

Summary
Meeting of the Duke University Board of Trustees
November 30 – December 1, 2018

Thursday, November 29

Trustees arriving on Thursday had the opportunity to:

- Tour student residences—of particular interest to members of the strategic task force, “Next Generation Living and Learning Experience.”
- Engage over dinner with students from Fuqua, Law, Medicine, and Sanford. Trustees and students discussed topics generated in advance.
- Attend the annual reception for students and faculty serving on standing committees and strategic task forces.

Friday, November 30

The meeting began with an executive session with the president, during which he briefed trustees on recent developments.

This was followed by meetings of the strategic task forces: “Activating the Global Network,” “Advancing Duke Science and Technology,” “The Future of Central Campus,” and “Next Generation Living and Learning Experience.”

For lunch, the trustees reconvened and paid tribute to Sam Hammond, University Carilloner since 1986, who is retiring at the end of December 2018. Following the tribute for Sam, the president led a discussion with trustees of the updates that had been distributed in advance by the members of the president’s cabinet.

Following lunch, the meetings of standing committees were held. In the evening, the president and his wife hosted a holiday dinner at Hart House, attended by members of the board, the senior administration, and student leaders.

Saturday, December 1

After early morning meetings of additional standing committees, the final plenary session of the board was held, focused on a key strategic issue—the financial status of the university. Vice President for Finance Tim Walsh led the session, designed to give trustees a good grounding in the current state of the university’s finances (very good) and options for funding strategic goals going forward. The board meeting concluded with an executive session for open discussion among trustees.

After the meeting, the Committee on Honorary Degrees met.

Meeting Summary of the Audit and Compliance Committee

December 1, 2018

What were the major topics discussed?

- Feedback and endorsement of Duke's Statement on Values and Culture and Code of Conduct
- Accountability and compliance issues for minors on campus participating in Youth Camps and Summer Programs
- University internal audit plan update

What were the major insights shared?

- Statement on Values and Culture and Code of Conduct
 - Value of regular communication among all faculty and staff and promoting the speak-up culture
 - Importance of case management and comprehensive tracking to identify trends and ensure accountability
- Accountability and Compliance for Youth Camps and Summer Programs
 - Compliance program design effectiveness and ongoing opportunities for improvement
 - Emphasis on accountability for connection with mission and compliance with policies and regulations; discussed leadership expectations and responsibilities for deans and program sponsors
 - Responsibility for ensuring safety and care of minors on campus and protecting the Duke brand
- Update on audit plan and results
 - Current audit activity summary
 - Increase in management requests to evaluate suspected problems or assist in process redesign
 - Plans to resolve aging and past-due management action plans

What actions were taken?

- Endorsed the Statement on Values and Culture and Code of Conduct, subject to specific editing recommendations made during the discussion
- Authorized the committee chair to sign the KPMG engagement letter and fee structure for fiscal year ending June 30, 2019
- Accepted changes to OARC charter as presented

What are the next steps to be taken?

- Circulate final copy of Statement on Value and Culture and Code of Conduct to committee members
- Committee requested in-depth discussion of data governance and information technology security

Meeting Summary of the External Engagement Committee

November 30, 2018

What were the major topics discussed?

- An update was provided to the committee regarding public opinion surveys on higher education, research universities, and specifically Duke University.
- Historical and background information were provided on the symbiotic relationship between Duke and North Carolina. One of Duke's founding purposes was to support North Carolina and the local community as stated in the Indenture of Trust (1924). A brief summary was provided on the economic impact of Duke University in the region.
- Historical background was provided regarding the Office of Durham Affairs and its role in community engagement followed by a brief summary of current programs and outreach. The discussion concluded with the sharing of ideas and potential goals to strengthen Duke's commitment to community outreach and engagement.
- The committee divided into three breakout sessions, each dealing with a specific topic and focus questions: Durham Affairs – K-12 and housing; University Development – philanthropic support; and Public Affairs & Government Relations – changing political environment.

What were the major insights shared?

- The Committee reviewed recent public opinion data regarding perceptions of higher education, research universities and individual institutions. The results were not surprising and confirmed Duke University's standing as one of the top universities in the country. Challenging public opinion issues such as cost and value are not unique to Duke.
- Duke is the second-largest private employer in North Carolina, and our economic impact reaches many, if not all, cities and counties across the state. The results from a comprehensive, state-wide impact study were shared with the committee providing information and details.
- The Office of Durham Affairs was created ten years ago and at the time, concentrated on nine partner schools and neighborhoods immediately surrounding campus. To follow and expand on the success of the first ten years, the Office of Durham Affairs will be considering ways in which to make a greater impact in the community through coordination, convening and working from a framework of collective impact.

What actions were taken?

- A motion was made to approve three naming resolutions put forth on the agenda. The motion was seconded and the committee unanimously approved all resolutions.

What are the next steps to be taken?

- The committee requested follow up or a summary on the evolution and conclusion of ideas and suggestions that are discussed in meetings.
- The chair and administrative liaisons will revise the remaining work plan to focus on issues that need further discussion and attention.

Meeting Summary of the Governance Committee

December 1, 2018

What were the major topics discussed?

- Feedback on governance changes, including September BOT meeting feedback and reports from committees/task forces on November 30 meetings.
- Trustee assessment and re-appointments, including the trustee assessment process and reports on trustee assessments and re-appointments.
- Board of Visitors systemization project update.
- Board composition and pipeline, including an update on top trustee prospects, current trustee profiles and priorities, current outreach process, and diversity targets and creation of an *ad hoc* Subcommittee on Pipeline Diversity.
- Length of terms of chairs of committees.

What were the major insights shared?

- Need to ensure the standing committees and strategic task forces understand their roles.
- Need a mechanism for communicating with trustees about their terms.
- Need to ensure we are utilizing current trustees' areas of expertise to the board's benefit and to support the president and his goals within the strategic framework.
- The Office of the Secretary is in the process of implementing the Guidelines for Boards of Visitors at Duke. The response from the school deans and development officers has been positive and collaborative.
- The committee needs to build a deep, robust and diverse trustee prospect pipeline.
- Need to consult strategic task forces regarding desired areas of expertise for future trustee candidates.
- It would be beneficial to have more trustees with higher education experience.
- The committee agreed that four years is generally the right length of service as a committee chair.

What actions were taken?

- Approval of the suggested trustee assessment process.
- Recommendation to the full board the approval of certain trustees for election and re-election.
- Endorsement of the *ad hoc* Subcommittee on Pipeline Diversity's charge and membership.

What are the next steps to be taken?

- Make available to the full board the retirement dates and terms of all trustees.
- The *ad hoc* Subcommittee on Pipeline Diversity will meet and update the Governance Committee on its work at the February meeting.
- At the February meeting, a deep dive on the trustee prospect lists will be done. The committee was given a homework assignment to review prospect lists and provide input by the end of January.

Meeting Summary of the Graduate and Professional Education and Research Committee

November 30, 2018

What were the major topics discussed?

- Faculty professionalism in the School of Medicine: Discussions centered on the SOM Professionalism Council as a way to address issues that fall through the cracks, or do not rise to more formal rule breaking. Key insight received was the importance of driving mandatory cultural expectations from the top.
- Burnout in the School of Medicine: Burnout is not a problem unique to Duke, and has far-reaching effects on quality and patient safety. What does a program focused on physician and nurse wellness look like? With increased administrative and clerical demands on physicians, what work can be done to counteract burnout? The SOM is trying to address these issues by, first, building metrics to show the existence and extent of burnout by department, and second, asking chairs to think creatively about how to improve these metrics.
- Defining scholarship for Nursing: The conversation focused on the breadth of scholarship in the field and practice of nursing: from scholarly research publications to the scholarship of teaching nursing to scholarship around the practice of nursing. How can we, and should we, expand our range of scholarship impact to provide for long term incentives (such as tenure) for nursing faculty who contribute to teaching and practice scholarship.

What were the major insights shared?

- Work culture is important for faculty excellence – not only in terms of achievement but in terms of integrity and how we treat each other. Expanding the focus on individual accomplishment to include excellence in professionalism helps to build a positive work culture and community.
- There are strong links to burnout leading to physicians cutting their time or leaving institutions. In the School of Medicine, every 18 – 24 months a large organization survey on burnout is done, and with the exception of physicians, burnout decreased. Many of the organizational changes to address burnout are focused on operations within units; as such, these efforts often do not reach the physicians because they are not connected to these units on the same scale as staff. The SOM's initiatives with departments has engaged departmental leadership and community building. As a result, they are starting to see some improvements at the physician level.
- The School of Nursing has multi-year contracts for those on the clinical track, and changes in APT criteria will allow different types of work to count for clinical faculty.

What are the next steps to be taken?

- Committee looks forward to the discussion on graduate students in February, and would like to hear from a range of student experiences.

Meeting Summary of the Committee on Honorary Degrees

December 1, 2018

What were the major topics discussed?

- President Price gave an update regarding the confirmed honorary degree recipients for 2019 and his thoughts regarding a possible commencement speaker.
- The committee discussed the candidates nominated for 2020, giving consideration to the importance of having a slate that reflects diversity of race, ethnicity, gender, background, and field of accomplishment, as well as including candidates who are Duke alumni and who have connections to Duke.

What actions were taken?

- The committee narrowed the list of candidates down to a short list for 2020.

What are the next steps to be taken?

- At the February meeting, the committee will select the candidates who may be invited by the president to receive honorary degrees in 2020, as well as a list of alternates.
- These candidates will need to be approved by the Academic Council and the Board of Trustees.
- Trustees are encouraged to nominate candidates for honorary degrees.

Meeting Summary of the Resources Committee

November 30, 2018

What were the major topics discussed?

- Duke University Faculty and Staff Retirement Plan redesign
- FY 2020 compensation, benefits analysis, and merit plan
- Preliminary budget planning assumptions for FY 2020
- Alternative funding mechanisms to support central strategic investment opportunities
- When does decentralized resource ownership work well

What were the major insights shared?

- Need to be prepared for a limited investment return environment over the next several years, which suggests a somewhat more conservative read on the capacity available from select funding alternatives discussed
- Decentralized management approach provides an incentive for deans and other programmatic leaders to aggressively pursue revenue to support their programs
- Aggressive oversight must be applied during the budgetary process to ensure that excessive expenditure growth is not pursued
- Concern was expressed about expansion of the debt program as debt capacity can also be very helpful in constrained investment environments
- Duke continues to maintain a highly competitive total compensation position

What actions were taken?

The committee recommended for board approval:

- With respect to the university's defined contribution retirement plan, a resolution which eliminates specific board fiduciary responsibilities and clarifies role of Executive Vice President, Vice President for Administration, and Investment Advisory Committee
- Naming – Koch Family Scoreboard
- Withdrawal from Certain Quasi Endowments

What are the next steps to be taken?

- Provide sensitivity analysis around tuition increases
- Identify and address redundant functions across sub-units
- Determine the trade-offs associated with cost reductions and rebalancing measures
- Send Bacow article on 'The Political Economy of Cost Control on a University Campus' to full committee
- Redirect savings towards new initiatives, share trade-offs with committee

Meeting Summary of the Undergraduate Education Committee

November 30, 2018

What were the major topics discussed

- Understanding and closing achievement gaps at Duke: What does Duke know (and need to know) about who struggles, when, and why at Duke?
- What are the achievement gaps at Duke? What are the predictors of success for students in STEM classes, especially underrepresented students such as women, low-income and first generation? To those ends, what is the current state of Duke's pedagogy?
- What has Duke tried and how well is it working? How can we learn from and scale our most successful programs?

What were the major insights shared?

- This was a broad discussion of the achievement gaps at Duke, particularly in STEM fields, which were outlined in extensive background materials. For example, data show that a much higher percentage of women than men drop out of their first or second STEM core course.
- Committee members discussed the limitations of focusing on gaps by sociodemographic groups, as these may not adequately pinpoint underlying causes. Rather, Duke needs to focus more on individual student performance and the reasons for underperformance.
- We were joined by Dean Arlie Petters (Trinity) who discussed SPIRE, a program designed to improve outcomes for students in STEM fields. Bill Walker and David Pittman (Pratt) introduced their Clark Scholars program, which has similar goals to improve outcomes among underrepresented students at Pratt. Both programs have similar characteristics. They are high-touch, with significant faculty and senior staff mentoring and an emphasis on cohort community-building. These characteristics were identified as best practices to enhance the performance of all students, perhaps particularly those who are underrepresented.
- The key challenge in closing achievement gaps is scaling our existing programs.
- Deans Valerie Ashby and Ravi Bellamkonda reiterated their belief that part of the solution is continuing to improve the curriculum and teaching of all undergraduates, with a particular focus on the large, required, overview courses that introduce students to the most popular majors.

What are the next steps to be taken?

- The committee wants more discussion on how to create a culture change at Duke. Improving teaching and changing curriculum to ensure the success of all students requires buy-in from professors.
- It was suggested that the next meeting could focus on advising needs.

Meeting Summary of the Activating the Global Network Task Force

November 30, 2018

What were the major topics discussed?

- Prior to the meeting, task force members studied a summary of relevant Duke survey research on key constituencies, including alumni, students, and parents to hone in on the current state.
- Against the backdrop of the survey data and using a selection of alumni and student personas (e.g. remote student, full-time parent, busy global alum) as a vehicle, members brainstormed solutions to get to an ideal future state of alumni engagement. Working in small groups, the task force explored the characteristics of a future alumni engagement ecosystem, including programmatic tactics and the infrastructure to support it.
- The task force generated several prototype solutions that would:
 - *Blur the line between alumni and student life* and develop affinity during the student experience that would carry over to alumni.
 - *Address needs and expectations identified by the survey data and in discussion prior to the meeting*, including post-graduation career and personal development; engagement between alumni and students; exposure to mentoring and learning opportunities; desire for cross-cutting networks and opportunities that go beyond school boundaries; desire for Duke to play more of a role in career obtainment for students; desire for Duke to play an ongoing role in learning and personal development of alumni. Task force members questioned whether our current models are adequate to address these needs.
- Members of the group gave feedback on the prototypes generated by the small groups, as well as the meeting facilitation and format.

What were the major insights shared?

- Lifelong learning, professional development and career support at Duke are siloed.
- Any solutions should reach beyond school and unit lines and address the entire life cycle of a Duke alum, from the prospective student phase to the end of a person's life and should simplify the entry point for engagement. Leveraging technology will be critical in bringing the full breadth of the university to bear.
- Currently, there is no central on-ramp for student or alumni engagement. Rather, the status quo system relies on individual people to act as brokers for engagement and programming.
- Getting this right could be a point of differentiation for Duke in attracting the best students, faculty and alumni support.

What are the next steps to be taken?

- The task force will gather for a teleconference on December 18. A selection of pilot projects will be shared on the 12/18 call so that they can be leveraged as a point of discussion in the stakeholder interviews.
- The task force will soon launch a stakeholder interview project in December, in which members will be asked to interview several staff, faculty, alumni, and students.
- A joint call with the Next Generation Living and Learning Task Force will take place in January.

Meeting Summary of the Advancing Duke Science and Technology Strategic Task Force

November 30, 2018

What were the major topics discussed?

- The initial “strawman” strategic approach to advance science and technology.
- Key priorities and strategies for recruiting faculty.
- Potential impacts of advancing science and technology on infrastructure, resources, and graduate and undergraduate education.

What were the major insights shared?

- The task force reviewed several thematic areas where Duke could potentially achieve excellence. Computation was identified as one “must-have” capability that will impact all other areas. Duke should prioritize this area and develop an appropriate organizational strategy and funding plan as a near term investment priority.
- The task force needs more analysis of the other thematic areas, with particular emphasis on “Why this area?” and “Why Duke?” to help focus and prioritize the science and technology long-term plan given that funds will not be adequate to support all areas in the first 5 years of the plan.
- The initial stages of the science and technology effort will be key to building early momentum, and planning and resources should be nimble and adjustable over time, in order to achieve a balance between promoting curiosity-driven research, risk-taking, and supporting established faculty, and to respond to new breakthroughs and “hot” areas.
- The initiative should include goals that relate to innovation in science and technology and societal impact, including collaborations with local institutions and government.
- Duke should take full advantage of the collaborative culture, geographic proximity of the campus and Duke Health, and legacy of “outrageous ambition” as differentiators in recruiting faculty.

What actions were taken?

- None required at this meeting

What are the next steps to be taken?

- Develop more detail around each thematic area, about why it is an important focus area (“Why this area?”) and how Duke is uniquely positioned in it (Why Duke?”), to help prioritize among the areas and determine the optimal phasing of resource allocation
- Begin developing the ‘story’ for potential donors to invest in advancing Duke science and technology, including the rationale for the specific areas of focus and Duke’s competitive advantages

Meeting Summary of The Future of Central Campus Strategic Task Force

November 30, 2018

What were the major topics discussed?

- Duke University Financial Overview
- The alternative uses for Central Campus
- Alternative paths of inquiry into exploring compelling ideas for Central Campus, including future trends in research and higher education.
- Approaches to mixed academic, commercial, retail and residential development at some other Universities

What were the major insights shared?

- The university is in a sound financial position, with some pressure from our aspirations and strategic priorities.
- The use of Central Campus does not necessarily have to create revenue, but it should also not be a cost drain.
- Undergraduate, graduate and professional housing can be addressed elsewhere on campus.
- Future science program needs would be better served within the science precinct.
- The university would seek to maintain a high degree of control in a development scenario.
- Land leases and/or sales will not generate meaningful income.
- The transformation of Central Campus could create a “destination location.”
- The activities and outcomes from the other task forces may drive programming needs and decisions for Central Campus.
- It would be helpful to develop a framework or process by which different proposals can be evaluated.
- It will be helpful to develop a communication strategy to include students and faculty.
- The use of Central Campus has to be strategic in value and its advancement of Duke University.

What actions were taken?

- A “Futurist” and others will be invited to the next meeting to discuss emerging “mega” trends in research and higher education and to lead a team storming discussion.
- All members will send the chair his or her notes on a sense of points of preliminary agreement, suggestions of experts on future trends within their academic communities, and what should be in the interim report to the board.

What are the next steps to be taken?

- Develop process map to evaluate future research and emerging trends and different use scenarios.
- Draft the interim report for the board.

Meeting Summary of the Next Generational Living & Learning Experience Strategic Task Force

November 30, 2018

What were the major topics discussed?

- Discussed the history, signature elements and challenges of the Vanderbilt and Rice residential life models; representatives from both institutions joined the meeting to provide insight.
- Approaches to increase faculty and student engagement outside of the classroom.
- Residence life programming, including life-skills, personal discovery and wellness offerings.
- Using student governance to increase student engagement and leadership.
- Integrating the arts within residential life.

What were the major insights shared?

- Vanderbilt moved to a residential college model as part of their commitment toward greater equity, inclusion and diversity. Key priorities include faculty engagement and community building. Faculty-in-Residence receive a stipend, time and resources that allows them to commit to their research and teaching. The first-year experience is on a separate campus, and Vanderbilt is in the early stages of designing a second-year curriculum to combat the sophomore slump.
- Rice's four-year residential college model offers an inclusive community, opportunities to engage with faculty, and strong student governance. Each college uses dining to build community. Rice has an active social life and tries to model moderate, responsible drinking. African American students and international students self-segregate because they don't feel as satisfied.
- The success of the residential models at Rice and Vanderbilt is dependent on significant staffing levels and resources.
- Duke has many strong co-curricular programs; need to determine which programs can be successfully scaled. The Faculty-in-Residence program on East Campus is effective, but a culture-shift is needed to increase faculty-student interaction outside of the classroom. Duke has impressive arts spaces and programs; opportunity to better integrate into residential life through workshops, student productions, artists' discussions, etc.

What actions were taken?

- Small groups brainstormed ways to increase faculty-student engagement, evaluate and improve programming, integrate the arts into residential life and provide opportunities for student leadership and governance.
- Gary Bennett will serve as a conduit between the task force and the Office of the President.

What are the next steps to be taken?

- Task force members who participated in the housing tour or meetings with faculty and/or students will send reflections to Hallie Davis-Penders by Dec. 14.
- Task force members will receive summaries of the calls with peer institutions by Dec. 14. A short background document and straw man of key principles to be used to guide the development of options will be sent by Dec. 10. Members can provide feedback to Hallie by Dec. 14.
- Betsy, Gary and Hallie will complete additional calls with Stanford, Cornell and possibly USC or Miami.
- There will be a call the week of Dec. 17 to finalize principles and reflect on learnings to date. If requested there will be time for calls with additional peer institutions to answer questions in early Jan.
- On Jan. 14 there will be a 3-hour meeting to build options.