

Minutes of the Emory University Faculty Council
18 October 2005
400 Administration Building

Present: Patricia Brennan, David Carr, Steven Culler, Thomas Frank, Maggie Gilead, Frank Gordon, Kate Heilpern, Carol Hogue, James Hughes, Nadine Kaslow, Connie Kertz, Frank Maddox, Richard Metters, Judy Raggi Moore, Carol Newsom, Ruth Parker, Rick Rambuss, Michael Rogers, Sharon Strocchia, Daniel Teodorescu, James Wagner, Richard Ward, Nanette Wenger.

Excused: Allison Adams, William Buzbee, Richard Doner, Jan Gleason, Bill Kelly, Harriet King, Earl Lewis, David Pacini, Judith Rohrer, Claire Sterk, Mike Terrazas, Steve Walton.

Absent: Robert Ahdieh, Mahlon DeLong, Arri Eisen.

Guests: Dwight Duffus, Kathy Parker, Eleanor Main, William Branch [Board of Trustees Faculty Counselors]

I. Welcome and call to order

Faculty Council Chair Michael Rogers called the meeting to order at 3:16 p.m.

II. Approval of September 2005 minutes

The minutes were approved with corrections: several names were listed incorrectly as “absent” when they should have been listed as “excused.” The corrected minutes will be posted on the web site.

III. Executive Committee Updates

Chair Rogers stated that Past-Chair Sharon Strocchia is working with Richard Mendola to put together a plan for faculty involvement on the IT [Information Technology] Steering Committee.

Chair-Elect Thomas Frank said that a call for nominations for the 2007 Distinguished Faculty Lecture will be sent out via email to Council members (and to faculty in general) in the coming days. He encouraged Council members to send in nominations as a way of honoring faculty achievements and of participating in the ongoing exchange of ideas that makes Emory a scholarly community. Past-Chair Strocchia requested that nominations seek to include groups that traditionally have been underrepresented, including women faculty.

IV. Remarks by President James Wagner

President Wagner invited Council members to discuss a question raised in last month’s meeting: how can the administration respond constructively and helpfully to those who perceive Emory as singularly focused on “business” concerns? He explained that he has encountered such perceptions in at least two different ways:

- 1) Some individuals assume that the administration equates ‘good business’ with being an excellent university in general. This assumption, President Wagner argued, is misguided. Doing good business is essential to becoming an excellent university, but it should never be equated with it. Educational value transcends financial issues. At the same time, Emory recognizes that education cannot be done thoroughly or with excellence in the absence of a solid financial foundation.
- 2) Other individuals who declare Emory to be too ‘business-oriented’ appear to be using this criticism as a cover for anxieties about change in general.

President Wagner said that while the first perception problem can be resolved through open communication and ongoing dialogue, the second remains problematic. It suggests an unwillingness

on the part of some individuals to move and grow into the future together. At the same time, he acknowledged, Emory administrators need and want to continue improving their communication, especially about financial issues, campaign concerns, and other 'practical' components of university life and work.

"Our values need to be broader than just our business direction," he concluded.

Questions and discussion followed. One Council member noted that students who have a terrific learning experience at Emory – especially in the classroom – will not mind tuition costs or other financial issues, because they will feel that their college years were well worth the expense. "We give lip service to good teaching, but we don't really support it in the ways that we could," he said. Discussion of this statement and ways to further support good teaching followed.

President Wagner will raise the issue of communication / "business" orientations in his State of the University Address on 25 October.

V. Counselors to Board of Trustees Committees [document distributed in advance]

Chair Rogers introduced members of the Council and visiting guests who serve as faculty counselors to the Board of Trustees: William Branch, Dwight Duffus, Kathy Parker, Eleanor Main, Carol Hogue, and Connie Kertz. He asked them to speak about their experiences serving in this role before the Council moved to address a proposed appointment process [document distributed in advance].

The BOT Counselors said that their experience with the Board of Trustees has been a good one. "Having faculty representation on these committees is good because it counters the usual tendency for the Board and the faculty to stay separated," said one Counselor. Others noted that the Board exhibited genuine interest in hearing how faculty think about given issues. William Branch, who helped create the BOT Counselor positions while chairing the Faculty Council several years ago, said that the system currently in place, though still relatively new, has changed the Board / faculty dynamics considerably. "We've gone from being a school with relatively little faculty involvement [on the Board] to being a school with one of the highest levels of involvement there," he said.

The Faculty Council Executive Committee then put forward a motion to approve a Proposed Appointment Process for future BOT Counselors. Discussion of the proposal followed. Council members raised a number of questions about *how* these counselors would be nominated and how their terms of service would (or would not) be limited. The Executive Committee noted that the document currently being discussed is a general or "framing" document only; if passed, the details about term limits and selections would be worked out by the Council in coming months in conjunction with the Office of the Secretary.

Council members unanimously approved the Proposed Appointment Process, but they inserted one revision before doing so: deletion of the word "new" (used three times) on page 2. This deletion will leave open the door for former Counselors to return for another appointment to the Board if invited.

VI. Defining "the Faculty" [document distributed at the meeting]

Following up on last month's introductory conversation, Chair Rogers distributed a working document to clarify the first stage of the Faculty Council's work in addressing a multi-layered question: who are "the faculty" at Emory?

Chair Rogers said that the Office of Institutional Research has been surveying other schools to see how they define and categorize their faculty. Some schools, like Emory, do not yet have a consistent or university-wide procedure for doing so. Other schools do. Most of these have four to seven categories of faculty and then subdivide each category into various ranks. Different expectations and parameters are assigned, in turn, to each rank. To move in this direction, Rogers suggested, the Council could form three task forces to set about the task of information gathering. The task forces would search for

faculty definitions in (1) WHSC; (2) Emory and Oxford Colleges; and (3) professional schools. “We want the Task Forces to gather data,” he said. “What are the titles [of faculty] and corresponding roles, rights, and responsibilities? What do their letters of appointment look like?” Once the information gathering phase is complete – hopefully by the end of 2005 – the Council can move to recommendations and implementation.

Discussion and questions followed. Maggie Gilead, School of Nursing representative, noted that her school has already done this kind of systematic overhaul of its categories for faculty. “We looked at comparable schools; we established various criteria for each rank,” she said. Other Council members summarized their respective school processes, as well. The consensus seemed to be that Council members did not feel a need to form Task Forces at this stage in the information gathering process. They preferred that the Provost’s office ask the Deans of various schools to provide whatever listings and job categorizations for their various faculty that are already available. Once those materials have been collected by way of the Provost’s office, then the Council will examine them and begin the process of recommendations. Chair Rogers said he will pose this suggestion back to the Provost and see what the next steps should be.

VII. New Business

There was no new business.

VIII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Stacia M. Brown
Assistant to the Faculty Council