

**Minutes of the Emory University Senate**  
**October 24, 1995**  
**Rita Ann Rollins Room, School of Public Health**

---

**Members and guests recorded as present**

Steven Batterson, Kimberly Detherage, Joyce Jones, Judy Raggi-Moore, Donna Brogan, William Dillingham, Maureen Kelley, Raghu R. Raju, David Buckholtz, Michelle Duncan, Harriet King, Ann Rouse, Joy Burnette, Raymond DuVarney, Adrienne Leder, Laura Sawyer, Bill Buzbee, Rich D. Freer, Richard Letz, Luthe Smith, Paula Cattanach, Jay Harris, Elizabeth McBride, Sidney Stein, Terry Clark, Gary Hauk, Kate McPherson, John Thomas, Anne Claxton, Leonard Hinds, Erik Oliver, Dan Treadaway, Michael E. Crooms, Linda Huddleston Donna Owen, Ted Weber, Gray Crouse, Howard Hunter, Kay Pendleton

Senate President Richard Letz called the meeting to order and mentioned, for the record, that Alexa Devetter and Larry Beard had called to explain their absence from the meeting. The minutes of the September meeting, distributed earlier, were approved. Dr. Letz apologized for the confusion about the meeting space and promised to distribute a revised calendar for the year to replace the current one that was mailed before deciding at the September Senate meeting to vary the location of meetings during the current year.

The second item on the agenda was the election of the members of the Senate Executive Committee. This includes the President, Past President, President-Elect, and Secretary. The tradition has been to also have the President of the Employee Council, the President of the Student Government Association, and a graduate student member. Kimberly Detherage was nominated as the graduate student representative, and the Executive Committee roster was approved.

The Senate Committee rosters were distributed and approved.

Dr. Letz introduced Bill Buzbee from the Law School, who was recently elected to serve as Chair of the Committee on the Environment. He spoke briefly saying the Committee on the Environment will continue its tasks. He indicated that he would accept suggestions on agenda items for the year and participation on the committee.

Dr. Letz mentioned that the Research Committee and the Faculty Relations Committee are now committees of the Faculty Council and so are not listed on the roster.

Dr. Harriet King was asked to discuss the recommended change to language concerning Emory's policy on conferring emeritus status to retiring faculty. She began by saying the existing Statement of Principles Governing Faculty Relationships (the Gray Book) provides any (emphasis added) retiring member of the faculty, age 55 with 15 years of service, or age 60 and 10 years of service, the title Professor Emeritus. This title is automatically awarded at the time of retirement and does not have to be approved by the Dean.

The recommendation of the Faculty Council is that the title be Emeritus and no automatic promotion be given at the time of retirement. It was brought to the Senate, as the Senate is the official body to make this recommendation to the Administration.

It was also noted in passing that the literal language of the Gray Book is to award the title Emeritus to both male and female faculty, but the Board of Trustees has awarded the title Emerita to female faculty. A suggestion was made to correct such inconsistencies of language as the Gray Book.

Dr. Ray DuVarney, Associate Professor in the Physics Department, spoke against this change. He believes the title Professor Emeritus is given as a way of honoring those members of the faculty who have spent their lives at Emory. He feels that the title of Associate Professor Emeritus falls short. He asked that the proposed change not be made.

Dr. Gary Hauk pointed out that a dean could still recommend an appointment of Professor Emeritus for a retiring faculty member not at the rank of Professor if they so wished under the proposed change.

Erik Oliver asked why this issue was being brought forward at this time. Dr. King responded by saying that some deans had questioned this policy and that is why it is being reviewed.

Dr. Gray Crouse indicated that there are some people who have the title Lecturer or Senior Lecturer and those people receive the title Professor Emeritus. He wondered what would happen to them if the title changed.

Dr. King indicated the proposal discussed in detail by the Faculty Council was whether the final decision on the title should be made by the appropriate dean or should it be automatic. The sense was it should be automatic.

Dr. Luther Smith would like to see what Professor means at other Universities. He thinks it makes a difference if the title represents one's function or if it is in fact a promotion.

Dr. DuVarney said he did not see a positive effect of changing this policy.

Dr. Crouse brought up that all permanent members of the faculty need to be covered in this policy.

Kimberly Detherage suggested that if there were going to be a word change made in the policy, the word honorific should be included. This would suggest that is not a rank or active status but an honorary title.

The motion to recommend a change in the policy of awarding emeritus status was tabled.

Dr. King said she will report back to the Provost and explain that some concern was addressed by the Senate and this issue needs to be discussed further and thought about more carefully.

Dr. Judy Raggi Moore was asked to present to an issue of concern to the Campus Life Committee, i.e., the question of how to disseminate general information quickly and efficiently to the entire campus. She began by saying the students have been able to communicate through flyers, posters and artistic creations on the sidewalk. This is not a realistic way for many of us to communicate because of time and cost. Discussions have begun concerning using e-mail for this purpose.

Dr. Raggi Moore explained she has contacted ITD about this issue and they have been working together on it. The e-mail option has become a reality. Her committee would like to make some recommendations, some general statements that will help to direct the use of the e-mail. Susan Mistretta from ITD was invited to speak to the Senate.

Ms. Mistretta said that there are 4 items to be addressed:

1. Review place within structure of university communication.
2. Define moderation process: Conversations have taken place with Billy Frye, Gary Hauk, Frances Lucas-Tauchar, Alice Miller, and Chuck Nicolaysen.
3. Define technical implementation using existing-mail systems and data repositories.
4. Educate community on use.

Currently there are 3 ways to communicate with the entire campus. The voice mail system, the electronic mail system, and the mail. It takes 10-12 hours to send voice mail messages to the entire campus, a couple of days to send mail and approximately 8 hours to distribute e-mail messages. 95% of the campus is wired for electronic mail. Almost all of the students access it but it is used much less by the faculty and staff.

Dr. Raggi Moore explained the committee feels our goal should be to have at least every department accessible. If there was one representative from each department checking the messages, they could distribute to the other members of the department.

Dr. Batterson pointed out that very few messages need to go to all members of the community. We need to target groups.

Ron Foust from ITD said posting on the World Wide Web is an option if everyone will access it.

Dr. Raggi Moore said the Campus Life Committee liked the idea of the WWW. They felt there should be a charge for posting but not for viewing.

Dr. Donna Owen, Chair of the Safety Committee, expressed a concern about large segments of the Emory population not being integrated with us. Egleston is an example. Dr. Raggi Moore explained that we are not going to get rid of traditional methods of communication.

Dr. Luther Smith brought up the issue of the current methods of communication. He would hope the Campus Life Committee will consider the material on the walkways and if we can

agree on a method of communication that might limit some of the less pleasing methods currently in use.

A motion was made to endorse the three recommendations that the Campus Life Committee had brought forth: Technical, Ethics, and Moderation.

Dr. Letz indicated his sense of the discussion was that there were some reservations about the wording of the recommendation, that the Senate supported the motion in principle, but that the Senate was not prepared to complete the discussion to be able to vote on the motion at hand.

Dr. Raggi Moore suggested the committee meet with Susan Mistretta again and create some potential scenario about what this system could look like.

Dr. DuVarney moved to table this motion until the Senate can hear back from the Campus Life Committee, and the Senate agreed.

Dr. Letz suggested all members communicate with their constituencies about this issue so that the Senate can discuss it further with more widespread input.

There was no further business, and the Senate adjourned at 5:00 p.m.