



**University Faculty Council
February 19, 2019
3:15-5:00 pm
Jones Room, Woodruff Library**

Attended: Christa Acampora, Henry Bayerle, Amy Chen, Kevin Crowley, Margaret Fleming, Octavian Ioachimescu, Laura Kimble, Ulemu Luhanga, Giacomo Negro, Rafael Pardo, Nicole Powell, Astrid Prinz, Ani Satz, Jason Schneider, Juliette Stapanian Apkarian, Aryeh Stein, Leslie Taylor

Excused Absences: None

Unexcused Absences: Douglas Ander, Carla Berg, Andreas Fritz, Sandra Garraway, Adam Glynn, Dilek Huseyinzadegan, Peng Jin, Matthew Klopman, Marilynne McKay, Kendall Soulen

Ex-Officio Administration Absences: Timothy Holbrook, Dwight McBride, Claire Sterk

Ex-Officio Absences: None

Guests/Correspondents/Recorders: Kimber Williams

I. University Faculty Council Meeting Called to Order at 3:20pm

Quorum was not achieved for the meeting.



Faculty Counselor
Report (Campus Life C

- II. Report from Campus Life Committee (Leslie Taylor)**
- a. A new VP for Campus Life, Enku Gelaye, will begin in August.
 - b. The new Student Center will open during Commencement weekend.

- c. Questions posed by members:
 - i. What is the rationale behind the increased interface between faculty engagement and campus life?
 1. Interviews were conducted with campus life staff and faculty to find areas for improvement or partnership.
 2. The Emory Undergraduate Project (Emory UP) is intended to be one possible avenue for more regular interface between faculty, campus life, and students.
 3. Looking into increasing the number of faculty involved in the faculty in residence program on campus.

III. Presentation from Christa Acampora, Deputy Provost for Academic Affairs

- a. Deputy Provost Acampora has been focusing on increasing shared governance regarding academic matters at the university level. There is currently no participation from faculty at the university level and this leads to redundancy and reinforces silos between units.
- b. A current project is to develop an Academic Review Committee (ARC) that would work with units across Emory and be responsible for reviewing proposals to create new majors, departments, or schools
 - i. An ARC could help with increasing transparency for the decision processes and help streamline the process
- c. Questions
 - i. How much does this relate to the TPAC (Tenure and Promotion)?
 1. These are separate committees.
 - ii. What process will be utilized to determine agenda items? What will be the purview?
 1. Currently, there is no formal process, allowing broader participation, for finalizing matters at the level of the university.
 2. The goal is to provide clear and specific channels for finalizing and implementing new university structures, degree programs, curricula, certificates, and related entities. The work of this committee will in no way encroach upon or substitute for the prerogative and responsibilities of the Board of Trustees or school-level review committees

- iii. What are the criteria for programs under review of this committee?
 - 1. Currently a process (substantive change committee-- term from accreditor); doesn't always meet as a group and currently doesn't necessarily include faculty; for example, a proposal for an online-only program would meet the requirements of this committee.
- iv. Would the ARC be involved with program closures?
 - 1. Yes, it would be involved with program closures. A program closure is a serious matter that requires thoughtful deliberation.
- v. Describe the composition of the committee
 - 1. Emory is big and decisions impact broadly. The goal is to have all stakeholders represented on the committee.
- vi. Will the committee create unnecessary administrative burden? Where are expected agenda items currently addressed?
 - 1. Here is an example: Economics wanted to change its registered CIP code. A CIP code refers to the Classification of Instructional Programs maintained by the federal government. CIP codes are used to track a variety of activities, and some—those connected with STEM disciplines—allow graduating international students to apply for certain kinds of visas and extensions. CIP code changes are examples of the kinds of items for review that would fall under the purview of the ARC.
 - 2. Huge need to improve speed of process for decisions related to academics on campus—this will require dedicated staff—this is a core service the university should provide. When a matter works its way through our existing school processes to the central administration, there needs to be a clear and specific pathway to finalization. Good academic planning depends on just that.
- vii. The committee will be responsible for programs wanting to “bubble up”—any thoughts on top-down initiatives from university administration?
 - 1. The vision of the committee is to improve these types of initiatives and avoid duplication by other units. The

ARC is not a generative group. It facilitates the work that rises up from the departments and school committees.

- viii. Will the Substantive Change committee go away (adding layers)? How will we know when there is a duplication of effort?
 - 1. Substantive Change committee will be absorbed as a subcommittee until it is determined if there is a significant function that remains to be filled.
- ix. There is currently a student-led push for a Latinx studies department. Administration noted that faculty was needed to staff the department. The current Latinx cluster hire doesn't do this. Would this proposed committee address this issue?
 - 1. A proposal to create a department needs a larger home. This committee would not generate but review proposals already vetted at the level of the academic unit.
- x. How often would the committee meet?
 - 1. At least monthly
 - 2. The goal is to meet twice this academic year
- xi. This seems like a significant mandate for a small committee.
 - 1. The Office of the Provost will provide significant review prior to adding an item to the agenda of the committee. The benefit of having a body with institutional knowledge about decision-making is that it will develop expertise over time, and it will be worth this investment of time and energy. It will be a great deal of work initially, but we will realize efficiency over time.
 - 2. These decisions are already being made, but without the benefit of the deliberative input of a larger engaged community. This is not the best approach.
- xii. At Oxford, the process in Atlanta is totally reactive for some faculty. There is currently no transparency in the process. This committee would allow faculty to be involved in decisions affecting them.
 - 1. Yes, being able to apprise and collaborate with departments at Oxford would be a key example of the ARC's function.

- xiii. What about bringing the work of the committee to this body since it already includes faculty from across campus?
 - 1. This is a good idea, but could take up the whole UFC agenda—every single meeting.
 - 2. We want to integrate the Faculty Council as much as possible, which is why I sought the advice of Jason and asked to connect not only with the body but also with any relevant committee of the Council. I will accept your invitation at any point, and I very much hope that you will nominate faculty to serve.
- xiv. How will members be appointed?
 - 1. A call will go out from the Faculty Council executive committee and to at-large faculty members.
 - 2. We would prioritize faculty with prior experience serving on curriculum committees for academic units.

IV. Proposal to amend the document governing the Faculty Hearing Committee (Aryeh Stein)



FHC w Proposed Updates.pdf

- a. The proposal is located here:
- b. Proposal to amend “paragraph 2” to “paragraph 2.a.7” or “2.b”
- c. Feedback
 - i. What does “procedural” mean?
 - 1. Where meetings are held, who is responsible for hiring the stenographer, process for making witnesses appear and not interact with one another
 - ii. Why is there a requirement to retain records for 6 years?
 - 1. Advice from university counsel; maybe to do with statute of limitations for litigation is 6 years
 - iii. Maybe “procedural” should be “logistical” instead
 - 1. The choice of wording has to do with how law works—not like in a court
 - 2. More than administration
 - iv. Does the wording make clear to a petitioner that their rights are being protected by this committee? The interface with administration could be worrying. Should the committee only be seeking information from administration, not support?

1. Has to do with the purpose of the committee; a body to appeal/air concerns
2. Need to let petitioners know that there will be discussion with University to get access to information and support.
3. The committee cannot function well without logistical support from the administration.

V. Executive Session

- a. During the executive session, the UFC discussed using Zoom at future meetings, getting a substantive update on *Toward Faculty Eminence* (formerly known as Class and Labor 2), and expressed concerns about McKinsey and the recent Organizational Health Survey.