

Emory College Faculty Meeting - Wednesday October 31 2012

Minutes of the Meeting

The meeting was called to order by Stefan Lutz, chair of the Governance Committee, at about 4:00 pm. He began by calling for approval of the minutes of the September 19 meeting of the College faculty. There was a motion to approve, which was seconded and affirmed by the faculty. He then called for approval of the minutes of the October 3 meeting. There was a motion to approve, which was seconded and affirmed by the faculty.

President Wagner and Provost Lewis were in attendance. Stefan Lutz introduced the provost and invited him to begin the main business of the meeting -- a presentation by the provost followed by a question and answer period.

Provost Lewis noted that this meeting would mark an end to nine years of participation in College meetings and that he would use the opportunity to reflect on what brought him to Emory, what has been accomplished during his tenure and what, he believes, are the most significant issues facing Emory in the future.

He began with a description of his move from the graduate deanship at the University of Michigan to the provost's office at Emory. He said that his time here has been marked by both accomplishments and profound personal losses. Among the accomplishments, he cited the organization of a modern provost's office, formulation and execution of the university's strategic plan, regularization of faculty review, and appointment of a new decanal lineup. He also included fundraising success, marked by Campaign Emory, appointment of distinguished faculty, acquisition of literary collections and, more generally, realization of potential with accomplishment.

The provost described "the elephant in the room" -- the changing position of higher education in American society. He noted that long before the onset of drastic financial pressures on both public and private universities, rooted in the 2008 recession, earlier recessions had had significant impact on universities. He remarked on the transformation of the University of Michigan from state-funded to state-located to state-harassed.

Emory has done comparatively well in the past but, he stated, we are not insulated from the changing economic circumstances and that significant action is required to support our institution and ensure its future. He briefly described the resource centered management model [RCM] for budgets that is used by Emory University and stated that for six of our nine units, expenses will exceed revenues this year. Budgets

will be balanced through transfers from university resources to the units. Regarding Emory College, \$12.9M will close this year's deficit and central resources will continue to support the College through 2016.

The provost then stated his support for the recent decisions announced by College Dean Robin Forman and Laney Graduate School Dean Lisa Tedesco. He acknowledged the pain of transition caused by the program and department closures but that he wanted to be crystal clear that we are moving forward with the plan and that decisions are final.

Provost Lewis then described several issues the academy will face in the short and long term. He began with the "durability of tenure", observing that since mandatory retirement for faculty was abolished in 1984, long term planning for the faculty has been a vexing institutional problem. He raised several questions he considers of particular importance for Emory College. What is our expectation for composing the tenured faculty -- is raising the unit's profile a necessary condition for hiring? How should the lecture track expand or contract? What is the relative importance of diversity? Relating a question to him from former graduate dean George Jones, the provost asked if it is acceptable that the tenured faculty of the sciences has been home to only two African-Americans? Is diversity the province of some departments and not others? He noted special significance of the last, given the announced closure of Educational Studies, a unit with a strong record of minority students graduation and engagement with Atlanta.

The provost continued with questions about Emory's role in Atlanta's future and the city's need to transform the Auburn Avenue - Peachtree Street intersection to a nexus including Buford Highway. He remarked on coming changes to pedagogy and curriculum in higher education, often fomented by new technologies, and the need for controlled, intelligent experiments. He pointed to the massive open online course [MOOC] as the current emblem of experimentation. Regarding leadership, he asserted that the academy is one place where institutional leadership is considered the dark side and that faculty need to more willingly accept leadership roles. He noted the potential impact of the Commission on the Liberal Arts.

Provost Lewis closed his remarks by urging that, as a community, we own our future and saying that he would like to be remembered as someone who has advanced Emory University. He then opened the floor for questions.

Kevin Corrigan [Institute for Liberal Arts] began by questioning the possibility of real community without dialogue and said that he wished that the ILA had been included in the process of program evaluation by the College and Graduate School. He continued by asking whether the administration had a plan to alleviate the burden of need-blind

admissions on the College budget. The provost responded to the second point by stating that rising financial aid costs are just one aspect of the budgetary problem -- for instance, the Emory Advantage program costs just \$3.3M of the \$84M financial aid total. He said that changes to admissions policies, such as increases in early decision admissions, can lower costs. Additionally, Emory's alums are most unusual in that they have yet to be convinced to give in support of financial aid. Regarding the Institute for Liberal Arts, the provost said that the Commission on the Liberal Arts could well return with recommendations for a new liberal arts structure.

Pat Marsteller [Emory College Center for Science Education] agreed with the provost's emphasis on community engagement, including K-12 education, and the relationship of outreach to diverse roles for faculty. She remarked on the contradiction implicit in the College decision to cut the CSE, a unit which has found external funds to support its activities and has devoted of these funds to programs for students. Provost Lewis cited the growth of new faculty roles, for instance, at the University of Southern California there are senior teaching faculty and tenured master teachers.

Maria Arbatskaya [DGS - Economics Department] said that she hears the calls for faculty involvement in administration and finds them ironic, given that recent decisions in the LGS have skirted the main faculty administrative entities, the Executive Council and the departmental directors of graduate studies. As a consequence of the decision process in the LGS, she has resigned from its Executive Council. The provost concurred that the process in the grad school was wrong but that he agreed with its outcome. He said that, to him, the process was flawed, the outcomes were correct and the important question now is how do we move forward.

Barbara Ladd [English Department and AAUP Emory Chapter President] said that the issues surrounding the program and department closures point to larger problems with faculty governance and relations between the faculty and the administration, and that it is time to revisit governance structures. She said that the decision processes used are troubling. The provost agreed that there is an opportunity for the College to examine governance but that it is up to the College to inspect its own processes. Professor Ladd asked for confirmation that there is an opening for discussions of governance involving the faculty and the Governance Committee. Stefan Lutz responded that the Governance Committee will begin the process of evaluating faculty governance in the College.

Martine Brownley [English Department] noted that 50% of the College Financial Advisory Committee [CFAC] is made up of scientists and that this committee advised on cuts to programs in the social science and humanities. Stefan Lutz responded that there has considerable change of membership on the CFAC and that he would check on its membership over time.

Juliette Stapanian Apkarian [Russian and East Asian Languages and Cultures] expressed frustration regarding the organization of international studies at Emory University. She said that the report of the Global Studies Committee has been met with silence from the College. She asked the provost what he would advise his successor about international studies at Emory. He responded that the answer is simple, that new configurations are required, and concurred that obtaining them continues to be frustrating. He agreed to help transmit the message that international studies requires institution-wide attention to the new provost but that we will continue to be "highly siloed".

Karen Stolley [Chair - Spanish and Portuguese Department] observed that fostering integrated thinking is the responsibility of the central administration and that the RCM budget model does not support the correct view that financial aid is a university issue, not a problem for just Emory College. The provost responded that the subsidies from central resources to the College are recognition of the significance of the financial aid situation. He restated that financial aid is just one aspect of the College budget problems, that there is also the historic problem that the College did not pay for graduate education. He also said that a targeted financial aid campaign is planned. Professor Stolley observed that notions of community and of shared governance seem strained to the faculty in this room and that if there had been a different form of shared communication between administrators and faculty, some of the pain of the last eight weeks may have been softened.

Sharon Strocchia [History Department] said that the possibilities for true partnership between faculty and administration have been undermined by the processes involved in recent decisions. Regarding the decisions made in the LGS, faculty have been cut out of the loop. The LGS Executive Council was not consulted. The process failed the faculty. How will you get people on board regarding faculty governance in future given that, on the graduate side, the faculty was bypassed entirely and, in the College, was run roughshod over? The provost remarked on the difficulties inherent in the Emory College/Laney Graduate School relationship and on the role of faculty in the College process through a committee structure. He asked how we were going to reconcile two schools of thought: do we stand by and reflect on our injury or move forward?

The meeting adjourned spontaneously and by acclamation at about 5:20 pm.