

Minutes of the Emory Faculty Council

January 21, 1997
Moore Room/Bishops Hall

The Faculty Council meeting on January 21, 1997 was called to order at 3:15 p.m. by Chair Luke Johnson in the Moore Room of Bishops Hall.

This meeting was extended with the first part of the meeting being held in the Moore Room of Bishops Hall, and the second part, convening in the Faculty Dining Room of the DUC after a dinner break. The extended meeting was a continuation of previous discussions with Billy Frye regarding the Strategic Plan. Provost Frye will be presenting the Strategic Plan to the Board of Trustees in May of 1997.

The Minutes of the November 19, 1996 Faculty Council meeting were approved as distributed.

Members Present

Ben Arnold, Donna Brogan, Susie Buchter, Bill Chace, Terry Clark, Bill Cody, Paul Courtright, Rich Freer, Billy Frye, James Hughes, Luke Johnson, Judith Kapp, Maureen Kelley, Harriet King, Steve L'Hernault, Linda Moneyham, David Pacini, Sidney Perkowitz, Rick Rubinson, Win Sale, Randall Strahan, Dan Treadaway, Nanette Wenger, and Keith Wilkinson.

Members Excused

Larry Beard, Doug Falls, Rick Letz, and Rod Pettigrew.

Announcements

Chair Luke Johnson informed the Council that they would receive reports from the Faculty Council committees during the February and March meetings. Committees of the Faculty Council include the Faculty Relations Committee, the Life Cycle Group, the Research Funding Committee, the Distinguished Lecturer Committee, the University Teaching Fund Committee, and the Carter Liaison Committee.

Discussion of Objective III

The Council began their discussion focusing on the issue of "an integrated scholarly community that will give emphasis to the promotion of a strong intellectual ethos, unimpeded communication and collaboration, and above all, a supportive mentoring relationship among students, faculty and staff." (Objective III of the Strategic Plan)

Suggestions to further this objective included:

- Co-teaching, which is being practiced to some degree throughout Emory, is thought to be an ideal method for developing stronger scholarly community and

- supportive mentoring relationships. In order to foster widespread co-teaching, rewards and forms of recognition could be put into place University-wide.
- Mentoring of faculty by faculty throughout the tenure process and even the full "faculty life cycle" including retirement was mentioned as a viable method of developing supportive relationships. Specifically, senior and retiring faculty would be mentors to junior faculty. Though this is being done to varying degrees within some of the schools and departments, it is not recognized as University-wide policy.
 - Establish supportive relationships by adjusting the time limits within the tenure process to reflect the variety of disciplines at Emory rather than maintaining a "one size fits all" time frame. Further, the tenure process could become more supportive by changing the required teaching load of junior faculty and encouraging team teaching.
 - Establish ways to recognize and reward faculty who are considered an "authoritative voice" within their specific field and who use that status in the service world.
 - Realize the mixture of "reality principles," and thereby build a scheme of flexibility that acknowledges the need for and importance of both junior and senior faculty. If a psychology of excellence is established University-wide and becomes grounded as a norm, riffs from the norm will be possible and indeed accepted as faculty strive for innovation.

Discussion of Objective V

The discussion shifted to issues about providing a "physical and socio-political infrastructure necessary to support a first-class academic community among its faculty and students, schools, departments and programs. (Objective V)

Suggestions and comments brought out during this part of the discussion included:

- Establishment of a reward structure that would encourage more faculty/student relationships, and thereby improve the intellectual ethos campus-wide.
- Campus Life is seen by faculty as an office that addresses R&R for students and not as an office that is concerned with issues of intellectual ethos. In fact, some Campus Life programs are seen as counter-productive to the faculty of educating the student.
- In addressing the goal to strengthen student/faculty relations the development of a strong residential college program, and a program whereby senior and retiring faculty would mentor students were mentioned as possibilities to meet this end. It was noted that the student/faculty cultural image varies greatly from department to department with key faculty members supporting a department's image.
- Need for a location(s) on campus where faculty/students can meet.
- Computer support personnel and budgeted upgrades of computer hardware and software are needed University-wide -- on the main campus and at satellite locations.
- Need for a University-wide orientation for faculty that would outline particulars about information technology and other services available at Emory, as well as beginning to establish expected norms consistent with a vibrant intellectual community.

- A shared institutional image is a "donut" in that Emory has schools and satellites on the perimeter, but there is an obvious lack of a center. This lack of centrality fosters fiefdoms which cause an inability to coordinate and communicate throughout the University at varying levels.
- The causes of the fiefdoms are seen as budgets, space, and faculty lines.
- Some schools have better dean-to-faculty communication than others. However, what is perceived as lack of communication may simply be lack of action when information communicated appears to have no immediate effect upon the reader. For example, the faculty is very responsive to issues at the departmental level (local), but not nearly as many are interested in University issues (global). Only when the Faculty Council takes action that affects the faculty directly will the faculty focus on unifying the University.
- Currently, faculty come to University meetings in a defensive posture, looking to save their individual hide or support the departmental stand. This needs to transition to a point where faculty attend University meetings for a desire to culminate creative efforts on behalf of the entire University.

Adjournment

The Faculty Council concluded with the agreement that Objective #6 of the Strategic Planning document will be discussed for one hour at the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m. to meet next on February 18 in Room 400 of the Administration Building from 3:15-5:00 p.m.