

Faculty Council Meeting Minutes
September 20, 2016
3:15 – 5:00 PM
Winship Ballroom, DUC
Approved October 18, 2016

Attended: Angela Amar, Juliette Stapanian Apkarian, Kimberly Jacob Arriola, Carla Berg, Deborah Bruner, Tamara Caspary, Elizabeth Corrie, Carrie Cwiak, Erica Duncan, Noel Erskine, Cam Escofferry, Sheryl Heron, James Hughes, Matthew Klopman, Anna Leo, David Lynn, Kristy Martyn, Judy Raggi Moore, Mimi Newell, Karen Scheib, Jason Schneider, Pamela Scully, Claire Sterk, Patrick Sullivan, Anand Swaminathan, Kristin Wendland, Cynthia Wetmore, Kimber Williams, Holly York, Lynn Zimmerman, Stuart Zola, Adriane Ivey (for Nichole Powell)

Visitors: RAS Task Force members (Andrew Jenkins, Elizabeth A. Krupinski, Stefan Lutz, Stephen Price, Donald Rainnie, Harold Spencer); Lynne Huffer

Excused Absences: Abdullahi An-Naim, Jaffar Khan, Astrid Prinz, Frank Wong, Christine Dunham, Jim Nagy

Unexcused Absences: Jason Hockenberry, Karen Stolley, Peter Topping

- I. **Call to Order, Welcome and Orientation.** Faculty Council Chair Kristin Wendland called the meeting to order at 3:17 PM. After welcoming everyone, she introduced the new members of the council. Wendland's orientation talk included the topics listed below:
 - a. New University Faculty Council (UFC) website
 - b. Transition from Blackboard to Emory Box as the file repository for UFC
 - d. Purpose of the UFC advisory body
 - e. UFC organizational chart
 - f. Full member roster of UFC
 - g. Attendance policy and need to let Graduate Administration Assistant Emrah Simsek know regarding absences
 - h. Main goals as the chair of UFC this year: i) Strengthening the communication, ii) Engaging more faculty members in shared governance
- II. **Approval of Minutes from April 2015.** Kristin Wendland said that the minutes were not available at this time.
- III. **Approval of Faculty Council Roster.** Approved with no opposition.

Approval of Faculty Council Committee Rosters. Eventually approved with no opposition. Before approval, Karen Scheib asked if the ones posted were all the standing committees. She further asked if Learning Outcomes was a standing committee. Wendland answered “Yes.”

- IV. **Faculty-Peer Mediation Committee (FPMC) Update.** Kristin Wendland mentioned that the committee was formed in 2013. She summarized the current situation: Provost office had provided financial support; this support will not be ongoing; and the chair of the committee, Edmund Becker, resigned on August 31. President Sterk wanted to clarify why funding would not be ongoing, due to lack of mediation cases. Kristin Wendland added that there were no “real action” mediations going through last year according to the committee report. Wendland described the next steps to try to move the mission of the Committee forward. After meeting with mediators and mediation ambassadors who had participated in training workshops this past year, it seemed the best next step was to give the Committee a hiatus and to form a task force to reassess the program in light of the strong infrastructure put in place this past year to facilitate mediation and conflict resolution. She had already engaged with prospective members who have already committed to serve in the committee.

Kristin Wendland suggested that members raise a motion for the UFC to form a Mediation and Conflict Resolution Task Force to assess what was learned from the goals set forth by the FPMC, assess what structure and procedures need to be in place to continue its mission, ascertain how outcomes can be assessed and measured, and report back to the UFC at its Jan 17, 2017 meeting with recommendations. Karen Scheib and Pamela Scully supported the need for such a task force. Yet, Pamela Scully also raised her objection about its necessity given no demands for mediation.

Carla Berg asked what started the conversation regarding such a need last year, and Wendland replied that the need for faculty mediation outside of the Faculty Hearing Committee has been coming up over and over for quite a few years. Becker’s report details the history. Karen Scheib raised the motion; Henry Bayerle seconded. Deborah Bruner amended the motion, raising the question about what would happen without any real data. Her friendly amendment added a point about “assessment of the need,” which was approved. Kristy Martyn asked if that is a need for mediation or need for coaching. She described how, in her experience, in Nursing (School) they have prevented such a need for mediation by coaching. She further asked, what is the need, and what should be the solutions? The amended motion,

including the point on assessing the need by obtaining real data, was voted on. The motion passed with no opposition.

- V. **RAS Taskforce Report, with members** Tamara Caspary, Deborah Watkins Bruner, Andrew Jenkins, Elizabeth A. Krupinski, Stefan Lutz, Stephen Price (Russ), Donald Rainnie (Tig), Harold Spencer (Trent). **RAS Taskforce Report.** Tamara Caspary was charged to gather RAS independent data last year. The Task force's main finding was high variability in satisfaction in different RAS units. Tamara C. introduced all the members on the Task Force representing distinct units. She said that RAS is an umbrella office with 9 units. In the RAS structure, each unit has a director who reports to the director of RAS central, who, in turn, reports to the Vice President for Research Administration. Tamara C introduced "Why we have RAS," saying that previously administrative support was within departments which caused extremely high variability in service leading to deficits covered by the University. Emory hired Price Waterhouse Cooper to further Emory's Business Practice Improvement initiatives. The first RAS unit was the Cancer and Imaging RAS, established in 2013. Tamara C. encouraged members to read the report, highlighted 6 major lessons from the report including the observation that "many faculty received support and deeply appreciated the support they received." Tamara C. noted several shortcomings of the system and highlighted the junior faculty's needs. Tamara C. stated that the task force was struck that there remains such variability in service around the University given that this was one of the major reasons for developing and adopting the RAS system. She also said that one of the initial goals of RAS has yet to be realized: Saving money. She concluded with the seven (7) broad recommendations that the RAS task force proposes:

1. Honor dual reporting lines from RAS director to Dept./school and to RAS Central with representatives of each school
2. Develop independent methods for RAS evaluation
3. Increase faculty representation on the Office of Research Administration Strategic Advisory Board and other committees that oversee RAS
4. Provide faculty with accurate financial reports on a consistently recurring basis
5. Ensure RAS unit staffing levels align with their workload
6. Encourage RAS staff to use critical/strategic thinking and problem solving beyond SOPs (Standard Operating Procedures) when supporting faculty.
7. Promote relationships and exchange of information that emphasize the necessary and interdependent relationship between RAS units, faculty, department and school administrators, and other Research Administrative Units.

Then, Tamara C. called on the members of UFC for two votes:

- 1) that the UFC endorse the RAS Task Force report
- 2) that the Task Force continue its work this fall to facilitate the implementation of the report's recommendations, and to explore whether such on-going implementation could be absorbed into the work of the UFC by expanding a current standing committee's mission.

Discussion & Recommendation before voting:

Erica Duncan: Are different RAS units physically (location-wise) under the same roof?

Tamara C: They are working in their own autonomous spaces in 9 locations, one per RAS.

Erica Duncan: How difficult is it to put a faculty member under the same roof with its own RAS?

Dept of Medicine RAS representative: We have 19 different locations in the city.

Erica Duncan: Do you have a percentage value of how many grants were rejected out of how many?

Tamara C.: No- and did not find grant submission per se to be an issue. Did hear of issues with grants being administratively rejected, but these were rare.

Stefan L: Generally found faculty had far fewer issues on the pre-Award side than the post-Award side of things.

FC member: Isn't it important to obtain data for individual RAS units and not aggregate data?

Tamara C.: Yes, and that is done by the RAS surveys and by us. Same variability was found among all different RAS units.

Jason Schneider: Has David Wynes seen the report and has he responded?

Tamara C. Yes, he has seen it and he has yet to respond.

Jason Schneider: Would it be possible to invite him here to the UFC to respond?

Tamara C. We can speak with UFC leadership about that.

Deb Bruner: Biggest issue here is that we are at a research intensive university and administrative support is so fundamental to this mission yet it is currently suboptimal. Stressed the importance of getting this right quickly because currently system is failing the faculty.

Kristin W: Let us reflect this comment in the minutes and move on regarding the time.

Interim Provost Zola: Previous negotiation had come under a business development idea. Notion was it should be as good as the current process. From the comments you say (high variability) does not sound clear regarding if this is really better than what it was before. You are suggesting to do tweaking to make it better. (I) just wanted add this perspective.

Tamara C. raised motion “UFC endorses RAS task force reports”. Motion passed with no opposition.

Tamara C. raised a second motion for RAS to become a standing committee to have a permanent home.

Pamela Scully: Although I am not opposed, would it not be difficult to do both at a time?

Tamara C.: I think we can handle.

Motion passed with no opposition.

VI. Title IX. Lynell Cadray (Office of Equity and Inclusion) provided an overview of Title IX and Title VII (and the difference between them) in response to questions raised by the Emory College of Arts and Sciences Senate. She introduced the Title IX and Title VII compliance officers from the OEI, Judith Pannell and Maurice Middleton respectively.

The Title IX officer, Judith Pannell, spoke first. She summarized that basically Title IX is a policy about sexual misconduct. Faculty members are asked to make sure that students are directed to the right point in case they are exposed to any sexual harassment. Several mechanisms exist depending on whether the student would like to proceed formally, informally, or ever pursue. Title IX applies specifically to the students. Here essential points include:

Title IX applies to situations in which a student is alleged to have engaged in sexual misconduct. Allegations of sexual misconduct not involving a student, or involving a student acting in an employment capacity, are primarily addressed through the university’s Equal Opportunity and Discriminatory Harassment Policy (Policy 1.3).

Every university employee who is informed about an allegation of sexual misconduct involving any student is required to notify a Title IX Coordinator either directly or through their relevant reporting structure.

University employees who serve in a professional role in which communications are afforded confidential status under the law (e.g., medical providers, therapists, and professional and pastoral counselors) are not bound by this requirement but may, consistent with their ethical and legal obligations, be required to report limited information about incidents without revealing the identities of the individuals involved, to a Title IX Coordinator or Deputy Coordinator.

Complaints under this sexual misconduct policy may be filed: (1) with the University Title IX Coordinator, (2) with the Title IX Coordinator for Students, or (3) with a Deputy Title IX Coordinator.

Faculty members raised substantial concerns around implementation including the issue of the inclusion of faculty as responsible parties; student privacy; and academic freedom.

One UFC member: What about privacy? Let us say a victim comes to me telling the action but not wanting me to talk about it with someone else.

Pamela Scully: What level of details can we have in our reports?

Judith Pannell: Whatever. There is no limit.

Pamela Scully: I think it compromises my relationship with my student, because I have to disclose if they tell me anything.

The Title VII and EO/AA Compliance Officer, spoke second. Maurice Middleton: It was mentioned that Title VII is a policy for faculty, staff and students. It rejects any kind of discrimination, not only sexual harassment. The Equal Opportunity and Discriminatory Harassment Policy (1.3) prohibits harassment and discrimination as it pertains to all faculty, staff and students based on their protected characteristics (i.e., race, color, religion, gender, etc.).

James Hughes raised a question about the academic freedom mentioned. He noted that we also have an open expression policy. It has an exception on harassment (as defined by law). He said that he is told that none of the sexual harassment just mentioned (improper touching, providing massage) fall into the law definition of harassment. He asked how Maurice would reconcile.

Maurice Middleton: It is an opportunity to revisit all other policies potentially related, including Open Expression policy.

Lynne Huffer: Sometimes we have to teach something in the class that may not be liked by some of the students in the classroom. I am worried that I would be attacking those

students with no intention. Does your office have any discussion of this? (This was tabled for the October meeting.)

Due to time limitation, Kristin Wendland tabled this entire discussion for the October meeting and invited the UFC to move on with the next presentation.

VII. An Emory Faculty Club: Michael Kutner and John Bugge. Professor Bugge noted the need for a faculty club at Emory, asserting there are very few places on campus where faculty can meet and get to know each other. Both faculty and administrators need a place on campus to entertain visitors, which is a feature at most top universities in the United States. Professor Kutner summarized past efforts at building support for a faculty facility or club: 1) six “happy hours,” 2) two faculty luncheons, and 3) obtaining the endorsement of the idea of a faculty club from high-level administrators (Deans of Schools and Colleges), and from faculty across the University. He added that these efforts have been funded solely by donations and gifts from those participating.

Kutner moved that “The UFC endorse further exploration of the feasibility of forming an Emory Faculty Club/facility by means of a university-wide faculty club/facility survey.” The motion was seconded by Cam Escoferry.

Discussion of the motion centered on whether any previous such surveys had been conducted (apparently not), and on whether any attempt to found a faculty club could be successful in view of the closing of the Faculty Dining Room in the Dobbs University Center (the latter operated under a very different financial model from the one envisioned, which would depend in fact on the results of the proposed survey). Wendland responded that, if the UFC endorses this motion, it will be up to the Faculty Club proposers to take this into consideration and bring to the Administration. Kutner added that we currently do not have a location for this. Campus Life center would be a nice place to have this.

The motion passed without dissent.

VIII. Remarks from President Claire E. Sterk: President Sterk introduced Interim Provost Zola to the UFC members and kindly requested applause for him. Due to lack of time, she did not make any further comments.

IX. Meeting adjourned at 5:09 pm.