

**Wake Forest University Faculty Senate Minutes**  
**Wednesday, January 23rd 2019**  
Tribble Hall, DeTamble Auditorium

Minutes prepared by Jayson Pugh and Senate Secretary Erica Still; submitted by Erica Still.

Note: To facilitate open discussion, the identity of most Senators making comments or questions is not recorded. Such comments as are recorded are generally not verbatim. The identity of comments from Senate Officers and Senate Ad Hoc and Standing Committee Chairs are given, as is the identity of persons commenting in their official administrative capacity (e.g. EVP, Provost and College Dean.)

**In Attendance:** Jane Albrecht, Graca Almeida-Porada, Doug Beets, Steve Boyd, Simone Caron, Arjun Chatterjee, Anna Cianci, Christine Coughlin, Jay Ford, Dwayne Godwin\*, Omaar Hena, Hugh Howards, Ana Iltis, Carrie Johnston, Steve Kelley, Ralph Kennedy, Rogan Kersh\*, Christopher Knott, Mark Knudson, Pat Lord, Ananda Mitra, Sherry Moss, Matthew Phillips, Michelle Steward, Erica Still, Barry Trachtenberg, Neal Walls, Lisa Washburn

(\*) denotes non-voting members  
26 voting members in attendance, a quorum

1. Call to Order
  - a. President Parker called the meeting to order.
  
2. Approval of Minutes from October 17, 2018
  - a. The motion to approve the minutes of the October 2018 meeting was made, seconded, and passed.
  
3. Matt Clifford: Update on College Student Code of Conduct
  - a. This has faculty implications because it raises questions about the faculty handbook.
  - b. Associate Dean of Students Matthew Clifford, who oversees the conduct violation process, provided a brief overview of the code of conduct revision process.
    - i. There has not been a review since the 1990's of the undergraduate code of conduct, so in 2016 a full review of the code of conduct was undertaken to gain clarity, coherence, and consistency. A draft document that examined best practices in student conduct work was used in the early stages as a reference point for the revisions. Student Conduct worked directly with the legal office throughout the process to ensure the committee was able to receive immediate feedback.
    - ii. After the first draft of revisions was completed, opportunities were provided for the campus community to submit comments regarding the code. Two primary concerns were raised:
      1. Faculty presence on the committee.

2. Policies regarding harassment, disorderly conduct, and disruption
- iii. Student Conduct addressed these concerns by increasing student and faculty representation on the reconstituted committee and by focusing especially on the three key policies. Some procedural elements and the composition of hearing panels were also addressed.
  - iv. Highlights on the Revised Code:
    1. A “Statement on Expression” was created to frame and provide context by expressing an explicit commitment to the free and constructive expression and exchange of ideas.
    2. The effort was made to reframe policies through more specific language related to students’ rights to participate in the life of the institution.
      - a. For example, “breach of peace” was the language used initially in the “disorderly conduct” policy, but that was reworked to promote wellbeing.
      - b. Likewise, the “disruption” policy was reworked to focus on maintaining an environment in which students can both express themselves and engage fully in university activities.
      - c. The “harassment” policy was revised to be more aligned with Title IX policies, and “immigration,” “socioeconomic status,” and “political affiliation” were added as protected categories under the policy.
    3. A hearing panel is now required for all charges of violations of the “harassment” and “disruption” policies.
    4. Organizational and hazing policies were also examined.
  - v. The new code has been accessed 1200 times, and the entire process revealed that the community was heavily invested in the code.
  - vi. The Judicial Council will be looking into creating a process for more frequent reviews of the code of conduct in the future.
- c. President Parker noted that in this era political disruption is a real possibility and he believes it was great to address the policy before it was applied to a concrete case. Dean Clifford expressed a similar view that the campus would see more active demonstration and protest.
  - d. During the question and answer period, one senator explained that the public comment process did not go smoothly for him. He continues to be concerned about Article 13 on disruption, on the basis that the code assumes the University to be a moral actor, though it is often not such. He expressed concern that the code is likely to curb speech that may be necessary for disrupting unjust behavior.
    - i. Dean Clifford noted that the code of conduct is a policy document that outlines the base level set of expectations. He explained that while the code of conduct itself is not the appropriate place in which to do it, Student Conduct remains committed to providing students support and strategies for effective expressions of protest, etc.

4. President Parker: Updates: Senate Retreat; Koch Foundation agreement; Shared Governance Committee

a. Update on Senate Retreat:

- i. The senate retreat was snowed out and has been rescheduled for 1/25/19. It is important for senators to attend this event. The majority of the senate indicated they will be able to attend.
- ii. Retreat Topics
  1. This is the time to think carefully about the unique contribution of the faculty voice in a shared governance model, especially in light of changes at the highest levels of leadership that are on the horizon. This is an opportunity to establish “the Wake Forest way.”
  2. Shared governance at the University will occupy the first half of the afternoon. The senate structure will also be examined as to how the Faculty Senate fits in the shared governance model.
    - a. What is our vision on shared governance?
    - b. How can the structure of the Senate support the implementation of that vision?
    - c. When could faculty input have solved a problem or prevented unintended consequences of the administration’s decisions?

b. Update on WFU agreement with Koch Foundation

- i. President Parker, the Executive Committee, and the Provost read the Koch document together. The Executive Committee asked the Provost to request that the Koch Foundation publish the contract on its website. The provost has contacted the Koch foundation and reported that they will do so within a week of today’s date (Jan 23, 2019).
- ii. A senator raised the point that the Eudaimonia Institute website still does not note the different levels of funding, so that major donors like the Koch Foundation are differentiated from smaller donor sources. A more transparent website needs to be created.
  1. A senator raised concerns about requiring that centers provide information about all of their donors, suggesting that donors should be informed of any kind of public recognition, even if in a tiered model (i.e. differentiating specific levels of giving).
  2. Further conversation emphasized the need for clear language and policy defining “gift” and “grant.”

c. Update on shared governance committee

- i. They are working to develop a “principles of shared governance” document that the Senate, the administration, and the Board of Trustees publicly endorse. Upcoming meetings with key stakeholders will help move this process forward. The work done at the Senate retreat will help to shape these conversations.
- ii. A key goal is to know when and how the Board of Trustees and administrators make their decisions so that the Senate can be more proactive in its work.

- iii. A senator asked “if there is desire *from the leadership*” for increased shared governance, to which Provost Kersh replied, “yes, absolutely.”
  - iv. In the spirit of shared communication, President Parker noted upcoming meetings of the AAUP:
    - 1. Monday Jan 28 -- AAUP meeting
    - 2. Wednesday Jan 30 -- AAUP forum with Provost Kersh to discuss salaries
  
- 5. Simone Caron and Mark Knudson: Update from the Ad Hoc Committee on Conflicts of Interest Regarding Gifts and Grants. (See Appendix A)
  - a. This draft is being brought forward as a revision of the motions introduced during the April 2018 Senate meeting. This draft offers more specifics about the work of the proposed subcommittee. The draft is being presented today for review, with the intention of presenting it as a motion in the February 2019 meeting.
  - b. Several suggestions were offered:
    - i. Combine Points 2 & 3, because faculty should automatically be consulted on the issues outlined
    - ii. For now the committee is focusing on the policy related to “gifts.” The “grants” portion will be addressed next, in order to take a step-by-step approach that allows for careful deliberation and definition of each component.
  - c. The importance of this work was re-emphasized, as senators noted the need for a standard operating procedure governing gifts and grants. The chief concern is to protect academic freedom and resist undue outside influence.
  
- 6. Simone Caron: Motion from Benefits Committee regarding benefits for spouses of retired faculty. (See Appendix B)
  - a. This comes as a seconded *motion*.
  - b. Retirees already have these benefits. The spouses of deceased faculty were not included.
  - c. The motion carries, all in favor.
  
- 7. Anna Cianci: Motion from Senator Cianci proposing education benefits for faculty and staff without children. (See Appendix C)
  - a. The senator was on the Fringe Benefits Committee last year and they suggested this motion be brought to the body. Before bringing forth a specific motion, she wanted to gain a sense of what people were willing to consider regarding this issue.
  - b. The senator clarified that this motion applies only to faculty without children, not staff.
  - c. Discussion
    - i. The following points were addressed during the discussion:
      - 1. In support of the argument for expanded education benefits:
        - a. Such an arrangement would allow Wake Forest to be more competitive in attracting new hires.

- b. The current arrangement privileges faculty with children.
  - c. Because the current tuition benefit cannot be accessed by all, it fosters inequity. This is different from benefits which faculty *choose* not to use, in that this one is *inaccessible* to some faculty.
  - d. Providing such a benefit supports lifelong learning and professional development, which further enhances the quality and competitiveness of the faculty and the institution.
  - e. Faculty who take advantage of the tuition concession enjoy a financial gain not available to faculty without children.
2. In opposition to the argument for expanded education benefits:
- a. The cost of such a benefit may be prohibitive. (As there was no readily available data on the current cost of tuition concessions, the possibility was raised that IR might be able to collect the necessary information to address this point.)
  - b. Given the reduction in benefits that have already occurred, additional requests such as this one might very well result in even greater cuts.
  - c. Benefits are already accessed differently by faculty for a wide range of reasons, and the mere existence of the benefit does not inherently promise its applicability to all faculty.
  - d. There seems to be no evidence that not having this benefit is causing Wake Forest to lose candidates to competing institutions.
  - e. The administration of such a policy would be unduly burdensome, and the potential scenarios under which this benefit might be utilized demonstrate the difficulty of managing and resourcing it.
  - f. Tuition concession is not equal to a financial advantage, in that it is not income.
- ii. A motion was made to create an ad hoc committee to further explore the desirability and feasibility of this policy. The motion failed:
- 1. Yays: 8
  - 2. Nays: 11
8. President Parker: New Business
- a. No new business was presented.
9. President Parker: Meeting Adjourned
- a. Motion to adjourn was properly seconded and meeting was concluded.

## Appendix A

### Draft of Resolutions on Conflicts of Interest / Gift Acceptance Committee from the Ad Hoc Committee on Conflicts of Interest Regarding Gifts and Grants

Already passed by the Senate (April 2018):

- The President of the Senate will be added as a permanent member of the Gift Acceptance Committee

Recommendations:

- A **standing subcommittee** will be formed that includes one representative from each of the six schools of the University and the Library. These representatives will be selected by the senators representing each unit. Senators may select themselves, or they may select a faculty member of the school they represent.
- This subcommittee **shall consult on gifts** when any member of the Gift Acceptance Committee **calls for a consultation**.
- Stipulations in a gift that would be of concern include **restrictions on hiring of staff and/or faculty; recruitment; curriculum; and/or ownership of research data, findings, publications and/or presentations**.
- This subcommittee must have the right to **request further information** to make their decision. The subcommittee must make their decision related to the acceptability or problematic nature of the gift known within thirty days of receiving all requested information.
- If the subcommittee **raises concerns with the gift, the donor will have the chance to respond to said concerns and revise their gift in line with accepted policy**. Confidentiality will be maintained throughout this step of the process.
- If a **gift seems closer to a grant**, the Gift Acceptance Committee will refer it to the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs as per university standard operating procedures.
- If the President of the University overturns the recommendation made by the Gift Acceptance Committee, the **President of the Senate will make that fact known to the full university faculty** because of grave concerns that could compromise Wake Forest University's standing with SACS.

## **Appendix B**

**TO: Faculty Senate**  
**FROM: Senate Fringe Benefits Committee**  
**DATE: January 19, 2019**  
**RE: Motion regarding retiree spouse benefits**

The Senate Fringe Benefits Committee recommends that the University extend the following privileges to the partners of deceased faculty: full library borrowing privileges, tickets to Secret events, and admission to the Reynolda House Museum of American Art.

## Appendix C

**TO:** Faculty Senate  
**FROM:** Senator Anna Cianci  
**DATE:** January 18, 2019  
**RE:** Motion to Extend Tuition Benefits to Faculty without Children

**Proposal:** to extend the average cost of tuition reimbursement per faculty or staff member with children to faculty without children to be used on education of his/her choosing. For instance, if the average cost of tuition reimbursement per faculty or staff member is \$15,000/year, then this amount would be available to faculty without children to use on his/her educational goals.

**Reasons for Proposal:** to address the fairness/equity and diversity & inclusion issues present in the current tuition reimbursement policy and to satisfy a business reason for tuition reimbursement. These reasons are described in the paragraphs that follow.

Fairness/Equity Issue: The tuition reimbursement policy at Wake Forest University offers tuition benefits for the children of faculty and staff. Such benefits can easily amount to over a hundred thousand dollars per child. As a senior faculty colleague said to me, “[When my child started at Wake,] I essentially received a \$47,000/year raise for the next four years.” Faculty (and staff) without children receive no such benefit or anything comparable to that benefit. Although the tuition reimbursement policy would reimburse, for instance, my getting another undergraduate degree or getting a masters in liberal arts, such pursuits for a faculty member such as myself with a doctoral degree in a particular discipline would be irrelevant. Therefore, such tuition benefits are in essence no benefit at all for a faculty member without children. While there may be some inequity among various benefits offered and used by persons, the tuition reimbursement benefit seems especially material and especially imbalanced.

Diversity & Inclusion Issue: It seems that the tuition reimbursement policy is biased in favor of faculty and staff who have children and biased against those who do not. This seems inconsistent with the diversity and inclusion initiatives and goals of Wake Forest University. For instance, I have heard that one reason for the tuition reimbursement policy is to attract high quality faculty. The problem with this perspective is that there is an inherent value judgment implied – that is, this policy is to attract high quality faculty *with children*. This policy does not attract high quality faculty without children. In addition, this inequity disproportionately affects those in the LGBTQ community as its members generally have fewer children or no children than those in the heterosexual community.

Business Reason: Additional education opportunities for longstanding faculty would enhance the intellectual capital of the university and enhance the faculty member’s ability to contribute to the university in terms of scholarship, teaching and service. No such benefit to the school is generated from educating the children of faculty and staff. Perhaps this is why most companies (i.e., non-academic organizations) that offer tuition reimbursement offer it to their employees, not to their employees’ children. Thus, it seems that there is a business argument to be made to offer such a benefit to faculty but no such argument appears applicable for providing tuition reimbursement to employees’ children.