

**Minutes of the Emory University Faculty Council
20 September 2005
Administration Bldg Room 400**

In attendance: Allison Adams, Patricia Brennan, Bill Buzby, Ronald Calabrese, David Carr, Steven Culler, Arri Eisen, Tom Frank, Maggie Gilead, Frank Gordon, James Hughes, Nadine Kaslow, Bill Kelly, Harriet King, Earl Lewis, Frank Maddox, Richard Metters, Judy Raggi Moore, Carol Newsom, Ruth Parker, Michael Rogers, Judith Rohrer, Sharon Strocchia, James Wagner, Richard Ward, Nanette Wenger.

Excused: Robert Ahdieh, Jan Gleason, Kate Heilpern, Carol Hogue, David Pacini, Daniel Teodorescu, Mike Terrazas.

Absent: Mahlon Delong, Richard Doner, Connie Kertz, Rick Rambuss, Claire Sterk.

Guests: Richard Mendola, Vice President for IT & CIO

I. Welcome and call to order

Faculty Council Chair Michael Rogers called the meeting to order at 3:18 p.m. and welcomed new and returning members.

II. Approval of April 2005 Minutes

The minutes were approved as distributed.

III. Introductions and Orientation [bylaws distributed at the meeting]

Chair Rogers invited members to introduce themselves and share with the group how long they have been affiliated with the Faculty Council. He then reviewed the Faculty Council Charter as laid out in the University Bylaws and named issues that the Council hopes to take up in the coming year. These include: a) defining 'the Faculty'; b) working with the administration to outline the future of the University Teaching Fund, University Advisory Council on Teaching, and other teaching-related programs; c) working with the Association of Emory Alumni to plan for greater faculty involvement with alums; d) rethinking/revisiting the appointment process for faculty representatives to the Board of Trustees.

IV. Remarks by Vice President for IT & CIO Richard Mendola [handout distributed at meeting]

Vice President Mendola, new to Emory this fall, introduced himself to Faculty Council members and laid out his principles and goals for the coming months. Core principles that ground his IT management style include agility of programs/structures, transparency of the process, and integrity.

Issues that Mendola's office will take up in the coming year include the following:

- Governance and prioritization: how IT aligns itself with the structures of the university, including administrative processes, needs to be streamlined and stabilized.
- Measurement: IT needs to improve procedures for measuring its own progress in meeting needs of Emory constituents.
- Directories and identity management: currently there are multiple ways to access contact information for staff, faculty, and programs / divisions. These directories can be streamlined so as to avoid repetition and confusion. Directories should be customer-focused as opposed to solely organization-focused.
- Business continuity: Emory's IT has its source computers / networks all housed in the same location, which could prove disastrous in case of an accident or unexpected event. IT needs to find ways to ensure continuity in case of an unexpected problem.

- Communication: IT will be looking for new and improved ways to reach out to the Emory community and discuss decisions and options.

Specific issues that Mendola hopes to address in the coming days include a) Email and b) Wireless.

Mendola then asked for suggestions about how to ensure faculty involvement in all aspects of IT planning and decision-making. He distributed a handout with a template for how faculty might be structured into the IT organizational layout. He hopes the Faculty Council will “formalize its relationship” with IT so that faculty will be ensured a voice in decisions that affect the Emory community’s technology resources and access. Questions and answers followed.

V. Remarks by Provost Earl Lewis

Provost Lewis laid out five issues his office will be working on throughout the 2005-06 school year:

- a) Strategic Plan: the Provost’s office is continuing work on the strategic plan, which is reaching the implementation stage this fall. Key to this stage is the establishment of *measurable* goals: Emory needs to be able to measure its own progress at each step along the way as it moves toward its larger vision.
- b) Senior administrative searches: currently there are at seven key openings that will need to be filled. These include three deans (Law, GSAS, Theology); a Director of Libraries; a Vice Provost for Community, Diversity, and Institutional Development (a new position); a Vice Provost for Student Enrollment Academic Services (a new position); and a Director of the Ethics Center.
- c) Exploring the question: who are the faculty? Together with Senior Vice Provost Claire Sterk, the Provost’s office and the Faculty Council will be looking at what it means to call someone a member of the ‘faculty’ at Emory. Are there assumptions or practices related to our use of the term that need to be changed? Who falls under the heading of ‘faculty,’ and how many different kinds of faculty does Emory have? What difference does our use of the term make in the first place?
- d) Exploring what ‘tenure’ means at Emory. In the Cold War era, tenure became a way of ensuring a measure of academic freedom and free speech. Does the same meaning make sense in the twenty-first century, or do we need a redefinition of tenure? Should tenure now be defined as a way to certify that someone has gone through his or her ‘due process’ and is now a truly credible resource in his or her field?
- e) A National Research Council review of doctoral programs is getting under way this year.

VI. Update on UTF: Arri Eisen

UTF Chair Arri Eisen explained that the University Teaching Fund has been given the green light (and the funding) to continue in its current form for the 2005-06 school year. At the end of the year, the UTF likely will merged into a new organizational structure, one that will offer some kind of centralized teaching, learning, and research resource for faculty at Emory. As things currently stand, the University Advisory Council on Teaching also will be integrated into this new center/organizational plan.

Eisen asked the Faculty Council if they preferred the UTF to have one or two calls for proposals this coming year – and if just one, whether they preferred November or February. Discussion followed. The consensus seemed to be that the UTF should offer two calls, not one: that way faculty have two different opportunities to submit grant proposals. Harriet King reminded the group that budgetary constraints currently dictate that any grant monies awarded to faculty would need to be spent by 31 August 2006. She suggested that the UTF work with the budget office to get around this restriction as it is currently laid out in the bylaws.

VII. Statements from Committees and Approval of Committee Rosters [handout distributed at the meeting]

Faculty Hearing Committee Chair Jim Hughes and Faculty Life Course Committee Nanette Wenger outlined their committee goals for the coming year. Committee rosters for UTF, Faculty Life Course Committee, and the University Research Committee were approved as distributed.

VIII. Defining “The Faculty” – Michael Rogers [handout distributed at the meeting]

Chair Rogers outlined a project to define “the faculty” that the Faculty Council will do in collaboration with Claire Sterk, Harriet King and others in the Provost's office. Whenever the word “faculty” appears in a University document, the question arises exactly which faculty members the document refers to. Experience has shown this is not always clear. The issues relate to access to resources and programs and to governance. Once the appropriate data have been collected, a subcommittee will be formed to work on the questions arising from what it found out.

As a first step, Chair Rogers reviewed a research document, compiled by Senior Vice Provost Harriet King, that lists all the different titles for ‘faculty’ in each school / major division. He asked Council members to review this list, to take note of anything that might be missing from it, and to send comments and suggestions about ways to better categorize and define “the faculty” to Claire Sterk at csterk@emory.edu.

Discussion of the research document and its contents followed. Some Council members expressed surprise and concern that they did not know what all the titles meant or why Emory seems to have so many categories listed under ‘faculty.’ Provost Lewis stated that as he understood the project, a subcommittee of the Faculty Council to work with his office on these questions over the coming months. Together, he said, we need to begin identifying the spectrum of issues that are affected or implicated by our use of the term ‘faculty.’ We then need to decide if we want to keep our definitions and job categorizations as they stand, or if we want to make some changes.

IX. Remarks from President James Wagner

President Wagner updated Council members on the work his office is taking on this fall. Emory is now entering a new phase of its strategic plan: *resourcing*. The capital campaign has commenced (as of 1 September 05) and is currently in its ‘quiet phase.’ The President explained that this is necessitating a good deal of extra travel on his part.

The President then asked Council members for their feedback on a question posed to him by an Emory student. The student had asked why Emory always seemed to be in “business” mode, and President Wagner wanted to know from the Council what they thought about that observation. Does Emory project a tone or ethos that is too much ‘business’ and too little creativity and free thought? Discussion followed. Several Council members thanked Pres. Wagner for being bold enough to bring such a potentially sensitive issue to the table. Judy Raggi-Moore noted that “the logic of numbers” sometimes seems to drive the university forward, more so than the individual gifts and strengths of undergraduates. Other Council members suggested that the administration should spend less time discussing the capital campaign in meetings with various faculty and student constituents. Better to mention the campaign and then move on to the broader range of issues that are important to building up community at Emory. Balanced presentation of the capital campaign and strategic plan remains key, Council members concluded.

X. New business

There was no new business.

XI. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Stacia M. Brown
Assistant to the Faculty Council