

## **Faculty Senate Meeting**

### **March 20, 2013**

**In attendance:** Paul Anderson, Sarah Bodin, Daniel Bourland, Kevin Cox, Carol Cramer, Mary DeShazer, Jacque Fetrow, Candelas Gala, Michele Gillespie, Michael Green, Laura Graham, Duncan Hite, Michael Hughes, Brad Jones, Kevin Jung, Leslie Kammire, Judy Kem, Rogan Kersh, David Levy, Jack Meredith, James Schirillo, Cathy Seta, Omari Simmons, Susan Smith, Michelle Steward.

#### **Topics:**

- Updates, committee reports and new business
- Provost report – Semester Online and Protection of Minors update.

#### **Updates from President, Dan Bourland:**

Next meeting: Wednesday, April 17, 2013

#### **Committee Reports:**

**Fringe Benefits:** David Levy reported that the fringe benefits committee has not met recently but David received an email regarding unpaid lab work from an employee at Baptist Hospital. In the email, the employee indicated that she was having difficulty with BCBS paying for lab work that was done during a routine physical. It appears that this should be covered and paid for by her insurance. If anyone else is experiencing this type of situation, please email David Levy so the committee can intervene if necessary.

*Comment: At present, billing issues at the hospital are a general topic because of the new computer system. The new computers could be contributing to the billing issue.*

*Comment: A suggestion was made for the employee to contact the service excellence department at the hospital with her billing problem.*

**Resources:** Cathy Seta informed the Senate that the resources committee is looking at faculty leave and development programs across campus. The committee has found lots of diversity in the programs. They recently met with Rebecca Thomas and Kim Wieters. The committee is in the process of compiling a final report.

**Senior University Appointments:** Kevin Jung reported that because the commencement speaker was announced prior to the Senate's approval of the Honorary Degree recipients that it could put the Senate in an embarrassing situation in the event that it disagreed with the nomination. The committee feels like they are just rubber-stamping because the assumption is that the commencement speaker will always be granted an Honorary Degree. On the other side is the difficulty of securing high-profile commencement speakers, often requiring multiple invitations before a speaker is secured. Rogan Kersh proposed that the Chair of the Senior University Appointments committee serve on the Commencement committee. By serving on the committee, the committee would be kept in the loop.

*Comment: When I previously served on the Senior University Appointment committee, the Honorary Degree Recipients were approved prior to the announcement of the commencement speaker.*

*Q: Wasn't there a nominee from the law school?*

*A: Yes, they withdrew for personal reasons.*

*Q: Have we ever granted an Honorary Degree to a Trustee?*

*A: No one knew the answer to this question.*

Kevin brought the nominations below to the faculty senate for a vote. They were unanimously approved.

### **Honorary Degree Nominations**

The Senior University Appointments Committee (SUA) recommends the following individuals (see below) for honorary degrees. These nominations have been received through the Office of the University Registrar, and reviewed by SUA and Senate Executive Committee. SUA recommends these nominations be approved by the Senate.

1. Gwen Ifill (Commencement speaker)

Brief profile: senior correspondent for the PBS NewsHour; the moderator and managing editor of "Washington Week"

Nominator: Nathan Hatch

2. Carolyn Woo (Baccalaureate speaker)

Brief profile: President and CEO of Catholic Relief Services; former dean of Mendoza College of Business, University of Notre Dame

Nominator: Nathan Hatch

3. David Wilkes (School of Medicine hooding speaker)

Brief profile: Executive Associate Dean for Research Affairs at Indiana University SOM

Nominator: Edward Abraham

4. Janet Murguia (Schools of Business hooding speaker)

Brief profile: President and CEO of the National Council of La Raza (NCLR), the largest national Hispanic civil rights advocacy organization in US

Nominator: Steven Reinemund

5. Mike Farrell (posthumous degree)

Brief profile: Trustee; Business School Board of Visitors; key donor to Farrell Hall

Nominator: Melissa Combes

**University Integration:** Michelle Gillespie informed the senate that Carmen Canales approached her counterpart at the medical school about expediting the onboarding process for the Internships to no avail. Michelle is currently working with Beth Hoagland and Anne Boyle on creating a smooth process for the students to be able to obtain the funding for the onboarding process from the Office of the Provost.

*Q: Are the Internship programs being advertised?*

*A: Yes, through Kevin Sullivan at OPCD.*

A new Ad Hoc Staff/Faculty Committee has been formed called Committee on Integration/Collaboration. The committee will investigate current integration and collaboration initiatives, business, and academic practices on both campuses. Below are the members of this new committee.

Graduate Student Association

Tamara Spence

Position

Neuroscience Program, PhD candidate

Staff

Angela Culler

Assistant Vice-President, Human Resources

Mary Cranfill, President, SAC

Exec Dir, Procurement Services, F&AS

Bill Kane

Administrator, Digital Publishing, IS

Jennifer Killingsworth

Manager, General Accounting, F&AS

Faculty

Dan Bourland, President, Senate

Professor of Radiation Oncology

Michele Gillespie, Chair, Univ Integration

Professor of History

Duncan Hite, Senator, Univ Integration

Professor of Medicine

Bruce King (*ex officio*)

Professor of Chemistry & Assoc Provost, Research

**Academic Freedom and Responsibility:** Dan Bourland reported on behalf of Linda McPhail. The committee received a response from the medical school regarding the letter they co-authored about the process for non-reappointment of non-tenured, tenure track faculty. The medical school's response indicated that a policy is currently in place regarding contract termination. Reynolda campus follows AAUP notification requirements and the Senate would like the medical school to consider this process. Three groups will prepare a reply to the medical school's response to the committee.

*Comment: With the new research requirements, to what degree are things staying within legal boundaries.*

**Staff Advisory:** Carol Cramer reported highlights from the last SAC meeting. Toby Hale spoke at that meeting and discussed the opportunity for children of faculty and staff (with enough years of service to the University) to attend summer school with no tuition cost.

**At-large Representative:** Judy Kem reported that the Academic Planning Committee is working on lowering academic requirements. David Coates will present the proposal at April's college faculty meeting. This proposal will require a vote by the college faculty.

### Old Business

**Sexual Harassment Policy:** Mike Green is leading the Executive Committee on responding to a draft Sexual Harassment Policy prepared by University Counsel's office. The committee will reconvene next week in order to complete the response and send it to counsel's office.

### New Business

- Provost's Annual Address  
4:00 p.m., Tuesday, April 2, 2013, Pugh Auditorium, Benson Center
- David Levy is assuming a new position on 6/30 and will be vacating his position as senator.
- Collegiate Senate nominations for 2013-14
- Other group of nominations for Faculty on BOT committees (many do not coincide with senate terms).

Dan asked the senators if they should schedule a senate meeting in May or June? Only seven members raised their hands in support of such meetings.

## **Updates By Rogan Kersh, Provost**

**Lawrence Joel Coliseum:** Rogan asked for feedback about Wake Forest purchasing the Lawrence Joel Veteran Memorial Coliseum.

*Comment: I haven't heard anything about this.*

Rogan explained that WFU and the City of Winston Salem have been discussing the possible sale of the Coliseum and surrounding 33 acres of land for several years. The facility is in need of significant renovations, which the City is unable to make due to budget constraints. Recently the two sides were able to agree on an appealing price (\$8 million), which would make it possible for WFU to purchase the facility. Funding to acquire and make necessary maintenance improvements along with Deaconizing the Coliseum will come entirely from revenues of Wake Forest Athletics. While no decision has been reached, the possibility of an acquisition is far higher than it seemed just weeks ago.

*Q: The article in the paper [Winston-Salem Journal] mentioned that some money would come from student fees. Is that correct?*

*A: No, that is incorrect. The reporter was referring to WSSU's possible purchase of the Bowman Gray Stadium on their campus. Wake Forest Athletics department will handle the entire debt service.*

*Q: Would WFU be scheduling other events at the Coliseum?*

*A: Yes, it will still host community events and be a resource for the larger community.*

*Q: Who is the Coliseum's largest customer?*

*A: Wake Forest University.*

*Q: What is the seating capacity of the WS Coliseum compared to the Greensboro facility?*

*A: WS Coliseum has approximately 14,000-15,000 seats compared to nearly 24,000 in Greensboro.*

*Comment: Forget the building; 33 acres for \$8 million sounds like a good deal. I heard that the city model is losing money when they have an event because they do not receive any revenue from the ticket sales.*

*Q: I am on the Arts Council and they have a committee that seeks out venues for their events. Would WFU consider having other smaller events at the Coliseum?*

*A: Yes, WFU is committed to this facility being a public facility and will continue to make it available to the community.*

*Q: What about the Annex adjoining the Coliseum?*

*A: The proposed purchase of the Coliseum does not include the Annex, though that may be revisited at a later date.*

**Semester Online:** The program continues to develop, with a first draft of the "Master Services Agreement" floated earlier this semester. In response, our WFU working group (informally: Jacque Fetrow, Lynn Sutton, Jennifer Collins, Beth Hoagland and Rogan Kersh, with substantial technical help from Brenda Knox, Rick Matthews, and others) has recently proposed some changes. These proposed changes included the size of courses, and financial terms. At present, eight schools have signed on to Semester Online and another eight or so (including WFU) are still considering the program.

**Protection of Minors:** Spurred by the tragic events at Penn State, as well as our responsibility to protect minors who visit our campus (in surprisingly large numbers, from summer camps to routine and often unannounced local school visits, Scouting events on campus, and so forth), WFU is working on a formal 'Protection of Minors' policy. After the Provost's conversation with the Senate late last fall, a working group (including risk-assessment experts from HR, legal and other departments) has developed a draft proposal. This initial draft primarily addresses potential new faculty hires; under the proposal their appointment letters would include language that the offer is contingent upon successful completion of criminal background check, sex offender registry, degree, and license verification and a drug screening. If something is flagged

in the process, HR will look at it first. Then it goes to dean and department chair. If they agree, and it warrants revoking the offer, or adding a significant limitation on employment, the decision would advance to the provost's office. At that stage, HR would also reach out to the applicant and give them an opportunity to respond, simultaneously alerting our legal department.

*Q: Can the background checks be done before bringing a candidate to campus for an interview?*

*A: Concern about doing the checks too early in the process, due to the expense. Additionally, according to HR, serious infractions do not surface very often.*

*Q: How long will this process take?*

*A: It is not a lengthy process. Currently in place for staff new hires.*

*Q: If this is for minors' protection then why limit to only new faculty?*

*A: Will discuss existing faculty next.*

*Q: Can this information about requiring background checks be included in the job posting?*

*A: That doesn't seem necessary; background checks for new faculty will likely become standard in the industry.*

*Q: Is there a law that you can't go fishing before an offer is made?*

*A: Don't know the answer to that.*

In regards to existing faculty, three options surfaced. We agreed to go with the third option.

1. Do nothing; keep the current (non-checks) policy in place. This could raise serious liability concerns, as well as equity: everyone else on campus, including new faculty hires, would be subject to checks.
2. Affirm that we complete background checks on existing faculty as we have done with staff.
3. Organize a committee, which includes faculty members, to work expeditiously to help us shape this policy and work through how we screen and what counts. Develop a matrix system to determine how far back the checks should go and which incidents are flagged.

*Q: When this policy was adopted for staff, beginning with new hires, did they go back and perform checks on existing staff?*

*A: Not sure, will check.*

*Comment: The medical school did not go back.*

*Comment: I don't see what drug use has to do with the protection of minors. This appears to be a back door for the Administration to 'police' faculty activity.*

*Q: How much information regarding an individual goes into the system when performing these checks?*

*A: Jennifer Collins indicated that based on her former experience as a federal prosecutor, it included: name, birthdate, and SSN. On rare occasions would get false positives.*

*Q: Are we definitely doing background checks on faculty at WF?*

*A: We are formulating a process, not definitive yet.*

*Q: What is the time frame for this?*

*A: Would like to return to the April Senate meeting with a proposal for new faculty. Maybe by September for existing faculty.*

*Q: Doesn't the University have the ability to do this without our blessing?*

*A: Yes, but we would like your input in shaping the policy.*

*Q: Would having this policy in place have prevented the Penn State situation?*

*A: No, there is no perfect (or even especially good) preventative policy. The hope is that a well-publicized system of background checking helps lead to a cultural shift and heightened awareness, which would encourage reporting of incidents like those which went unreported (or dismissed when reported) at Penn State.*

Please consider volunteering for this committee, would like 2 to 4 faculty members to serve.

*Adjourned: 5:35 p.m.*