

Commission on the Liberal Arts

Final Report

August 29, 2014

Submitted to Provost Claire Sterk by the executive council:

Robyn Fivush (Chair)
Deborah Bruner (Vice-Chair)
Karen Stolley (Vice-Chair)

Preface

The primary mission of Emory University is to build the intellectual and creative foundation for its students and faculty. The core principles of a liberal arts education remain decisive for societal, institutional and personal achievement for the 21st century. A vibrant society needs individuals effectively engaged in critical thinking and writing, creative and collaborative problem-solving, and an understanding of culture and diversity. A liberal arts education further presents opportunities for students to explore and reflect in ways that encourage personal growth and civic involvement. A leader among residential liberal arts research universities, Emory University offers a transformative interface between the student, the institution, and the larger local and global community. Through innovative programs and dynamic educational experiences, Emory University promotes individual flourishing and ongoing engagement that inspires a fully realized life.

Emory University -- an excellent residential liberal arts college situated within a Research One University, in a richly diverse, historically important city -- is uniquely positioned to provide a 21st century liberal arts education. Being residential means that Emory offers students experiential learning, combining scholarly interactions with residential and community experiences in teams of engaged faculty and peer learning communities that unite undergraduate, graduate and professional education. Being a Research One University provides Emory students with unparalleled access to discovery and creativity, working with world renowned faculty, in the laboratory, the library and the local and global community, across the humanities, social sciences and sciences, in the pursuit of inquiry driven scholarship.

The Commission on the Liberal Arts (CoLA) engaged in dynamic interactions with students, faculty, staff and administrators to define and sharpen our goals and provide guidelines that will invigorate our learning, our teaching and our research, positioning Emory structurally and intellectually among the best residential liberal arts research universities. The work of the Commission of the Liberal Arts (CoLA) over the past year has highlighted the multiple ways in which Emory University already provides innovative and exciting opportunities for undergraduate students, graduate and professional students, and for faculty. In our recommendations, we suggest ***partnering with existing programs*** and initiatives in ways that ***expand their impact across units and constituencies***, continuing to engage students in ways that maximize the potential synergies of Emory's unique position as an Atlanta-based residential liberal arts research university. We emphasize that, throughout this process, we have found students, faculty, and staff to be highly engaged; students are enthusiastic about intellectual engagement and novel, experiential learning, and faculty are passionate about our mission and seek ways to be more creative in research and teaching. Two major themes have emerged. ***One, to build intellectual community, we must prioritize and value those activities that create spaces for intellectual engagement across units and among students and faculty. Two, we must work to create more dynamic and flexible structures that unleash the creative potential of our students and faculty.***

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	5
1. Introduction.....	7
1.1. Initial mandate.....	7
1.2. Summer Planning Panel.....	8
1.3. CoLA Vision Statement.....	8
2. Organization of CoLA.....	9
2.1. Committee Structure.....	9
2.2. Committee Mandates.....	9
3. Outreach Activities.....	10
3.1. Panel discussions.....	10
3.1.1. Fall Forum on the Liberal Arts.....	10
3.1.2. Emory Engaged: Ongoing initiatives in the liberal arts.....	10
3.1.3. Emory Engaged: Mentoring matters.....	10
3.1.4. Shakespeare and the Arts across the disciplines.....	10
3.1.5. Spring Forum in the Liberal Arts.....	11
3.2. Communication and media.....	11
3.2.1. Website.....	11
3.2.2. Media.....	11
3.3. Meetings with key stakeholders.....	11
3.4. CoLA lunches.....	12
3.5. Survey.....	12
3.6. Archival Research.....	14
4. Interim Report in December.....	14
4.1. Progress to date.....	14
4.2. Recommendations regarding infrastructure.....	14
5. CoLA recommendations.....	16
5.1. Reports from the three sub-committees.....	16
5.2. General themes.....	17
5.2.1. Ongoing and open communication.....	17
5.2.2. Leverage existing structures.....	17
5.2.3. Creating synergies.....	18
5.2.4. Outcome and assessment.....	18
5.2.5. Changing the infrastructure.....	18
6. Specific Recommendations.....	18
6.1. Recommendation 1: Build intellectual community: The Life of the Mind.....	19
6.1.1. Common intellectual experiences across the university.....	19
6.1.2. Building communities across campus.....	20
6.1.2.1. Build on the Fox Center for Humanistic Inquiry dinners.....	20
6.1.2.2. Develop a dynamic network model of faculty interests.....	20
6.1.2.3. “Continue the Conversation” coffee hours.....	21
6.1.3. Create a culture of celebration.....	21

6.1.4.	Create better university communication.....	21
6.1.5.	Specific action steps.....	21
6.1.5.1.	Constitute a “Life of the Mind” Steering Committee.....	21
6.1.5.2.	Develop network maps.....	22
6.1.5.3.	Appoint an intellectual coordinator.....	22
6.1.5.4.	Timeline, evaluations and assessment.....	22
6.2.	Recommendation 2: Create integrated cross-unit courses.....	22
6.2.1.	Participants.....	23
6.2.2.	Course development.....	23
6.2.3.	Assigning credit hours.....	23
6.2.4.	Integrating scholarship and experiential learning.....	23
6.2.5.	Goals.....	23
6.2.6.	Specific actions steps.....	24
6.2.6.1.	Create a synthesis seminar steering committee.....	24
6.2.6.2.	Develop a call for proposals.....	24
6.2.6.3.	Pilot.....	24
6.3.	Recommendation 3: Expand and coordinate student mentee-mentor opportunities.....	24
6.3.1.	Undergraduate students.....	25
6.3.2.	Graduate and post-doctoral fellows.....	25
6.3.3.	Junior faculty.....	25
6.3.4.	Senior and emeriti faculty.....	26
6.3.5.	Leverage ACTSI.....	26
6.3.6.	Specific action steps.....	26
6.3.6.1.	Mentoring across the university steering committee.....	26
6.3.6.2.	Developing best practices.....	26
6.3.6.3.	Creating a matching system.....	26
6.3.6.4.	Develop a program for freshman.....	27
6.3.6.5.	Timeline, evaluation and assessment.....	27
7.	Long term recommendations.....	27
7.1.	Align faculty evaluation with university priorities.....	27
7.2.	Rethinking “teaching credit.”.....	27
7.3.	Rethinking the academic calendar.....	28
7.4.	Allow individual faculty to create multi-year plans.....	28
7.5.	Emory needs to “tell our story.”.....	28
8.	Conclusions and overarching themes.....	29

Appendix A: CoLA committee structure, membership and mandates

Appendix B: Materials from the CoLA lunches

Appendix C: Online survey of Emory stakeholders: Summary of findings

Appendix D: CoLA Interim Report and Recommendations

Appendix E: Reports from the Sub-committees

Executive Summary

In Spring 2013, Provost Sterk re-energized the Commission on the Liberal Arts (CoLA) that had been created in 2011 by then-Provost Earl Lewis to develop a vision for Emory University as a residential liberal arts research university with deeply engaged students and faculty. CoLA, and its three sub-committees, *Learning through Instruction*, *Learning through Innovation* and *Learning through Integration*, connected the entire Emory community through forums, lunches, websites, and a survey. Hundreds of faculty, students and staff were involved in these discussions in various formats. Through this process a vision of Emory emerged:

Emory University is a leading residential liberal arts research university. Fundamental to our vision of Emory's future is the creation of dynamic, permeable and flexible structures and processes that unleash the creative potential of our students and faculty. We envision Emory University as a destination university for students and faculty engaged in innovative interdisciplinary learning and scholarship that crosses traditional boundaries of discipline and school, that integrates a liberal arts education across the entire university, and crosses into the local and global communities. To achieve this vision we must be bold in facilitating students and faculty to create learning and research communities in ways that may disrupt traditional classroom structures and calendars, and we must align our strategic priorities with this vision.

This vision is already being implemented across the university in many exciting programs, centers and initiatives that integrate students and faculty in innovative learning environments. We see our recommendations as building on what Emory already does well in ways that will leverage existing resources to enhance and expand this vision across the university.

Across the year, several recurring themes emerged:

1. Ongoing and open communication. We need more efficient and more effective online and print communication that will take advantage of new technologies to create more dynamic and interactive communication in ways that will enhance dialogue among students, faculty, and staff and about the value of a liberal arts education.
2. Create synergies and leverage existing programs. We should work to create synergies among the many exciting pedagogical and learning communities and initiatives already in evidence across the university in order to leverage existing structures in ways that will enhance opportunities for student engagement.
3. Evaluation and assessment. We need to set clear strategic priorities and align assessment and evaluation of educational and scholarly programs, evaluation of learning outcomes, and evaluation of students and faculty with this vision. Clear and transparent metrics must be established for evaluation.
4. Changing the infrastructure. There needs to be more permeability and flexibility for multiple curricular activities that cross schools within the university to better allow learning initiatives to take advantage of all the Emory University offers.

The general themes point to multiple possibilities for integrating a liberal arts education across the student experience within the whole university. In addition to these general ideas, CoLA is making three specific recommendations. Each of these emerged from and contribute to the general themes, but we underscore that these specific recommendations are proposed as initial steps in a longer process of transformative change. The three specific recommendations, each tied to a series of concrete action steps, are:

1. To facilitate intellectual engagement by creating more opportunities for sustained conversations among students, faculty, staff, alumni and the Board of Trustees. This can be accomplished through three interrelated activities: a) creating a common intellectual experience through organizing orbit events around one to two major university events per year; b) facilitate interactions among students, faculty, and staff with common interests through dinners, coffee hours, and dynamic mapping of research interests; and c) create a culture of celebration of student, faculty, and staff achievements.
2. To create of a new kind of cross-unit course that would integrate scholarly and experiential learning with an interdisciplinary, cross-unit team of undergraduates, graduate and professional students and faculty that would provide an integrative liberal arts educational experience. We envision developing student-faculty learning communities that will cross traditional boundaries of disciplines, schools, and even academic calendars to create innovative learning spaces that will integrate the principles of a liberal arts education.
3. To expand and coordinate mentoring programs to provide structure and best practice guidelines for specific mentoring programs across the university, and provide a dynamic interface for students to find mentors and collaborators within the Emory community.

CoLA further recommends a series of long-term strategic initiatives:

1. Facilitate a university wide conversation to clarify and emphasize the significance and evaluation of faculty activities critical to building intellectual community, including annual faculty evaluations and tenure and promotion processes that genuinely value intellectual engagement with the Emory community, mentoring and institution building.
2. Re-visit how teaching is defined and how teaching credit is allocated with some consideration of number of contact hours and number of students. Metrics and guidelines should be developed and teaching load should be determined as fulfilling a certain number of teaching “credits” rather than as number of courses or lectures.
3. Re-think the academic calendar to allow greater flexibility in course scheduling; expand the possibilities for faculty to develop courses of different lengths, contact hours and credits, and have a metric for defining teaching credits based on these instead of “courses,” to allow maximal flexibility for creative curricular innovations.
4. Allow individual faculty to create multi-year plans that would flexibly allow faculty to meet their commitments to teaching, research and institution building across their career.
5. Develop an “Emory tells its story” project across campus, in which students and faculty would engage in story-telling focused on their experiences at Emory and/or their professional lives that would create a shared personal and intellectual experience for the university.

1. Introduction

We begin at the end. After an exhilarating year of discussions, we remain convinced that Emory is a great institution with faculty, staff and students truly committed to our liberal arts mission. In this report, we outline the history and processes that brought CoLA to specific recommendations and long-term priorities. Throughout the year, we heard again and again the dedication and excitement involved in being a part of transformative change at Emory, alongside frustration, especially at points where infrastructure and institutional resources impeded creative initiatives. Through this process a vision of Emory emerged. This vision is already being implemented across the university in many exciting programs, centers and initiatives. We see our recommendations as building on what Emory already does well in ways that will leverage existing resources to enhance and expand those initiatives across the university. Thus we begin with a vision statement that both emerged from and guided our discussions across the year:

Emory University is a leading residential liberal arts research university. Fundamental to our vision of Emory's future is the creation of dynamic, permeable and flexible structures and processes that unleash the creative potential of our students and faculty. We envision Emory University as a destination university for students and faculty engaged in innovative interdisciplinary learning and scholarship that crosses traditional boundaries of discipline and school, that integrates a liberal arts education across the entire university, and crosses into the local and global communities. To achieve this vision we must be bold in facilitating students and faculty to create learning and research communities in ways that may disrupt traditional classroom structures and calendars, and we must align our strategic priorities with this vision.

1.1. Initial mandate:

In Spring 2013, Provost Sterk re-energized the Commission on the Liberal Arts (initially convened by then-Provost Earl Lewis in 2011) and appointed Steve Everett and Robyn Fivush as co-chairs. Provost Sterk's mandate was based upon her essay published in the Academic Exchange in spring 2013 (http://www.emory.edu/ACAD_EXCHANGE/issues/2013/spring/stories/sterk/index.html). In consultation with Provost Sterk, Drs. Everett and Fivush organized a planning panel over the summer of 2013 with the objectives of developing a more detailed mission statement for CoLA and an organizational structure that would be broadly representative across the university. With Dr. Everett's departure in June of 2013, Dr. Fivush became the chair of CoLA and an executive council was formed consisting of the chair and two vice-chairs, Dr. Deborah Bruner and Dr. Karen Stolley.

1.2. Summer planning panel:

The summer planning panel consisted of 12 faculty members drawn broadly from across the university, with representation from each unit:

- William T. Branch, Professor of General Medicine
- Deborah Bruner, Robert W. Woodruff Professor, School of Nursing
- Tara Doyle, Senior Lecturer in Religion and Director of Tibetan Studies Program in India
- Martha Fineman, Robert W. Woodruff Professor of Law; Founding Director, Feminism and Legal Theory Project; Director, Vulnerability and The Human Condition Initiative
- Jeffery Galle, Director, Center for Academic Excellence, Oxford College
- Justin Gallivan, Associate Professor of Chemistry
- Brooks Holifield, Charles Howard Candler Professor of American Church History, Emeritus
- John Lysaker, Professor of Philosophy
- Michael Sacks, Associate Professor in the Practice of Organization and Management
- Jessica Sales, Research Assistant Professor, Behavioral Sciences and Health Education
- Holli Semetko, Asa Griggs Candler Professor of Media and International Affairs
- Leslie Taylor, Professor of Theater Studies

The planning panel met three times across the summer to discuss the specific vision and organization for CoLA. Members helped develop initial reading lists, and committee members engaged in formal and informal discussion of the issues. At the end of the summer, the planning panel had produced a vision statement and an organizational structure.

1.3. CoLA Vision statement

The summer planning panel developed the mission statement for CoLA that has guided the work throughout the year:

We envision Emory University as a leader in the 21st century liberal arts research university. Current challenges facing higher education highlight the need for increasingly flexible and permeable structures that facilitate innovative learning through both teaching and research. Across disciplines and units, the shared core values underlying the creation and dissemination of knowledge that embrace a liberal education include:

- *Knowledge of human cultures and the physical and natural world*
- *Intellectual and practical skills, including critical and creative thinking, communications skills, quantitative literacy, inquiry and analysis and collaborative problem-solving*

- *Personal and social responsibility, including civic engagement and ethical reasoning and action*
- *Learning that encourages the application of knowledge to complex problems*

To achieve this vision, the Commission on the Liberal Arts (CoLA) will engage in dynamic, transformative conversations with faculty, students, staff and administrators to define and sharpen our goals and provide guidelines that will invigorate our teaching and our research, positioning Emory structurally and intellectually among the best residential liberal arts research universities.

2. Organization of CoLA

2.1. Committee structure

CoLA was organized as three working committees, each focusing on specific aspects of the academic endeavor: 1) *Learning through Instruction*, focused on curricular structures and processes including courses and credits, interdisciplinary teaching, and integration of teaching and residential experiences; 2) *Learning through Innovation*, focused on creation and discovery, and integration of students into the research mission of the university; and 3) *Learning through Integration*, focused on crossing boundaries across disciplines, universities, and local and global communities. Learning was the umbrella term to highlight that learning is the core of an academic institution, whether we are learning through teaching, through mentoring, through research or through community engagement. Each committee had two co-chairs, one co-chair from the College and one from another academic unit. In addition, all academic units, undergraduate students, graduate students, staff, administration, alumni and the BoT were represented on each committee. Committee membership was developed iteratively through nominations, including self-nominations. Committees were formed by the end of October 2014.

In order to provide clear communication among the three committees, the committees were directed by a steering committee, composed of the co-chairs of each of the committees, the executive council, and three ex-officio members - the provost, the director of the Center for the Development of Faculty Excellence (CFDE) and the associate director of the CFDE. Appendix A displays the committee structure and lists all the committee members.

2.2. Committee mandates

Committee mandates were developed iteratively by the summer planning panel, the executive council and the steering committee. Committees were asked to re-imagine what Emory could be rather to focus on obstacles; essentially, what do we already do well, what can we do better and what can we imagine? Committees were further asked to consider all constituencies, including undergraduate, graduate and professional students, faculty, staff, administrators and alumni, and to consider issues of infrastructure, including physical spaces, calendars, and technology. Within these broad frames, each committee was mandated to explore specific issues relevant to their focus. Appendix A lists the mandates both in graphic and textual form.

3. Outreach Activities

3.1. Panel discussions

3.1.1. Fall Forum on the Liberal Arts

On September 30, 2014, CoLA hosted a Fall Forum on the Liberal Arts to announce its new structure and processes. The forum gathered administrators to discuss the values of a liberal arts education across the university. Speakers included President James Wagner, Dean Robin Forman, Executive Vice-President for Health Affairs Wright Caughman, and Senior Vice-President and Dean of Campus Life Ajay Nair, and BOT member Ms. Laura Hardman. Provost Sterk moderated the panel and provided comments. Approximately 150 people from across the campus attended.

3.1.2. Emory Engaged: Ongoing Initiatives in the Liberal Arts

CoLA and CFDE co-sponsored a panel discussion on Emory Engaged: Ongoing Initiatives in the Liberal Arts that focused on innovative curricular and administrative initiatives in the liberal arts. Approximately 60 faculty, students and administrators attended. Panelists were: Dean Micheal Elliott on Academic Engagement, Dr. Sheila Cavanagh on The World Shakespeare Project, Dr. Violla Hartfield-Mendez on Imagining America, Dr. Pamela Scully on the Emory Quality Enhancement Plan, and Dr. Harvey Klehr on The Voluntary Core Curriculum

3.1.3. Emory Engaged: Mentoring Matters in the Health Sciences

CoLA and CFDE co-sponsored a panel discussion focused on mentoring and mentoring initiatives in the health sciences. Panelists were: Pamela Scully, Director of the CFDE; Debra Houry, Vice-Chair for Research and Associate Professor of Emergency Medicine; Deborah Bruner, Robert W. Woodruff Professor of Nursing and Vice-Chair of CoLA; Patricia Marsteller, Professor of Practice; and Deema Elchoufi, 2013 Global Health Institute Field Scholar and Emory College student. Approximately 50 people attended.

3.1.4. Shakespeare and the Arts Across the Disciplines

As an example of the type of cross-disciplinary and cross-school scholarly programs that CoLA advocates, CoLA co-sponsored with The World Shakespeare Project a panel discussion and student poster display in celebration of Shakespeare's 450th birthday. Panelists were: Dr. William Ely, School of Medicine; Steven Paskoff, President and CEO of Employment Learning Situations; Sarah Higinbotham and Bill Taft, Georgia State Prison Initiative; Jim

Grimsley, Creative Writing Program; Kate Winskell, Rollins School of Public Health; and Carolyn Cook, 20013 Suzi Bass Best Actress Awardee. The event, which took place in the Emory Barnes and Noble bookstore and attracted a large crowd, showcased the many ways in which engagement with Shakespeare had created opportunities for shared intellectual engagement for faculty, students, staff and administrators. Most impressive, there was good attendance from the health sciences, and points of intersection between a humanities and health sciences approach to the importance of Shakespeare and literature were highlighted, as well as opportunities in the arts and community engagement.

3.1.5. Spring Forum on the Liberal Arts

On April 30, 2015, CoLA hosted a Spring Forum on the Liberal Arts to present and discuss recommendations from the committees. Each committee presented their recommendations in advance of their written reports. Approximately 100 people attended.

3.2. Communication and media

3.2.1. Website

CoLA has maintained a website, liberalartsforwardemory.com, since its inception. The website is updated on a regular basis to provide ongoing information about CoLA's activities. In addition to summary articles, the website provides links to the videotaped panel discussions, links to relevant readings, and a full description of CoLA's organization and committee membership. Visitors can leave comments.

3.2.2. Media

CoLA has maintained a high profile in all campus publications. We have publicized events in advance and provided subsequent reports of all events in outlets including Emory Report, AE, The Emory Wheel, Thoughtworks, and on the homepage.

3.3. Meetings with key stakeholders

Throughout the year, members of the executive council have had meetings, both individually and with groups, on a frequent basis. We have done presentations to:

- The Council of Deans
- The Alumni Board
- The Academic Affairs Committee of the BOT
- The Administrative Council
- The Faculty Council of the University Senate
- The Chairs and Directors of Emory College

- The Humanities Council of Emory College
- The Faculty Science Council of Emory College

In addition a member of the executive committee has met individually at least once with the following people:

- Lynn Zimmerman, EVP, Academic Affairs
- Lisa Tedesco, Dean of LGS
- Linda McCauley, Dean of Nursing
- Robin Forman, Dean of ECAS
- Robert Schapiro, Dean of Law
- Jim Curran, Dean of SPH
- Ajay Nair, Dean of Campus Life
- Wright Caughman, VP for Health Affairs
- Stephen Bowen, Dean of Oxford College
- Allison Dykes, Secretary of the University
- Maryam Alavi, Dean of Business
- Jan Love, Dean of Theology
- Paul Wolpe, Director of the Center for Ethics
- Philip Wainwright, VP for International Affairs
- Rosemary Magee, Director of MARBL
- Salmon Rushdie
- Tom Jenkins
- Rhonda Mullens

3.4. CoLA lunches

In the spring semester, CoLA hosted 4 lunches for faculty, staff and students to discuss emerging themes and ideas. Committee members generated lists of faculty, staff and students to send specific invitations to, and a general invitation went out to all faculty. Approximately 30 people attended each lunch. Tables of about 6 people each were assigned to insure cross unit conversations. Lists of attendees are included in Appendix B. Attendees were emailed beforehand to explain the purposes and the structure of the lunch discussions to maximize productive discussion, and materials were available both on line and at each table to help structure discussion (see Appendix B for details). During each lunch, we organized a live twitter feed to facilitate communication among attendees and to insure discussions would be memorialized. The twitter feeds across the 4 lunches were content analyzed to help the CoLA committees in formulating their final reports (see Appendix B).

3.5. Survey

As part of its work, the Subcommittee on *Learning through Integration* developed an online survey instrument based on an assessment tool developed by Campus Compact to assess the extent of institutional support for exemplary service learning and civic

engagement practices at colleges and universities across the country. The survey was distributed via email to the entire Emory community between April 10 and May 5, 2014. Approximately 46,000 emails were sent. About 10,000 of these were opened and, of these, 1,063 respondents (or 10% of those who opened the email) were included in the analysis; respondent primary affiliations were as follows: faculty (20.9%), administrators and staff (38.9%), students (21.4%), alumni (16.8%), and other (1.9%). Respondents' primary disciplinary area based on their primary Emory affiliation included: health sciences (28%), arts and humanities (27.5%), social sciences (15.2%), natural sciences (7.3%), and other (22%). Overall, nearly half of all respondents (47.7%) and almost two-thirds (64.7%) of faculty respondents reported they had been affiliated with Emory University for ten or more years.

Data were categorized into four quadrants: 1) "Concentrate here" signifies importance rated above the mean for that domain of items but below the mean response on performance; 2) "Keep up the good work" signifies importance and performance both rated above the mean; 3) "Low priority" signifies both low rated importance and performance; and 4) "Possible overkill" signifies low rated importance and higher performance. Nuances of these findings, including differences between groups of stakeholders are detailed in the full report (see Appendix C), but there was also good consistency across stakeholders.

Survey respondents consistently identified Emory's mission and Emory's senior administrative and academic leadership as aspects of learning through integration that had relatively high importance and relatively high performance. Other achievements in the "keep up the good work" quadrant included Emory's methods and practices of teaching (campus-based); integrated and complementary community service activities that weave together student service, research, service-learning, and other community engagement activities (Atlanta-based); forums for fostering public dialogue (Atlanta-based); Emory's external resource allocation (global and international); and the degree to which disciplines, departments, and interdisciplinary work have incorporated a global perspective that penetrates all disciplines (global and international). Areas identified as worthy of concentration (relatively high importance and relatively low performance) included faculty roles and rewards (campus-based) and internal resource allocation (campus-based and Atlanta-based). Open ended comments generally supported the quantitative results. Overall, respondents expressed that there was a need for greater recognition and support for faculty, greater guidance and direction from central administrators regarding university goals and objectives, and better institutional support for the infrastructure needed to pursue and attain those objectives.

The results support and extend the year-long conversations. The Emory community perceives Emory to be committed and successful in multiple domains, including leadership, teaching and integration into the community. But there are also areas that need attention. Specifically, there is consensus that Emory needs to better articulate its goals for integration into the local and global communities, improve processes for faculty evaluation and align internal resources with these priorities.

3.6. Archival Research

A recurring question at all committee and outreach meetings was what we know about what Emory is already doing. It became quickly apparent that there are many successful and ongoing initiatives across the university of which most people are not even aware. In fact, a general theme that echoed throughout the year was the need for a more dynamic, coherent and user-friendly repository of information about programs, events, and people. We return to this issue below in our specific recommendations, but as a first step, CoLA undertook to gather at least some information in an organized format, and developed a series of annotated inventories. Although all of these annotated inventories remain works in progress as we continually discover more programs at Emory that are relevant to CoLA's mission, these inventories provide an initial glimpse of the various ongoing initiatives. We have placed the following annotated inventories on our website:

1. Mentoring programs at Emory University
2. Capstone experiences at Emory University
3. Capstone experiences at our peer institutions
4. Study and Research abroad opportunities for Emory students
5. Dual degree programs at Emory

4. Interim report in December

4.1. Progress to date

In December, the executive council filed an interim report to the Provost (see Appendix D). The report detailed the work accomplished to that point, including committee work, outreach activities and spring plans.

4.2. Recommendations regarding infrastructure for teaching and teaching credit.

As part of the interim report, the executive council developed a series of initial recommendations to the provost, *Teaching Across Units*. Based on issues that emerged, beginning with the planning panel and that continued to be voiced in virtually every venue, these recommendations called for changes in how teaching credit is allocated and compensated across units. The initial report and recommendations are included in Appendix C. Because these recommendations remain a cornerstone to all our recommendations, we reprint them in a revised form here.

Preliminary recommendations from CoLA

A recurring issue, beginning with the summer planning panel and reverberating through the three main committees, as well as discussions with deans, is ***the need to facilitate teaching across units***. There are three major obstacles, all of which need to be addressed if CoLA is to be able to fulfill its mandate:

1. **Faculty compensation and credit across units.** Faculty find it difficult to teach across units because existing structures for tracking and crediting tuition revenue means that deans are concerned about losing tuition dollars when faculty teach students from other units. Discussions with deans across this past semester suggests that they are interested in faculty teaching across units and can cite instances where this has been successful on a case by case basis, or through specific programs. CoLA would like the deans to consider ways to regularize and institutionalize this process so that faculty might more easily teach across units, without having to negotiate on a case by case basis. There are at least four ways in which this needs to happen:
 - a. Faculty from one unit teach an entire class in another unit. In this model, a faculty member from one unit would teach a course listed through another unit. There are some examples of this already happening. For example, there are professors from the law school and from SPH who teach a course in the college. Although we have not been able to discern the exact financial arrangements in such cases, we emphasize that processes should be in place that allow this on a more regular basis, and that would specify issues concerning faculty salary and teaching credit when teaching courses in a different unit.
 - b. Faculty teach a cross-unit listed course. In this model, one faculty member teaches a course that is cross-listed among at least two units and students from at least two units enroll. This involves several issues: faculty salary (who pays given that both units benefit?); teaching credit (how many students from each unit must enroll for the faculty member to receive teaching credit?); and tuition transfer (who receives the tuition from the students enrolling from each unit?).
 - c. Faculty team-teach a cross-unit listed course. This is the most complicated scenario. At least two faculty from at least two units team teach a course in which students from at least two units enroll. All of the issues listed in b) need to be worked out.
 - d. Graduate student opportunities for teaching. Graduate and professional students should have more opportunities for teaching across units, either as teaching assistants or as instructors. Such opportunities would better prepare them for a changing higher education landscape and could potentially contribute to graduate and professional school recruitment efforts.
2. **Academic calendars and teaching credit.** The previous task force on coordinating the academic calendar solved this problem by creating a unified calendar, but units are now requesting waivers of that calendar structure. This has essentially returned us to the previous situation of listing courses across units that operate on different calendars. We further note that the possibility of flexible teaching modules has also come up in various discussions; pursuing this kind of

flexibility will necessitate considering both academic calendars and allocation of teaching credit. We ask the deans to consider the following:

- a. Allocation teaching credits for credit hours taught. In this model, faculty could develop various types of courses – workshops, modules, intensive seminars, half-semester courses and full semester courses, which may or may not be writing intensive, research intensive, etc. Number of credits would be based on number of course hours, and faculty would be allocated that number of “teaching credits.” Teaching credits could be accrued throughout the academic year, or over a period of years. Most units already have courses that vary by number of hours and number of credits, so we are suggesting thinking about an even more flexible system.
 - b. Alignment of faculty evaluations with teaching credits. There needs to be a reconsideration of how teaching is assessed and evaluated across the university. If we can develop a system of “teaching credits” that transparently describes how teaching is to be “counted” and evaluated, this would be an important first step in aligning faculty evaluation with university priorities.
3. Cross-unit course approval processes. Faculty who want to teach courses that are listed with more than one unit must currently obtain approval from multiple curriculum committees. There needs to be a centralized and efficient curriculum approval process. One possibility is to have a “supra-committee” composed of a faculty member from each unit’s curriculum committee that is empowered to approve cross-unit courses.

5. CoLA Recommendations

5.1. Reports from the sub-committees

After our year-long deliberations and conversations across the university, several specific recommendations for how to enhance the liberal arts experience emerged. Each sub-committee, *Learning through Instruction*, *Learning through Innovation* and *Learning through Integration*, prepared a final report summarizing the work of their committee and specific recommendations that emerged from their deliberations. In making final recommendations the executive council discussed the sub-committee recommendations, the themes that emerged throughout discussions and meetings with key stakeholders, and archival research on programs and initiatives already in place at Emory and at our peer institutions. Reports from each of the sub-committees are in Appendix E.

We start with a summary of the general themes and ideas that resonated across the year-long discussions. These themes provided a larger context within which to think about Emory and the commitment to liberal education, and provide general guidelines for action. They also provide the context for the specific recommendations and action steps that follow.

We emphasize that a recurring theme throughout our work has been that to create energy, enthusiasm and excitement, we do not need to do *more* of the same, we need to

do something different. As discussed throughout this report, Emory already has many exciting programs and initiatives. In proposing the specific recommendations, CoLA's goal is to create synergies among existing programs, activities and events in ways that will leverage what we already do. Our goal is to enhance a culture of integration and celebration across our missions of teaching, research and institution building, and across our constituencies of undergraduates, graduate and professional students, faculty, staff, alumni and Board of Trustees.

Finally, our work pointed to larger issues that need to be considered as we move forward. Although not yet concrete in terms of implementation, these are the issues that faculty, students and staff agree need to be addressed in the future, and they are reflected in CoLA's long term recommendations. These are addressed following a discussion of the specific recommendations.

5.2. General themes:

5.2.1. Ongoing and Open Communication. First and foremost, faculty, students and staff across the university are passionate about their research and teaching, and enthusiastic about the possibilities for engagement that CoLA offers. As Emory moves forward, it will be important to maintain open avenues of communication across all units of the university so that faculty will be able to keep the conversation going about the implementation and short- and long-term goals. This means creating more regular opportunities for cross-talk across units similar to the kinds of events CoLA has sponsored in recent months. Two aspects of communications are critical:

5.2.1.1. Emory needs better and more integrated web-based communication. As discussed further below, a recurring theme was the difficulty of navigating Emory's website to find relevant information about programs, events and faculty. In addition, there are multiple print and online publications, some of which seem redundant. A more efficient, flexible, user-friendly interface, that provides more coordinated information, is needed.

5.2.1.2. Emory should support ongoing discussions about the definitions and values of a liberal arts education. While there was clear consensus that a liberal arts education was the heart of Emory's mission, there was ambiguity about what this means exactly. Related to this, Emory needs to clarify its identity as a residential liberal arts research university, and create a more coherent narrative about its values and mission. More sustained dialogue on these issues is needed. Two excellent models already exist that could be adapted to expand campus discussions about the liberal arts. The Center for Faculty Development and Excellence sponsored an Academic Learning Community on higher education that was begun this past year and will continue into the current academic year. The second model is the Transforming Community dialogues that occurred across campus on racial relations.

- 5.2.2. **Leverage existing structures.** We can leverage existing structures that exemplify student-faculty experiential learning such as the Global Health Institute (GHI), the Piedmont Project, the Center for Science, the Center for Community Partnerships (CFCP) and the Center for Faculty Development and Excellence (CFDE). The CFDE sponsors a range of cross-unit teaching and learning opportunities such as Academic Learning Communities (ALC) and the University Courses that can serve as a model. University Courses bring together undergraduate, graduate, and professional students who explore an interdisciplinary topic through guest lectures by faculty from across the University. Many students report that the opportunity for sustained intellectual discussion with such a wide range of faculty and student interlocutors results in one of the most significant experiences of their time at Emory.
- 5.2.3. **Creating synergies.** Emory already offers a dizzying array of programs, speakers and seminars. Simply adding more is not the answer; to truly create an intellectual community, we must create synergies across existing activities. This necessitates finding better ways to coordinate communication and events, including creating more effective websites, as discussed above. We can also take better advantage of innovative technology to centralize, catalogue and provide a user friendly, searchable database to provide a repository of information and communicate across units by using interactive websites, Twitter, etc. Additionally, there must be a coordinated academic calendar to facilitate planning.
- 5.2.4. **Outcome and assessment.** All new opportunities must be designed with learning outcomes and assessment processes built in from the outset, and evaluation of faculty and students must be aligned with university goals. This necessitates that the university provide an articulated vision and set of goals and develop transparent assessment measures to meet those goals. It further necessitates a clear articulation of metrics of evaluation for faculty, staff, students and programs that are in alignment with the university's strategic goals.
- 5.2.5. **Changing the infrastructure.** The successful realization of curricular innovations will depend on the implementation of the infrastructure recommendations enumerated earlier in this report, including coordinated flow of tuition revenue, credit for student matriculation, and credit for faculty involvement.

6. Specific Recommendations

The general themes point to multiple possibilities for integrating a liberal arts education across the university. In addition to these general ideas, CoLA is making three specific recommendations. Each of these emerged from and contribute to the general themes, but we underscore that these specific recommendations are proposed as initial steps in a longer process of transformative change. The three specific recommendations, each tied to a series of concrete action steps, are:

1. To facilitate the life of the mind by creating more opportunities for sustained intellectual community among faculty, students, staff, alumni and the Board of Trustees.
2. To create of a new kind of cross-unit course that would integrate scholarly and experiential learning with an interdisciplinary, cross-unit team of undergraduates, graduate and professional students and faculty that would provide an integrative liberal arts educational experience.
3. To expand and coordinate mentoring programs, and provide a dynamic interface for faculty and students to find mentors and collaborators within the university.

We note that the coordination and implementation of these recommendations depend on resource allocation. Thus we applaud the provost for creating the position of Associate Vice-Provost for Academic Innovation, whose office will oversee implementation and function as a kind of ‘hub’ for integration of liberal arts education across the university. As will become evident in the action steps, CoLA proposes that the Associate Vice-Provost for Academic Innovation will constitute multiple advisory and steering committees, representative of the Emory community, which will play a critical role in refining these recommendations, setting timelines, metrics for evaluations and outcome criteria

6.1. Recommendation 1: Build intellectual community: “the life of the mind.” In a very real sense intellectual community is the heart of any great university. Yet defining exactly what intellectual community is or what it entails can be quite nebulous. CoLA conversations across the year revealed faculty, student and staff eagerness for building more cohesive intellectual community at Emory. Several themes emerged. First, Emory sponsors a dizzying array of speakers, workshops, programs, but it is often difficult to find out exactly what is happening when because events are listed in so many different places, or not listed at all in university wide communications. The university calendar simply does not work as effectively as it should. Second, although there are many events, they generate little cohesion or resonance; events come and go without many university-wide opportunities to prepare for or deliberate about events among interested constituencies.

In addition, our conversations revealed two somewhat distinct, but related, aspects of intellectual community. One is the idea of a common intellectual experience across diverse constituencies. The other is building communities across the university based on shared research interests. Both of these rely on better and more dynamic communication. Finally, intellectual community must rely on a culture of celebration of faculty and student research and engagement.

6.1.1. Common intellectual experiences across the university. As noted above, it is hard to keep up with what is happening around campus. Events seem to appear and disappear, with some advance publicity but rarely any follow-up experiences. CoLA recommends a more integrated approach to a targeted number of university events. While most events will continue to follow established procedures, CoLA

recommends selecting one major university event per year (or maybe one a semester) and building orbit events around it, creating a series of intellectually cohesive happenings around this major event. These orbit events could be quite varied, such as reading groups in preparation for an event, faculty panels before and after an event, follow-up lectures by specific faculty, art performances, and so forth. Events might take place in classrooms, on campus and in residence halls. CoLA notes that partnering with the QEP and existing programs housed within Campus Life around some of these events would be an ideal way to integrate multiple university initiatives. We emphasize that we do not envision a unitary annual theme; rather, we envision facilitating an extended university discussion about one or two major university events a year.

6.1.2. Building communities across campus. Emory has engaged in many programs over the years to try to bring together faculty, students and staff with similar research interests, including Emory meets Emory, the Fox Center annual dinners, and the current Provost's salons. All of these are or have been effective, and should continue, but CoLA recommends additional, more targeted and concerted, and more fully integrated efforts.

6.1.2.1.1. Build on the Fox Center for Humanistic Inquiry dinners. The Fox Center for Humanistic Inquiry hosts a highly successful annual dinner and discussion on a selected broad theme. These dinners are well attended, mostly by faculty in the humanities; CoLA underscores that these should continue in their present form as they serve an important function. We recommend that we leverage this model and partner with the FCHI to create an additional university wide annual dinner (during the semester that the FCHI dinner does not convene), using the model that the FCHI has developed of selecting a broad topic, inviting specific faculty to lead table discussion, and solicit participants across the university. Given the recurring theme of defining the liberal arts, we suggest that the first such dinner be organized around this topic. We further recommend that follow-up activities to this dinner be coordinated, perhaps through blogs about the dinners, or through "continuing the conversation" coffee hours (see below).

6.1.2.1.2. Develop a dynamic interactive network model of faculty interests. Emory has expertise in mining big data and we should put this to use in developing interactive network maps based on existing web pages and research profiles across the university. This would allow us to "map" areas of concentration and help target areas where we can facilitate building relationships across the university. We note that this recommendation is related to our later recommendation concerning developing mentor-matching systems, but this recommendation is largely about mapping areas of interest and providing a visual representation of areas of high impact across the university. This would allow us to better

target the development of faculty groups around common interests by discovering areas of high concentration.

6.1.2.1.3. **“Continue the conversation” coffee hours.** To facilitate ongoing discussions among faculty, students, and staff about university events and/or university dinners, etc., we recommend partnering with existing programs in CFDE, Campus Life and other engaged centers and programs, to publicize and pay for coffee hours organized by faculty and students. The specific parameters of who is eligible, how many people must attend, etc. must be worked out, but this should remain a relatively simple idea, that provides a few dollars for coffee, and is simple to apply for.

6.1.3. **Create a culture of celebration.** Emory faculty and students are highly accomplished and achieve significant honors on a regular basis. Yet there is little university wide acknowledgement or celebration of these accomplishments. CoLA recommends that we develop more proactive celebrations of ourselves! Specifically, we recommend that the university build on and expand the “Feast of Words” celebration that focuses on faculty who have published books during the past academic year. We envision a two day festival, that incorporates the Feast of Words, includes additional sessions more focused on achievements in science publishing, in performance, in teaching, and in public scholarship. We believe this festival should take place in multiple, highly visible locations around campus, and all classes and other university events should be suspended during this two day festival. The festival should include a large dinner, during which a number of faculty and students are publically recognized for significant achievements. Alumni and Board of Trustee members should be included in the festival activities, and especially the dinner.

6.1.4. **Create better university communication.** All of these recommendations rely on better communication about Emory events, both before and after they occur. Currently, there are multiple web pages, printed reports, email announcements, etc. There needs to be better coordination of information, and there needs to be better targeting of that information so that the appropriate people get the information they are looking for. There also needs to be better coordinated communication following major events that facilitate ongoing discussions among faculty and students. This will require some strategic thinking about how to streamline communication, and how to communicate it more effectively.

6.1.5. Specific action steps

6.1.5.1. **Constitute a “Life of the Mind” Steering Committee** to develop the specific details of selecting a major university event and creating orbit events. Once the major event is selected, the committee should identify faculty and student leaders who can organize specific orbit events and should work with department chairs, program directors and deans to solicit their support. In

addition to planned events, the committee should oversee more spontaneous orbit events, including “continuing the conversation” coffee hours, and faculty and student initiated related events. The committee should work closely with Campus Life to make sure that at least some of these events are conducted in residence halls. The committee should also develop guidelines to organize an online presence for the event and orbit events, including twitter discussions and blogs.

6.1.5.2. **Develop network maps.** Work with the Institute for Quantitative Theory and Method to develop a network map of Emory University web pages, perhaps focusing on research web pages. Use this network map as a visual guide to focusing on developing groups of faculty with common interests.

6.1.5.3. **Appoint an “intellectual coordinator.”** Building intellectual community takes targeted strategic interventions and resources. CoLA recommends that Emory appoint an “intellectual coordinator” whose primary responsibilities would be to sift through planned events and figure out connections and create more targeted invitations to related constituencies. This person would work with the Associate Vice Provost for Academic Innovation, and help coordinate multiple aspects of building intellectual community. This would include: 1) streamlining the presentation of upcoming events; developing a more compelling and user-friendly university calendar; 2) targeting invitations to upcoming events to appropriate faculty and students; 3) organizing an annual faculty dinner modeled on the FCHI dinners; 4) soliciting, organizing and coordinating spontaneous orbit activities around the selected university event; 5) coordinating and overseeing online discussions of university events, including blogging; 6) organizing the Celebration of Emory festival.

6.1.5.4. **Timeline, evaluations and assessment.** As with all our recommendations, CoLA advises that procedure be put in place to develop specific timelines and metrics for annual evaluation of these activities. The “Life of the Mind” steering committee should develop these metrics as it develops programming.

6.2. **Recommendation 2: Create integrated cross-unit courses:** Faculty and students are excited about teaching and learning opportunities that cross units in innovative ways. Existing programs through the Center for Faculty Development and Excellence (University Courses, Academic Learning Communities), the Piedmont Project, the Center for Science Education and the Global Health Initiative are already offering some academic courses in which faculty and students from across the university come together around a scholarly or community issue. Some of these programs include an experiential learning component, and the Center for Community Partnerships also offers many opportunities for students to engage with the community. CoLA applauds all of these initiatives and encourages their continuation. The best possible liberal arts experience provides multiple opportunities to fit different faculty and student needs.

CoLA further recommends the creation of a fundamentally new kind of cross-unit course initiative that builds on existing programs. We envision a “synthesis seminar” that crosses units, student populations, scholarly inquiry and experiential learning, in ways that will allow the flexible creation of faculty and student learning communities. More specifically, we envision:

- 6.2.1. **Participants.** A seminar that includes a minimum of two faculty from different units across the university, at least two graduate or professional students, and undergraduate students, who form around a specific scholarly issue.
- 6.2.2. **Course development.** Synthesis seminars will be communal learning courses. One possibility is that syllabi and reading lists would be guided by faculty, but developed among all the seminar participants. This development period could be the initial part of the seminar, in which case faculty and student seminar members will receive credit for the period of communal seminar development.
- 6.2.3. **Assigning credit hours.** Synthesis seminars can be for variable credit and variable time. That is, synthesis seminars can be conventionally one semester, or can be a full academic year, or can include an academic semester and a summer internship component, or a series of intensive workshops across a period of time, etc. Credit hours for each student will be determined by the number of hours of class meeting time in combination with out of classroom experiences time. Possibly, different students could enroll for different numbers of credits in contract with the faculty. The idea here is that the synthesis seminar participants will gather as a group and decide how the seminar should be structured and the number of credits that each student will receive for the work committed to. Individual student contracts will be developed so that all seminar members are fully aware of expectations of each member.
- 6.2.4. **Integrating scholarship and experiential learning.** Each synthesis seminar will focus on delving into a specific scholarly issue, and will also include an experiential component for each student related to that issue. We emphasize that we view experiential learning in the broadest possible way to include many forms of active student engagement with the material. This might involve creating an art project or a work of fiction, hands-on experience in a research lab, archival research in the library, or a community-based internship, to name a few. These experiential components can be tailored to individuals or groups. Students in the same synthesis seminar might choose very different experiential component (e.g., writing and performing a play, working with health access teams to deliver health care to migrant farm workers, working in a wet lab, writing a thesis, etc.), but the experiential component must enhance the scholarly component in a significant way. Students can work in teams to create their experiential component if they wish. Experiential components to the synthesis seminar, and final products/ projects, must be discussed and agreed upon in advance during the period of seminar development. Again, depending on the experiential component, students could receive differing credits for this part of the seminar.

6.2.5. **Goals.** The synthesis seminar is designed to provide the maximal amount of flexibility for faculty and students across the university to come together over a shared scholarly issue and to create an academic learning community to explore that issue both inside and outside the classroom. By including all members of the seminar in the development phase, the seminar will provide an environment that facilitates an understanding both of the content of the seminar, and also how questions are formulated and asked in ways that frame learning. Further, by integrating an experiential component designed by each student, students will gain a better understanding of how what they learn in the classroom is linked to what they do outside the classroom. By allowing maximum flexibility for the seminar participants to decide on the time, the credits received for work done, and the integration of scholarship and experiential learning, students will become active participants in their educational journey.

6.2.6. Specific action steps

6.2.6.1. **Create a synthesis seminar steering committee.** Constitute a committee of faculty and students to develop the idea of a synthesis seminar. Develop guidelines for how these seminars will be resourced. Examine how to create the infrastructure for this course, including faculty teaching credit, curriculum approval, registrar issues especially for flexible time and credit enrollment, etc. This should be coordinated with CFDE, perhaps through the existing University Courses procedures.

6.2.6.2. **Develop a call for proposals** that describes the objectives and possible organizational structures for synthesis seminars. The proposal should be explicit about wanting to think “outside the box” to allow maximal flexibility in how faculty and students participate in this kind of learning community. The proposal must include guidelines for assessment of the seminar both while it is ongoing and once it is completed. Learning outcomes and ways to assess these outcomes must be specified.

6.2.6.3. **Pilot** at least two synthesis seminars. Develop and implement evaluations and assessment metrics for these pilot seminars, working closely with the CFDE.

6.2.6.4. **Timeline, evaluations and assessment.** The steering committee should develop metrics for the evaluation of courses, and across courses, metrics should be developed to evaluate the impact of these courses more widely.

6.3. Recommendation 3: Expand and coordinate student mentee-mentoring opportunities and faulty training in mentorship. Throughout the CoLA discussions, faculty and students consistently mention mentoring as an import part of university life. It is also the case that Emory already engages in multiple mentoring programs, aimed at

mentoring different constituencies (undergraduate students, graduate students, young faculty). The issue of what aspects of mentoring are more effective when specific to a discipline and what aspects of mentoring may be more effective when crossing traditional lines remains undetermined, but it is unlikely that centralized mentoring programs are adequate; students and faculty want to mentor and be mentored by individuals knowledgeable about the specifics of their discipline. At the same time, there does seem to be an economy of scale issue; some aspects of mentoring may benefit from a more centralized approach.

Thus CoLA recommends *a coordination of ongoing mentoring programs at Emory*. A coordinated mentoring program could provide structure and guidance to specific mentoring programs across the university. CoLA further recommends that Emory adopt best practices for mentoring that includes a life-long learning program for mentorship based on the Karate belt achievement system. This system begins with students learning to be proactive in seeking mentors, and building skills to become mentors themselves. In addition, Emory should provide a more interactive web-based interface for matching mentors and mentees.

- 6.3.1. **Undergraduate students** would begin with education and practice that would start them on a journey from innocence to mastery. It would begin with achieving a “White Belt” as an expert mentee where they learn how to choose a mentor, communicate expectations and set goals. Undergraduates would be able to achieve a “Yellow Belt” as they transform from a pure novice to developing a basic understanding of the skills required to provide peer-to-peer mentorship. The white and yellow mentee- peer-mentor belts are the basic principal building blocks (good decision making, setting and meeting expectations, documentation, communication, time management, interpersonal skills including compassion, , ethics and critical thinking and how to take advice and critique) and all other methods learned in higher belts are built upon these basic skills.
- 6.3.2. **Graduate and Post-doctoral fellows** would participate in this life long learning program for mentorship by progressing through orange belt training that would teach beginning mentorship skills including advising and mentorship by example of undergraduate students, as well as interpersonal skills of supportive critique and encouragement. At the purple belt level the student will have advanced from the beginner level to the intermediate level. At this level the student should be a proficient and successful mentee, an expert peer-to-peer mentor, and a beginning mentor of graduate students. Orange and purple belt skills increase understanding of the components of mentee/mentorship including advising, counseling, coaching and mentoring.
- 6.3.3. **Junior faculty** would progress from green belt, where life long learners become humbled by the challenges, responsibilities and tremendous opportunities of tenure or other faculty career trajectory. They are trained to renew and revise their mentee training and their mentorship of undergraduate and graduate students. Dedicated as training as a mentee and mentor becomes harder and more intense at this level. As

junior faculty progress from assistant to associate professor they also should move from a green to a brown belt. At the brown belt level a life long mentorship learner learns to balance independence with select menteeship and to advance their level of student and assistant professor mentorship and peer-to-peer mentorship of other associate professors. Evaluation of mentorship activities increases and critical evaluation, taught at all levels becomes more intense.

6.3.4. Senior and emeriti faculty progress through the terminal levels of mentorship achievement. At the red belt level, they are nearing mastery. Life long learners will have achieved skills that foster both practical and creative mentorship skills. Confidence is the exemplar of skills that allow red belts to identify their life long mentee needs and foster appropriate mentorship relationships to meet those needs. At this level faculty actively advise, counsel and coach mentees as well as seek opportunities to reward and promote mentees. At the black belt level of mentorship, the faculty have reached the summit of achievement in mentorship. As in karate, those at the black belt of mentorship, “work years to accomplish the mastery of a black belt. While the black belt is a symbol of great achievement, the belt itself is not the ultimate goal. The real reward is in the new self-awareness this belt represents.” (<http://www.sandovalkarate.net/how-does-the-belt-system-in-karate-work/#ixzz34dC77bN5>)

6.3.5. Leverage the Emory Atlanta Clinical & Translational Science Institute (ACTSI) infrastructure example to develop an Emory University Interactive Resource Tool (IRT), a new web-based application used for research resource discovery which will offer Emory current and potential students, post-doctoral fellow and junior faculty a unique searchable resource to find faculty whose research matches their interests. Such a service has additional benefits of a novel resource to allow senior faculty to easily find new collaborators. This resource would also allow Emory centers and cores a platform to advertise their services, and students and investigators a means to locate services for their use in research.

6.3.6. Specific Action Steps:

6.3.6.1. Mentoring across the university coordinating committee. Constitute a coordinating committee of all current faculty and administrators who oversee mentoring programs, based on the inventory already collated by CoLA (see website), and continue to iteratively refine this inventory. The coordinating committee should discuss assessment and evaluation metrics for mentoring programs.

6.3.6.2. Developing best practices. The coordinating committee will be responsible for developing best practices and guidelines for mentoring and for the evaluation of mentoring across programs, although individual units will continue to develop and run their own mentoring programs. Thus we envision a hybrid model, where aspects of mentoring that crosses disciplines can be coordinated while maintaining discipline specific mentoring.

6.3.6.3. **Create a matching system.** Work with information technology experts to create a dynamic web-based inventory of faculty research areas and mentor-mentee matching pools, using ACTSI as a model:

http://ebirt.emory.edu/#q=%3A*

6.3.6.4. **Develop a program for freshman.** Develop a program to be instituted with Residence Life during the fall semester of the freshman year for undergraduates that will help students in selecting and maintaining appropriate mentoring relationships.

6.3.6.5. **Timeline, evaluation and assessment.** Again, we underscore the need for the steering committee to set clear timelines and metrics for evaluation of all mentorship programs.

7. Long-term recommendations

Conversations across the year were exciting, chaotic, and energetic. Faculty, students and staff expressed commitment and motivation for change, and many ideas were pondered. The three specific CoLA recommendations emerged as the most consistent and most concrete first steps, but several long term strategic initiatives were voiced. Here we present the 5 initiatives that emerged from these discussions. We note that many of these are interrelated, and all require a great deal more thought and precision.

7.1. **Align faculty evaluation with university priorities.** A resonating theme throughout our year of conversations was faculty expressing high interest in developing innovative teaching and intellectual communities, while simultaneously expressing concern that these activities are not “valued.” This theme was echoed in conversations, committee meetings and in the survey results. The survey results were particularly informative in showing that faculty across the university perceived that innovation was underappreciated, and faculty feel overwhelmed with trying to “do it all.” In particular, faculty perception is that promotion and tenure, as well as annual evaluations and raises, are heavily weighted towards research productivity with little serious attention to teaching, institution-building, and public scholarship. Obviously, although this perception is pervasive, it may not accurately reflect practice, and/or it may reflect practice in some departments and units more than in others. It is beyond the scope of CoLA to address this issue. However, *CoLA recommends creating a university wide conversation to clarify and emphasize the significance and evaluation of faculty activities critical to building intellectual community*, including annual faculty evaluations and tenure and promotion processes that genuinely value intellectual engagement with the Emory community, mentoring and institution building. CoLA suggests that these conversations can begin within tenure and promotions committees, the Council of Deans, and chairs and directors of departments and programs.

- 7.2. **Rethinking “teaching credit.”** In most units within the university, teaching load is determined by number of courses (or number of lectures) taught rather than number of credits or contact hours. In this model, courses that confer variable credits (e.g., lecture courses versus laboratory courses, or writing intensive courses) each still count as one course taught towards the required teaching load. In addition, directing research and/or honors students is considered as “counting” toward teaching load in some departments and units and not in others. ***CoLA recommends re-visiting how teaching is defined and how teaching credit is allocated.*** Issues to consider in thinking about allocating teaching credit include number of contact hours, number of students, number of intensive grading hours involved (e.g., multiple writing drafts), among others. Metrics and guidelines should be developed and teaching load should be determined as fulfilling a certain number of teaching “credits”.
- 7.3. **Rethinking the academic calendar.** Within most units of the university, courses are of a set length, usually one semester. Within each unit, there are courses that may be of variable credit, and a few courses that are of variable length. ***CoLA recommends re-thinking the academic calendar to allow greater flexibility in course scheduling.*** Courses could be developed that are intensive weekend workshops, and perhaps are 1 or 2 credits; or a 6-week course (half semester), or a year long course. This idea is obviously related to rethinking teaching credit; if we can open up possibilities for faculty to develop courses of different lengths, contact hours and credits, and have a metric for defining teaching credits based on these instead of “courses,” we would allow maximal flexibility for creative curricular innovations.
- 7.4. **Allow individual faculty to create multi-year plans.** Faculty lives are long and complex, and faculty appointments differ in their emphasis on teaching, research and/or institution-building. Current evaluation metrics often overlook the complementarity of different faculty cohorts such as TTF and LTF, or trajectories across a career. ***CoLA recommends opening up the possibility that faculty pursue individual trajectories, such that at certain points in their career they may be more or less focused on different aspects of the university mission.*** Faculty could develop a personalized plan with their chair that would map out a 3 to 5 year plan for meeting their own and the institutions’ goals. The assumption would be that, over time, faculty would engage in all ways that are appropriate to their appointment, but that they could vary, at least to some extent, their commitment to various components across multi-year plans. For example, a faculty member could choose to do a great deal of teaching one year in order to free up time the following year to finish a book; or a faculty member could choose to be evaluated for a year or two based more on their contributions to institution-building, while engaging less in teaching. We emphasize that across a multi-year plan, faculty must commit to meet all expectations appropriate to their appointment, and for many faculty, the easiest way to accomplish this would be to continue to do this every year, but this would allow more flexibility for individual faculty, and would simultaneously provide an explicit indication that all missions of the university are equally valued. These conversations can be integrated with conversations about faculty evaluations discussed above.

- 7.5. **Emory needs to “tell our story.”** As we noted at the beginning of this report, a recurring theme of the CoLA discussions was that while there is strong commitment to Emory as a residential liberal arts research university, exactly what this identity means is less clear, both for those at Emory and beyond the university. This theme was evident in calls for better definitions and clarity regarding what a liberal arts education means in the context of a Research 1 university, as well as comments about Emory’s lack of a coherent identity or commitment to a set of strategic goals. In order to help clarify Emory’s identity and strategic vision, *CoLA recommends that Emory develops and implements an Emory “Story Corps.”* Stories are fundamentally the way we understand human experience, and by analogy, human institutions. Stories connect people to people, and people to places, both critically important elements of defining an institution. The idea of an “*Emory Story Corps*” emerges from multiple ongoing initiatives at Emory, including The Voices of the Liberal Arts project through Communications (Jan Gleason), Telling our Stories through Imaging America whose annual meeting Emory is hosting in October 2014 (Violla Hartfield-Mendez), and the Teagle Foundation project on collecting Emory alumni stories (Brent Gadsden), among others. CoLA envisions a pilot project across campus, in which students and faculty would engage in story-telling focused on their experiences at Emory and/or their professional lives. We note that such a project would create a shared personal and intellectual experience for the university, a year of “telling our stories” in order to better “tell our story,” followed by the creation of an ongoing archive.

8. Conclusions and overarching themes

Emory is a distinguished university with dedicated and committed faculty, students and staff. Over the past decades, we have emerged as a leader as a residential liberal arts research one university, but this transition has not always been smooth. Faculty, students and staff are excited to be part of innovative change, but, at the same time, wary of the plethora of events, programs, centers and initiatives. Emory needs to develop a clear identity and set strategic priorities. This will allow Emory to better align its mission with resource allocation and evaluation. Two major commitments are needed to accomplish this vision:

- 8.1. To build intellectual community, we must prioritize and value those activities that create spaces for intellectual engagement across units and across students and faculty. This will necessitate clear communication of Emory’s mission and values and aligning assessment and evaluation of faculty, staff, students and programs with these values.
- 8.2. We must work to create more dynamic and flexible structures that unleash the creative potential of our faculty and students. This will necessitate revamping the infrastructure to allow more permeability across schools and units, and rethinking allocations and evaluation of teaching credit and courses.