

Faculty Opportunity for Strategic Planning Group

March 10, 2004

DeKalb Room, Cox Hall

1:00-3:00 p.m.

Attendees: Theodosia Wade, Joyce Murray, Sam Speck, Kay Levine, Robin Bostick, Consuelo Kertz, Rich Metters, Jim Morey, Deepika Petraglia-Bahri, Win Sale, William Branch, Jr., John Ford, Kathy Moss. Those not present: David Petersen and Carlos del Rio (see attached list for faculty members' departments)

John Ford called the meeting to order at 1:00. All participants introduced themselves. Dr. Ford told the group that President Wagner and Cabinet members decided that the best way to get the strategic plan process started was to set up 10-12 groups such as this one to meet and discuss ideas from faculty, brainstorm strategic goals, and share thoughts on where we should be going. Goals for Emory include where we might go, why we will go there, and how we will get there. Dr. Ford suggested that the group look at the keywords in the vision statement such as "destination." Directing their attention to the 2nd page of the handout, "Strategic Planning Process and Timeline," he outlined the Phase I process and indicated that they would be in this phase until August 4th. A report will be written compiling the feedback and thoughts from these 10-12 Faculty Opportunity Groups. These reports will be made available to the group.

Petraglia-Bahri asked what the purpose of this group was and what they would do here today. Dr. Ford said that this was the opportunity to address particular questions in a diverse group. Some indicated that they had not been involved in a discussion like this yet.

Speck suggested that this would be a good opportunity to flesh out the Phase I goals.

Wade indicated that she felt her purpose at this meeting was to share what they were doing at Oxford and how it was working for them.

Ford referred the group to the last page of handout, "Questions for Discussion about Strategic Plan and Vision Statement."

1. Imagine the University had no constraints. What would you like to see Emory do differently?

Levine began the discussion by stating that the academic calendars for all schools should be synchronized. It was a problem in the School of Law.

Kertz replied that the School of Law originally wanted a different schedule and that initially they were all on the same schedule. She wasn't sure if there was still a reason for the different calendars now.

Wade indicated that Oxford College was shifting their calendars to coordinate better.

Kurtz said that synchronization of calendars was a good idea to help encourage cross teaching, communication, and interdisciplinary work; however, it has an effect on the promotion of tenure and publication opportunities.

Ford reiterated that the discussion was to look at the essence more than the practicality of doing new things. It was important to get away from the status quo and try new things, get rid of barriers and find new incentives.

Murray mentioned monetary and budget issues as areas for improvement.

Ford shared that toward the end of Phase 2 and in Phase 3, Emory will be ready to introduce a comprehensive fundraising campaign.

Meters indicated that the achievement of appropriate faculty numbers (scale) was an area of concern. He felt that there was an insufficient and disproportionate number in departments such as English. To attract faculty and to become a destination university, Metters claimed that there needed to be sufficient number of faculty members in departments.

Branch mentioned two ideas from his department:

- Strategic Planning in doubling NIH grants through increase numbers of investigators. Looking for investigators is a priority.
- Investing significant amounts in smaller number of highly innovative education programs that will have immediate impact.

Branch said that the problem with the above is that to be a great university, you need to be known in a number of areas. How do we figure which ones and make them known?

Petraglia-Bahri stated that Emory needs a first rate library and a first rate bookstore. She was concerned that Follett was not qualified to run a university bookstore and she felt that the library was depressing. She also suggested that Emory needs a “smarter campus” in technology support and equipment. This should not be an idealistic goal but one that is available now. They need new media technology but also some basic technical support.

Speck and Murray indicated that their technology support was sufficient.

Wade talked about a planning meeting at Oxford where they were working on their mission statement and vision statement. Two of their big concerns are facilities and I.T. equipment.

Murray agreed with Branch’s statement about innovate educational programs and teaching to attract students. She reminded everyone that students were coming in already technologically advanced.

Speck said that unique educational opportunities were important. The infrastructure has become seriously weaker due to rapid growth. But the graduate program growth has been much slower. The problem was getting enough “bright” students and qualified faculty. Capturing the best students should be a priority.

Wade spoke about their undergraduate research program and indicated that students were looking for these opportunities.

What would you like to see Emory do differently?

Speck claimed that better financial commitment and resources are needed. Other strategies to capture more of the brighter students need to include: stipends for students, better web presence, and program structure.

Petraglia-Bahri talked about the “esprit de corps” – and there needs to be more cross-disciplinary conversations. The retention of the junior faculty is an area of improvement mentioning “they are losing heart.” Not much alumni spirit was here. She asked, “Where’s the heart?” There is a need for students to get the word out (via websites, newsletters) and to have a strong bond with the University.

Some examples of good programs supporting faculty may be found at: University of Chicago, Princeton, CalTech, and Harvard.

Kertz has been at Emory for over 20 years and felt that the University has always been in transition. There is no sense of place but always change. The challenge will be to make people want to do all the work of affecting change and do their regular work on top of that. What will they get out of this investment?

Mettters thinks the key is connecting with alumni. At Stanford, there are unique programs to entice graduated professors back for alumni weekends, etc. He thinks that Stanford has developed a critical mass of alumni who want to be involved and come back. This requires initial \$\$ investment.

Speck said that the payoff is worth the investment.

2. How might we become the “destination university” our new vision statement predicts?

Wade shared that Oxford has accomplished a sense of community because of its size. There is a low turnover of faculty/staff and she is asked constantly about possible openings there. Perhaps Oxford could be used as a model and ask the question, “Why does it work?” The other question would be, “How do we make a University so large accomplish the small community feeling?” It is apparent that President Wagner has started this sense of community building through these input processes.

Morey thinks that Emory has been doing many of the things necessary to become a destination university. Replacing the word “destination” with “reputation”, he suggested that this is a long-term process. He would like to take a look at what the PhD’s from Emory are doing now in comparison to others. Where are Emory’s PhDs today? Are they teaching at places like Yale, Harvard?

Sale agreed with Morey although he felt it wasn’t quite as bleak. He sees PhDs from Emory in Cell Biology at Yale, Harvard. Resources into graduate education need to improve.

The question was asked, “How do we get the best, qualified students?”

One suggestion was to use capital campaign money to strengthen already good graduate programs to make it more appealing to the best students.

Levine, having moved from California, indicated that Emory does not have a strong presence nationally. There is a need for better marketing at a national and international level.

Speck shared that in an address by Jimmy Carter, it was said that Emory tends to be more locally based (parochial) and this may affect diversification at an international/national level.

Sale agreed and said that there also needs to be a broader (national/international) representation on the Board of Trustees. There is a strong Atlanta representation but not nationally diverse.

Petraglia-Bahri would like to see more faculty/staff, increased stipends, and a health care system for graduate school.

Branch stated that Emory is uniquely weak in its graduate program.

3. What are the unique aspects of Emory and the social cultural, academic, and geographic context in which we find ourselves?

Murray listed that Emory has places like CDC, American Cancer Society, Carter Center, and Martin Luther King, Jr. Center. The issue is how do we take advantage of these unique places and how are students involved in these areas?

Branch asked if Emory takes advantage or projects out nationally the uniqueness of Atlanta.

Wade added that people always hear about the air pollution and traffic and the media projection of Atlanta does not encourage people wanting to transfer here.

Murray heard on NPR that Atlanta was the top city for young males/females. Metters shared that Atlanta has a large number of Fortune 500 companies who continually connect with local community.

Several people discussed the physical safety environment of the medical center.

Branch referred back to the discussion about the Carter Center and Jimmy Carter's comment about the lack of Emory students' participation in Carter Center activities. There is no official program on campus for students to be involved with the Carter Center. According to Mr. Carter, students from other locations are more involved at the Carter Center than Emory students.

Murray indicated that she spends 40% of her time with Carter Center projects (i.e. Ethiopia, International Nursing Education program, and International Affairs Office – brings people to campus).

Sale feels that there needs to be more of a link with formal and informal programming connecting Emory and Atlanta. *Programs that have developed these connections may be found at Morehouse and Spellman College.*

4. What are the distinctive opportunities that we should seize at Emory in moving forward?

Morey would like to see a comprehensive campaign. He thinks there is a lot of untapped interest and wealth in Atlanta and a huge resource in “lost alumni”.

A comment was made about diversifying the endowment to stabilize Emory's base.

Sale shared that one needs to look at the history of the Board of Trustees to determine its effect on diversification.

In her international work with the Aids/Aids Prevention program, Murray has received e-mails from Coca-Cola wanting to become more involved. Are there areas for Coca-Cola to invest? How do (or would) these programs support the employees of Coca-Cola?

Metters offered that Emory has “islands of excellence.” An example is the medical school. How can we make it even more wonderful? Add the dirt to build these places up even more to be seen.

Speck thinks that Emory is doing a reasonable job in the areas of emerging infectious diseases and bioterrorism.

Murray mentioned CDC is here and is an automatic partnership opportunity.

5. What are the issues and challenges that cut across all of our academic departments?

Wade prioritized money for facilities, money for programming, acquisition for up-to-date equipment, space for projects and programs for students and faculty, release time for individual research and independent coursework. She shared a feeling of being “overly focused” on what needs to be done immediately that it was hard to find time to discover what was out there and what other people are doing.

Speck wants more junior faculty development and ways to integrate with the community and still succeed in tenure acquisition. He would like to know the statistics for male/female tenure on a national level.

Levine felt that the Law School is having an easier job in the area of community relationships.

Wade said that Oxford has a high female tenure statistic but it was probably due to the high number of female instructors there.

Petraglia-Bahri noted that GA Tech has a high number of tenured instructors in the Sciences.

Sale mentioned that there is a different set of evolutionary stages for the junior faculty.

Ford asked about the other end of the faculty spectrum.

The “distractive exhaustion” syndrome was discussed by Morey. The amount of labor used in institutional building (meetings like this one, is an example) and the desire to work closely with students but stay in the big league of publication were all components of this syndrome.

Branch resurfaced the comment by Kertz about the constant changing factor she mentioned earlier. There is a lack of personal identification at Emory. The School of Medicine needs more contact with students and students want more opportunities to interaction with the faculty.

Morey said there was a cost in scholarly reputation when faculty focused on being available to students (particularly undergraduates). There is a labor issue and there is a need for more faculty. Most colleges have a two-tiered faculty system.

Petraglia-Bahri asked how the cost of being more available to students could be shared. There were brief comments from several who said that they tried to leave their junior faculty alone for at least the first two years.

Wade wants more I.T. support staff and sees possibly an office where a person can be responsible for making the connections needed for faculty and technology needs.

Sale warned that the Woodruff professorships have flat lined and there needs to be a better development of endowed chairs.

Metters notices a lack of internal public relations. There are great things happening but the word is not getting out even within the University system. There are issues from Faculty Council and pay scale concerns. He is pleased with the opportunities for travel in his department but wonders if this is consistent University-wide. He stressed the importance of trumpeting internally the successes of individuals and departmental achievements.

The senior faculty successes need to be broadcasted. Sale wondered if there are enough opportunities created for this, does the University effectively use their senior faculty. Is the senior faculty winding down in research activity or do we just not hear about them?

6. If Emory is poised for transformational growth, what does that look like to us? Where do we see ourselves in the promotion of that type of growth?

Speck said that it's a whole package growth. Is there a commitment to grow? Is there support for this growth for junior faculty? Do we grow proportionately in all areas at the same time? Do we double growth in number of applicants or do we grow in the quality of applicants instead?

Branch asked if we mean growth in excellence or growth in numbers.

Sale shared that competitors create resources to bring in top students from around the world not only by recruiting domestically. (Stipends? Who's going to pay them?)

Bostick (newest member of the faculty) has transferred from the University of South Carolina. He is familiar with the multi-disciplinary approach and is hearing that this may be an area of growth for Emory.

Kertz cautioned that there is a disconnect in what is said and what is done. For example, everyone wants interdisciplinary methods applied but how do you do it when there are tenure issues not supporting this approach? How do we reward it? What does Emory want to be when it grows up? A top-notch research university? A nurturing student-oriented environment? Can we do both or do we end up doing neither?

Bostick said that he was familiar with the Cancer Center and finds it effective for people to be together geographically. It makes people who run these centers valued in tenure decisions and can be part of the new culture by putting them into the structure.

Ford asked that like the Science and Public Health Centers, would Emory be better to grow the number of centers or to grow the centers it already has?

Petraglia-Bahri shared that the Humanistic Inquiry Center has a lot and could do a lot more if it were strengthened.

Committee 12 Report

Sale did not believe that more public relations were needed but real development of programs and faculty support, which takes time.

Speck responded that there must be effective public relations in addition to development. P.R. does not need to just be a “spin” on what’s going on.

Branch is not sure he knows how much of it is left to chance. Have a few doing great work, then someone to have a vision to see growth in that area, pour resources into it and see how it will transform. Opportunities need to be made and developed for the transformational growth to occur (rise up).

Petraglia-Bahri said that they have seen great people in the Humanities Inquiry Center snatched up by other places. She indicated that not enough nurturing, support and development is offered as incentives to stay.

Bostick suggested bringing the right people in to build critical mass (for example, in the graduate program) so that if you lose one person in the group, it does not devastate the work being done.

There being no parting thoughts, Dr. Ford gave the group his e-mail address and encourage all to e-mail him with additional feedback and ideas. The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

ADDENDUM: See attached follow up e-mail (dated March 11, 2004) from Theodosia Wade (Faculty Opportunity Group participant)