

Faculty Council Meeting January 23, 2007

In Attendance: Allison Adams, Robert Ahdieh, Sundar Bahradwaj, Patricia Brennan, William Buzbee, Ronald Calabrese, Arlene Chapman, Paul Courtright, Yayoi Everett, Thomas Frank, Kate Heilpern, James Hughes, Nadine Kaslow, Bill Kelly, Keith Klugman, Earl Lewis, Eleanor Main, Frank Maddox, Ken Minneman, Santa Ono, Ruth Parker, Alton Pollard, Denise Raynor, Dierdra Reber, Michael Rogers, Claire Sterk, Randall Strahan, Douglas Unfug, James Wagner

Excused: Deepika Bahri, Steven Culler, Jan Gleason, Leslie Harris, Roland Ingram, Carol Newsom

Absent: David Pacini, Ora Strickland, Daniel Teodorescu

I. Welcome and Introductions

Tom Frank called the meeting to order at 3:17 P.M. Tom reminded FC members of the upcoming Distinguished Faculty Lecture by Dr. Jagdish N. Sheth. Also, the University Research Committee is encouraging additional applications for University Research funding grants, especially from the humanities. Application information is available on the Faculty Council Blackboard site. February 15, 2007 is the submission deadline.

II. Approval of November 2006 minutes

The minutes were approved as distributed, except for one revision of the attendance information from the November meeting.

III. Comprehensive Campaign Update

Dan Macaluso—Vice President for Development, University Programs—and Phil Hills—Vice President for Development, Health Sciences—gave an update on the University's comprehensive campaign. Three principal non-financial goals are at the heart of this campaign: 1) to clarify and affirm Emory's unique institutional identity, 2) to expand the university donor base, and 3) to involve a wide range of constituents who make up the Emory community. With the pre-campaign completed in August 2005, the campaign is currently in its preliminary quiet phase with the goal of kicking off the public phase of the campaign possibly as early as the Fall of 2007. August, 2012 is the anticipated concluding date for the campaign.

The comprehensive campaign's priorities are closely related to the strategic plan of the University and its schools and program units. In order for the strategic plan to be successful, university and unit strategic initiatives need to be adequately funded. To implement the strategic plan will cost roughly four billion dollars over the next fifteen to twenty years. The initial implementation of the plan will require five hundred million dollars over the next five years. As of December 2006 the capital campaign has raised more than \$538,000,000 (35% in cash (\$198,058,710) and 57% in outstanding pledges (\$294,653,100)). These figures include the Woodruff Foundation donation of \$261,500,000.

Macaluso and Hills also observed that the comprehensive campaign team is searching for a subtitle to *The Emory Campaign* that can be used in marketing materials. The goal is to choose a final name for the campaign by March 15 and to develop a campaign case statement by July 31.

Faculty Council members asked several questions:

- How many donors will it take to reach the campaign goal? Mr. Hills noted that in the past the general rule has been that 80% of the money raised for a campaign will come from 20% of the donors. The trend as of late has been to increase this gap even further (i.e. 90% of the money comes from 10% of the donors).

- How many donors are left who remain untapped? Mr. Macaluso indicated that this is a hard number to determine. On the one hand there are certainly some Emory constituents who haven't been tapped, but in addition there are some who have but who haven't yet donated as much as they could. Emory has a large number of potential donors around the \$100,000 level who have not yet been fully engaged in the campaign.
- What are some of the biggest motivators that can encourage donations? Mr. Macaluso replied that there are some projects that are very tangible to potential donors. For example, university scholarships, and in particular Emory's new financial aid program, provide clear examples of how donations will make a tangible impact on the university. The new financial aid plan, while expensive, should contribute substantially to the University's fundraising efforts. Furthermore, the strategic plan emphasizes the concrete ways in which university faculty are making a tangible difference in the world. The impact of faculty on the broader community also serves well to encourage and expand Emory's donor base.

IV. Faculty Response to Student Alcohol Use

Kate Heilpern and Ruth Parker gave a presentation on student alcohol use at Emory. Some highlights from their presentation:

- Heilpern and Parker are currently working with the committee in charge of editing the university's drug and alcohol policy. Articles in the Academic Exchange have drawn attention to this issue on the Emory campus. Alcohol abuse is a topic of great concern about which faculty need to be informed. As a follow-up to a fall issue of the Academic Exchange, Parker and Heilpern wanted faculty to be aware of the February 2005 report from the President Commission on Alcohol and Other Drug Use. There is a committee that will be making follow-up recommendations to the Senate regarding a University alcohol use policy. Parker and Heilpern noted how thorough, well written and important the 2005 report is, and suggested faculty read the report, currently posted on Blackboard for Senate members.
- Heilpern observed that her concerns about this issue emerged from her experiences working in the Emory hospital emergency room, where she regularly faced large numbers of gravely intoxicated, underage students. This is a fairly common occurrence on weekends that requires attention from the university. President Wagner observed that while this was a substantial problem in the Fall, there were no reports of emergency room visits by intoxicated students during the Dooley's Ball in the Spring, when students receive wristbands and alcohol is served. The problem of drug and alcohol abuse seems to be especially acute among Emory's freshman population.
- Parker expressed surprise at the level of alcohol tolerance she has observed among many students as well as the level of drug use, especially around exam time when students make use of drug stimulants. Faculty need to be well informed about drug and alcohol use in order to make informed responses to students.
- Parker summarized three needs that emerge out of the Executive Summary on Alcohol and Other Drugs: 1) Emory faculty and administration need to decide if they want to be part of a culture that says that drug and alcohol abuse is acceptable, 2) there is an urgent need for a campus-wide drug and alcohol policy, and 3) faculty need to be aware of what resources are available at Emory (e.g. student health services, the student counseling center, etc.). The issue that the University faces is not simply the prevalence of underage drinking; it is also the drinking patterns of students who are of age.

Faculty council members made several observations:

- What is happening on Emory's campus is little different than what is happening in other college and in American high schools. This is not simply an Emory problem; it is a national and international problem. The larger cultural issue is how to help students of this age learn to fit in with and relate to their peers. This is an important issue to address, but we need to be wary of paternalistic interventions.
- Claire Sterk observed that it is important that we distinguish between the cultural and legal issues associated with drug and alcohol use. Culturally, experimenting with drugs and alcohol is part of

becoming an adult, but there are things that we can do as a community beyond simply creating awareness. Students themselves can be valuable contributors to this conversation. What ideas do they have about how to develop a caring environment?

V. Faculty Life Course Committee

Randall Strahan presented a report on recommendations for non-tenure track faculty. The Faculty Life Course committee focuses on issues that arise in different stages of faculty careers (for example, parental and maternity leave, the role of the Emeritus College, issues that new faculty face when entering the Emory system, etc.). Working with Daniel Teodorescu, the Faculty Life Course committee developed a survey, administered last Spring, that reveals some problems related to the role of non-tenured faculty at Emory. During the Spring of 2006, Emory University had 1582 non-tenure tract faculty, the majority in the School of Medicine. Five hundred thirty of these faculty members responded to the survey. A summary of the survey's findings:

- Over 60% have been employed for more than 5 years. About 30% have administrative responsibilities. Just over 70% teach at least one course per academic year.
- Many of the non-tenure tract faculty have been at Emory for an extended period of time and make substantial contributions to the University. Most report having institutional loyalty to Emory, and there is a relatively high level of satisfaction with the work that they are doing at the University.
- There is a much lower level of satisfaction in the area of salary and support for professional development. In the qualitative remarks section of the survey, non-tenure tract faculty also expressed concerns related to the terms of their employment and job security. Widespread concern about lack of participation in larger governance groups and a general feeling of under appreciation also figured prominently in these remarks.

After reviewing survey, the Faculty Life Course committee determined that there is some legitimacy to some of these complaints and that the University needs to find some ways to address them. The committee offered several suggestions:

- The haphazard system governing non-tenure tract appointments is an area of major concern. Each school needs to clarify its procedures for appointing non-tenure tract faculty and needs to communicate these procedures and the terms of employment clearly to faculty to whom these terms apply. Schools also need to clarify the responsibilities of non-tenure tract faculty and the bases for evaluation and contract renewal.
- The university should adopt a standard three-tier approach to non-tenure tract faculty so that their status within the university structure may be clarified.
- The university should undertake a review of non-tenure track faculty salaries, work to incorporate these faculty members into the governance structure of the university, and make greater effort to acknowledge the contributions of non-tenure track faculty to university life.

Faculty Council members asked several questions and offered some observations:

- How does Emory compare to other peer institutions? A two year study of peer institutions indicates that Emory is very much comparable to other institutions in the degree to which we rely on non-tenure tract faculty appointments.
- What would be required to implement the Faculty Life Course Committee's suggestions? Strahan replied that a good next step would be for each school to review its procedures for dealing with non-tenure tract faculty and communicate the results of this review to the Provost's office, which can then determine the feasibility of a university-wide review.
- One council member asked about whether or not the committee's recommendations were for the Faculty Council or for the Provost's office itself. Strahan replied that these recommendations are for the Faculty Council to consider. The hope is that getting the Faculty Council's endorsement will begin the process of filtering these recommendations to Emory's schools.
- Another member queried about whether or not the University has some overall prohibition against the participation of non-tenure track faculty in school governance or whether their exclusion is

more informal. Strahan replied that the survey offers no consistent answer to this question. Emory College has fairly consistent policies across its academic units, but policies and practices vary widely outside of the college. What is common across all of the university's units is a general feeling of exclusion from participation in governance, especially in settings beyond the faculty member's home department or program.

- Several council members observed that the heterogeneous nature of non-tenure track faculty roles (in teaching, research, clinical, and administrative work) makes it difficult to set standards and implement university-wide policies. The concerns about non-tenure track faculty meld into the concerns raised last year about the lack of clarity as to who is a faculty member at the university.
- One council member observed that tenure is quickly becoming an archaism that in 20 years will likely no longer exist. There may be alternative forms of distinction, for example declaring some faculty members "research track" and others "teaching track." President Wagner concurred that some schools have recently begun delineating faculty subsets on the basis of a "suite of expectations" associated with their role.
- One member queried about whether or not adjunct faculty were considered as part of the non-tenure track survey. Strahan observed that the document is not clear about whether or not adjunct faculty were included as part of the study. Michael Rogers noted that the number of non-tenure track faculty at Oxford College is much smaller than reflected in the survey, suggesting that the number of actual non-tenure track faculty may be much smaller than the survey suggests.

Faculty Council members will review the committee's recommendations, make comments to the committee, and will consider a revised document when the committee brings it to a future meeting.

VI. Collaborative Initiatives of the Faculty Council and Office of the Provost

Santa J. Ono detailed some plans that the Office of the Provost is developing in collaboration with the Faculty Council. Highlights from Ono's presentation:

- Currently the Faculty Council is sponsoring the Distinguished Faculty Lecture. In the Fall of 2006, the Faculty Council discussed the need to "enhance the intellectual life of the faculty" as an important issue for the university to address. In response to this request, the Office of the Provost 1) began collecting and cataloguing the interdisciplinary intellectual events occurring across the university, 2) solicited feedback from faculty across the university about intellectual events that they'd like to see at the university, and 3) surveyed what peer universities are doing to enhance intellectual life. Most peer universities have developed a series of general lectures targeting faculty, students, and the general public. The Office of the Provost is suggesting a collaboration with the Faculty Council to develop an Emory University lecture series.
- Ono envisions developing a monthly or bimonthly lecture series. Talks could be recorded and made available via the Office of the Provost website. The Faculty Council could assist by organizing a committee of representatives from across the university to plan the schedule of lecture. The goal would be to launch this series the next academic year.

Council members expressed general enthusiasm for this initiative. President Wagner noted that Emory has ample qualified faculty whom it could tap to participate in such a series. Feedback on this plan should be submitted to Santa or Tom Frank.

VII. Opportunities for Conversation on the Middle East and Provost Lewis and Pres. Wagner remarks

Provost Lewis made several remarks related to three key issues that Emory is currently facing:

- Emory's new financial aid plan was masterfully developed, unique to Emory, and a leading initiative in higher education that will dramatically benefit low and middle-income families. While the plan does not eliminate the burden of debt for these families, it greatly reduces it. Much work remains to be done relative to financial aid policies and the mechanic of financial aid packaging at the university.

- Lewis recommended a new book by Derek Bok, *Our Underachieving Colleges*. On the bright side, the book claims that higher education institutions rightly claim to be doing a lot for their students. The problem is that it is not always possible for the institutions to provide a kind of measurable product showing how this is the case, and there are not clear structures that are holding institutions accountable. Lewis argued that universities like Emory need to develop their own metrics for measuring success rather than allowing accrediting organizations or government bodies to set these metrics for us. We need to pursue internally the question of how to assess our success as a higher education institution.
- Last Fall the university initiated a series of events entitled *Religion, Conflict, and Peacebuilding*. President Carter's book, and the recent controversy it has spurred, has helped to sharpen this issue in our community and around the country. President Wagner added that in a recent presentation in South Florida he defended the important role that universities play in providing space for people with violently different opinions to engage nonviolently. In controversies such as this we need to err on the side of having more, not less conflict. Provost Lewis added that this controversy has served as a catalyst for a new idea—an "Evening at Emory" program that will allow the university to take the controversy of President Carter's book and contextualize within the larger picture of the Middle East Conflict.

Dr. Wagner concluded the meeting by noting that, with Johnnie Ray's resignation, the University is reconfiguring that position and has launched a search for a Senior Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations. The search advisory committee has recommended four names. This change reflects the University's need to focus on development and alumni relations as related to the capital campaign. Communications and marketing remain important functions and will be reorganized within a new office.

X. New Business

There was no new business at this month's meeting.

XI. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:07 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Vic McCracken