



Emory University Faculty Council Meeting Minutes

January 17, 2023

3:00-5:00 p.m. | Zoom

Attendees: Alicia DeNicola, Grace Goh, Gregory Fenves, Ravi Bellamkonda, Erin Bonning, Richard Castillo, Pearl Dowe, Roberto Franzosi, Jodie Guest, Nitika Gupta, Curtis Henry, Ursula Kelly, Benn Konsynski, Ashima Lal, Michelle Lampl, Ulemu Luhanga, Babak Mahmoudi, Noelle McAfee, Joy McDougall, Carlos Moreno, Edjah Nduom, Modele Ogunniyi, Elena Pesavento, Kamina Pinder, Florian Pohl, Usha Rackliffe, Susan Ray, Reza Saadein, Karen Sedatole, George Shepherd, Aryeh Stein, Phillip Wolff, Kate Yeager, Holly York

Excused Absences: Lanny Liebeskind, Giacomo Negro

Unexcused Absences: Hashem Dezhbakhsh, Octavian Ioachimescu, Jessica Sales, Salmon Shomade, Patrick Sullivan

I. Welcome and Approval of Consent Agenda, *Alicia DeNicola, Faculty Council Chair*

Dr. Jodie Guest moved to approve the consent agenda; Dr. Benn Konsynski seconded the motion. The motion carried.

II. Announcements, *Alicia DeNicola, Faculty Council Chair*

Congratulations to Tavi who accepted a position in Wisconsin; he will remain as the Past Chair of the Faculty Council to assist for the rest of the year. Due to feedback received, the remaining meetings this year will be in person in February and April, and via Zoom in March.

III. Discussion: Logistics of Committees; logistics of minutes and reports; discussion of openings and recruitment, *Alicia DeNicola, Faculty Council Chair*

Committees are required per the bylaws to submit meeting agendas and minutes to the admin assistant for archival. Feedback from last year indicated that the Faculty Council would like fewer presentations and more interactive discussion. Consensus was that there was not enough information ahead of time to formulate relevant questions on the spot and have a discussion. Maybe invited speakers could send out a written report for review a week before the meeting to enable better conversation during the meeting. Recruiting for the Faculty Council has been and continues to be difficult; leadership recognizes that it is up to them to make governance relevant to all constituents. What is the best way to get people to buy into shared governance? Why are people not interested in serving? Is the work no longer relevant? Is it a matter of not having enough exposure? We need to be better at promoting our impact and relevance. Should we bring back Council Concerns Newsletter? Who is going to write it?

Comments and questions from the floor:

- 1) One week is not enough time to review; need both review in advance *and* present in person, which means the format of report should be both written document and slides.
- 2) When I joined the Faculty Council, I thought that I would be able to engage in real change, but it has been disappointing to find out that we just listen to reports all year. There were things I



wanted to talk about like pedagogy and the student experience, but there was no space held for this.

- 3) New faculty nomenclature went through Council of Deans, but the Faculty Council was not consulted. Are there other discussions/issues going on that have not been brought to our attention?
 - a. The process of reviewing titles began 6 years ago as part of the accreditation process. Not sure how the Faculty Council was excluded but many groups representing the different schools were involved. High turnover has affected communication, but we do ask any proposed policy changes to be communicated to the Faculty Council as part of the approval process. We should also improve communication from Deans and Faculty Deans to faculty.

IV. Report on Faculty Input for Research Grant Support, *Alicia DeNicola, Faculty Council Chair*

There has been a lot of interest and collaboration on making sure we have better grant support at Emory. I have learned through talking to many groups, that there is a consensus that schools need different kinds of support. We are currently working on a 3-year pilot project under RAS to fund grant specialist support for Humanities and Social Sciences (ECAS, Oxford, Candler). Not to exclude the other schools, but they have slightly different needs.

V. Discussion: Scholarly outputs directly related to URC funding, *Alicia DeNicola, Faculty Council Chair*

Dr. Phillip Wolff presented on impact survey data collected after the URC award period ends. Faculty obtained \$103M in external grants for less than \$3M invested between 2018-2020. Other scholarly outputs that directly resulted from URC funding are summarized in the table below.

Scholarly Product	Total number (2018-2020)
Artistic Work	14
Award or Recognition	13
Book Other	15
Disclosures or Patents	4
External Funding	64
Keynote Speaker	52
Media Coverage	12
Policy Making	4
Presentation Other	86
Professional Journal	95
Proposals Funded	49
Single Authored Book	19
Workshop or Conference	8
Total Grant Funding	\$103,296,939



Comments and questions from the floor:

- 1) Were the \$103M in grants evenly distributed between the different schools? Since 23 out of 49 are NIH grants, it seems that biological and health science are overrepresented. Humanities outputs are single authored books, and foundation grants.
- 2) This dataset represents a resounding argument for expanding URC funding, given the tremendous ROI. Also there are more good proposals than there is funding for them.
 - a. The Provost responded that we have been putting more resources in focused areas such as AI.Humanities vs. adding to general funding pool such as URC. However, he is always open to discussing options.

VI. Executive Session

VII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:47pm.