic, where there are plenary sessions or mass communication ways of putting people on the same page, at least orienting to the same questions and problems, but then you propagate smaller, productive conversations. I'm more than happy to think through with you how that would be helpful, and I know I speak for my colleagues in saying we're more than ready to do this.

Kirk: So, it is actually not a charge to you, but a charge to all of us.

Price: I appreciate that.

Gaby Katul (Civil and Environmental Engineering): My question to you goes back to the issue of public trust. Universities now are much more, so to speak, embedded within the corporate sector. The research is now being monetized that is coming from universities. And certainly it is expected

that this will have a negative feedback in terms of public trust when universities themselves are producing research that may have a profit dimension to it. This is going to happen more often with public funding for research diminishing and faculty members actually being more approached by industry. How do you envision we're going to adapt to this problem in the future?

Price: First off, I would say I'm not so convinced that this commercialization of intellectual property that we produce is viewed negatively by the public. In fact, I think it's the opposite. We live in a capitalist society that wants to see new companies, new ventures, opportunities to establish wealth. We need to think carefully about how we can distribute the benefits more equitably. I think it's a strength, not a weakness. Honestly, I don't think we talk about it as much as we should. When I'm out and about, when I say that we're now producing 15 companies a year, roughly, it's not exclusively faculty intellectual property, but it is almost exclusively faculty intellectual property. 80% of those companies over the last five years have stayed in North Carolina. The last two years this university generated more than \$100 million of licensing revenue. That goes back into the research enterprise. To your point, it is a counterbalance against reductions in public funding. And then you start to think about what that means by way of jobs produced and incomes earned and these kinds of things. It's a positive story for us to tell. We just have to be thoughtful about how we tell it. As I say, think in ways that we do this responsibly so that if there are anxieties, if it just looks like we're avaricious, either individually or collectively, we can point to the public benefits of all of that activity.

The bigger challenge, it kind of comes back to Cam's question in a way. If we continue on this trajectory where the willingness to support discovery, science, missions, and there's a strong insistence on applied research that has demonstrable, immediate value that's bad for all of us. So, making the case for investments that don't produce, right now at least, commercializable intellectual property is the hardest argument to make because it takes incredible patience, faith in this community. But we can go back and tell historical stories of how these accidental discoveries in field after field after field over time have been the most transformative. So, we have to be better trained to do that, all of us, myself and others. The other thing I would say is that if we start leaning on private industry as a financial vehicle to do what we do, we have to establish ground rules where we maintain our academic freedom as scientists. Easier said than done sometimes, but at the same time become more flexible about how we constitute faculty roles. You can live in a world where, and we do some of this, where we loan faculty to private enterprise and it moves back and forth. There can be power in that, but it's got some real downsides that have to be managed. Conflicts of interest, personal and collective hazards, respecting academic freedom, these kinds of things. I don't think they're unnavigable. They just require a lot of thought.

Katul: Just a counterargument to this comment and the trust in science has gone down by quite a bit because of perception of how, should we say, financial interest in producing science. That is not to say there is a sector of the population that will never be convinced, no matter what you said. But I would say

a non-trivial proportion of the public was primarily distrustful of science because of the financial model behind it. We can argue the same thing about genetically modified crops for example.

Price: Pharma companies...I will say this, to step back one step further, it's big and every institution and developing societies has lost public trust. I read the U.S. Supreme Court and its pronouncements, it's been decades long, go back into the sixties and seventies the U.S. Congress has never enjoyed particularly high levels of public confidence or trust, but the U.S. Supreme Court sure did, and it has plummeted. Higher Ed sure did and we have plummeted. The media were like first out of the gate, losing public trust and confidence, but sadly gaining it back when it's almost a perfect mirror of what people think. But where we stand right now, among the institutions of society that have not lost public confidence is the military. And that's not exactly a great look for democracy. I mean, this or any democracy. It's not that the military doesn't deserve public trust. My argument is they do but that they would stand out while education and business and every branch of government loses trust, there's something seriously amiss there. And lack of confidence in science is quite disturbing because it's a lack of confidence not just in science, but in reason. In fact, it affects humanness as much as it affects the biological sciences. Any and all ideas about how to work assiduously. It is something that is on the agenda of the Association of American Universities, the leading 70 or so research universities. It's really number one on their agenda because they're advocating for research investment. You can imagine how alarming those trends are. We're all in the same boat there.

I realize, I'm standing between this fabulous room and refreshments.

Jones: Before you leave, let's thank Vince (*applause*) for his leadership, for that excellent address and for his thoughtful

responses to your questions. And thanks to all of you for your very thoughtful questions. Our next meeting is on April 18th and we look forward to seeing you then and during the reception in the corridor. Thank you for your time.

