

Minutes of the Emory Faculty Council

November 16, 1993

Present: D. Danner, W. Dillingham, B. Greene-Plauth, M. Gutterman, A. Hartgraves, M. Kaufman, T. Lancaster, F. Lechner, R. Letz, E. Navarro, U. Neisser, H. Ragsdale, R. Schlant, J. Scott, L. Smith, J. Crooks, B. Frye, G. Hauk, H. King, D. Treadaway.

Frank Lechner, President of the Senate and Faculty Council, opened the meeting at 3:15 p.m. Minutes of the Faculty Council meeting on October 19, 1993 were approved.

Joseph Crooks, Vice-President and General Counsel, explained Emory's need for a consulting policy, a draft of which had been distributed. Emory needs to comply with IRS rules governing tax-exempt organizations and avoid liability for private activities by faculty. He stressed that the university policy would set only minimal requirements, to be specified by individual schools. In response to questions, Mr. Crooks emphasized that a simple policy that would allow faculty to consult for one day a week would not be sufficient; that a university policy could not be too general or too specific; that disclosure of consulting activities by faculty in writing would be left up to individual schools; and that Deans need to have authority to assist in enforcing the policy. After discussion, the draft policy was amended to exempt all traditional faculty responsibilities from scrutiny under this policy and to define the Dean's role as reviewing a consulting arrangement disclosed by faculty in order to determine whether a conflict of interest exists. The Council voted to endorse the policy, as amended.

Dr. Lechner conveyed a request from Harvey Klehr (Political Science) for faculty to think about and participate in the planning of the academic component of Emory's involvement in the 1996 Olympics. He also alerted the Council to the work of the Campus Life committee of the Senate, chaired by Judy Raggi Moore (French and Italian), which will explore the possibility of a new space where faculty and students can gather for serious conversation.

Dr. Lechner initiated a discussion of Emory's direction, intended to give the Faculty Council a more (pro)active role in issues that concern the whole university, by raising the question: Can and should Emory define itself as a new kind of research university? A recent article by Jonathan Cole on dilemmas faced by research universities had been distributed in advance. Several members commented on the need for shared governance between faculty and administration, a more assertive role for the Faculty Council, and clearer principles to shape the way decisions are made. The discussion then turned to Emory's potentially distinctive path. Members commented that one source of distinction lies in Emory's Methodist connection and its location in the South, close to historically black colleges. Another potential source of distinction lies in Emory's ability as a private institution to advance new things; one example mentioned was the possibility of a much more collaborative method of learning that would involve students and faculty. To realize that potential, members thought that more interaction among schools was needed and the formulation of a "vision" for the institution as a whole should not be left up to administrators. Others critically noted a recent tendency to emphasize the "good" over the "true." The Council decided to continue the discussion at its next meeting.

Adjourned at 5:00 p.m.