Wake Forest University Faculty Senate
Minutes
18 April 2018
DeTamble Auditorium

Minutes prepared by Mia Harris and Senate Secretary Ralph Kennedy; submitted by Ralph Kennedy.

In Attendance: Jane Albrecht, Doug Beets, Steve Boyd, Simone Caron, Stewart Carter, Arjun Chatterjee, Anna Cianci, CL Colyer (for Michelle Gillespie), Larry Daniel, Allyn Howtett, Hugh Howards, Simeon Ilesanmi, Ana Iltis, Molly Keener, Ralph Kennedy, Christopher Knott, David Levy, Pat Lord, Jason Lowe, Ananda Mitra, Sherry Moss, James (Wilson) Parker, Tim Pyatt, Sarah Raynor, Mary Scanlon, Kathy Smith, Michelle Steward, Neal Walls, Julie Wayne

1. President Carter called the meeting to order. Motion to approve the minutes of the March 21 meeting made, seconded, and approved.
2. Announcements by President Carter
   a. President Carter will be meeting next week with Dedee Johnston to be updated on campus pedestrian and traffic issues.
   b. President Carter is scheduled to meet with Acting Chief Diversity Officer José Villalba and Vice President for Campus Life Penny Rue to discuss the Senate's request for diversity and inclusion policies from campus Greek organizations.
   c. The resolution on faculty salaries adopted at the March 21 meeting of the Faculty Senate has been forwarded to Provost Kersh for presentation to the Board of Trustees. See Appendix II for Compensation Committee Report to the Faculty Senate, April 2018.
3. Election of officers for 2018-19. Slate of nominees provided by the Nominating Committee presented. Additional nominations for the floor invited, but none were made. *Motion to approve the slate by acclamation seconded and adopted*. Officers for 20182019 will be:
   a. President: Wilson Parker (Law)
   b. Vice-President: Mark Knudson (Medicine)
   c. Secretary: Erica Still (English)
   d. Member-at-large: Wayne Silver (Biology)
   e. Hugh Howards was elected by the Collegiate Senators at their last meeting to serve as Chair of the Collegiate Senators for 2018-19.
4. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Centers and Institutes. On behalf of the Ad Hoc Committee on Centers and Institutes, Sarah Raynor presented a lengthy report (see Appendix I for full report), which generated much discussion. The committee proposed the following three motions for adoption by the Senate:
   a. That the Faculty Senate should review the existing COIC (Conflict of Interest and Commitment) policy for the Reynolda campus, including the constitution and responsibilities of a COIC committee, make any necessary changes, and approve

the policy by May 2019. Any future changes to this policy should be approved by the Faculty Senate.

    b. That the Faculty Senate call upon the administration to fully implement the COIC policy and take appropriate action when conflicts of interest or commitment do occur.

    c. That there be created a new standing faculty committee known as the Centers and Institutes Committee (CIC). The committee will be composed of 12 faculty members, with one tenured member of each Division within the College to be elected by the College faculty, and one tenured member elected by the faculty of each of the other five schools of the university, and a faculty member at the level of associate or above elected by the faculty of the university library. These committee members will be elected by the bodies they represent. The Executive Committee of the Senate selects the chairperson as the twelfth member of the committee. Committee members need not be members of the Senate and will serve 3-year staggered terms. This committee will recommend policy for center and institute creation, review, and renewal, and will have oversight of the creation and renewal of centers and institutes. Additionally, in cooperation with the Provost's Office, it will conduct an annual review of each center and institute and lead the more in-depth reviews of the directors and centers and institutes on a scheduled five-year cycle.   It will report on its work annually to the senate and bring any substantial policy changes to the senate for approval at that time. It will work with other campus entities as needed to fulfill its role. Its full proposed charge is detailed in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee.

A vote was held by paper ballot. The three motions carried: (a) by 20 to 3, (b) by 20 to 3, and (c) by 14 to 9.

5. Resolution on Evaluation of Academic Administrators: Wake Forest University faculty will evaluate the President of Wake Forest University and senior university academic administrators (the provost and deans of the College, professional schools, and library) during their second year in office and annually thereafter. These evaluations will be managed by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate. Results of evaluations of the president will be reported to the Board of Trustees and to the president. Results of evaluations of the provost will be reported to the president, the Board of Trustees, and the provost. Results of evaluations of deans will be reported to the president, the provost, the Board of Trustees, and the individual deans. *This resolution passed on a voice vote.*

6. Conflict of interest office issues Standard Operating Procedure based on a recommendation from the Provost's Task Force on the Conflict of Interest Policy. Prior practice applied only to faculty research supported by external funding sources. This SOP broadens the class to whom the COI policy applies to include "those faculty members who receive funding from a Wake Forest University institute or center to support research activities when the source consists of 'grants' or 'restricted gifts', as those terms are defined in the Wake Forest University Gift Acceptance Policy, received from a third party to the University." (Quoted language from the Conflict of Interest Office, Office of Compliance.)

7. Resolution on the Gift Acceptance Policy: the Faculty Senate resolves that the following changes be made to the Gift Acceptance Policy:
    a. The President of the Senate will be added as a permanent member of the Gift Acceptance Committee.
    b. 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 of the school they represent.
    c. This subcommittee would consult on gifts when any member of the Committee calls for a consultation.
   The Senate approved the first part of this resolution, (a), but did not approve parts (b) and (c).
8. President Carter asked if there was any new business. Hearing none, he adjourned the meeting.

Report to the Faculty Senate from the Ad Hoc Committee on Centers and Institutes

Charge of the Committee

The March 2017 report from the Ad Hoc Committee of the Senate of Wake Forest University on the Eudaimonia Institute read, in part:

> Given the short window of time for this review, the Committee could only preliminarily examine policies related to the creation, review, and governance of University institutes. There are few guidelines governing the proposal, review, and approval of institutes. In addition, the variations found among the three standing institutes calls for a Faculty Senate Ad Hoc committee devoted exclusively to this issue.

Following this report, 2017-2018 Senate President Stew Carter formed an Ad Hoc Committee on Centers and Institutes (the "Committee"), chaired by Sarah Raynor (College). Membership includes: Doug Beets (Business), Steve Boyd (College), Chris Coughlin (Law), Ana Iltis (Graduate School), and Allen Tsang (Medical School). Stew Carter (College) was also present at most of the Committee's meetings.

The Committee took as its charge the recommendation of policies regarding creation, review, and renewal/non-renewal of centers and institutes. The Committee did extensive research on best practices and current WFU practices, and its recommendations are delineated in this report.

Executive Summary

The committee has the following findings:
- There is no clear definition of a center or an institute at Wake Forest. We propose considering the following characteristics in determining whether future initiatives are considered centers or institutes:
  - Centers and institutes should be faculty-developed, faculty-led, multidisciplinary academic units. They should be highly collaborative and should not duplicate the work of any existing academic units.
  - An institute should have broad scope and be germane to the mission of the university, with both research and co-curricular foci.
  - A center may have a narrower scope, and be focused on research or co-curricular activities, or both.
  - Any academic unit meeting this description and funded by the Provost's Office or receiving significant external funding should be considered as a center or institute and covered by the proposed policies.
- Because we find the differences between centers and institutes to be more quantitative than qualitative, we recommend mutually consistent policies for both centers and institutes.

- Shared governance necessitates that faculty have input on the formation of initiatives as important and integral to the academic mission of the university as a center or institute. To satisfy AAUP guidelines, elected faculty should have a direct role in the policy, formation and review of centers and institutes.
- Pursuant to that, there is a need for a standing faculty committee to oversee policy on centers and institutes, in cooperation with the Provost's Office. This committee will establish policies on centers and institutes and make recommendations to the Provost's Office regarding new and existing centers and institutes. This committee will not necessarily be composed of senators, but its chair will be appointed by the Senate Executive Committee and it will report annually to the Senate on its work.
- Consistent with the principles of faculty governance, faculty should be involved in the oversight of centers and institutes, independent of the advisory and advocacy roles which the entities' own boards may take on. This oversight will be done by a new standing faculty committee, the Centers and Institutes Committee (CIC), which will complete regular reviews of all existing institutes and centers and the five-year center and institute review cycle.
- The Reynolda campus needs a stronger Conflict of Interest and Commitment (COIC) policy that will be consistently applied. Our ad hoc committee recommends that the Senate review the policy currently being created by the standing COIC committee and approve it or recommend changes. The committee also recommends that the administration fully implement the policy.
- There is a fundamental issue in the distinction between a gift and a grant, which has caused several concerns in how funding is treated on campus. The existing COIC committee needs to clarify this distinction and funding needs to be labelled appropriately and treated according to industry standards.

Motions

The Ad Hoc Committee on Centers and Institutes proposes the following motions for adoption by the Faculty Senate:

1. That the Faculty Senate should review the existing COIC policy for the Reynolda campus, including the constitution and responsibilities of a COIC committee, make any necessary changes, and approve the policy by May 2019. Any future changes to this policy should be approved by the Faculty Senate.
2. That the Faculty Senate call upon the administration to fully implement the COIC policy and take appropriate action when conflicts of interest or commitment do occur.
3. That there be created a new standing faculty committee known as the Centers and Institutes Committee (CIC). The committee will be composed of 12 faculty members, with one tenured member of each Division within the College to be elected by the College faculty, and one tenured member elected by the faculty of each of the other five schools of the university, and a faculty member at the level of associate or above elected by the faculty of the university library. These committee members will be elected by the bodies they represent. The Executive Committee of the Senate selects the chairperson as

the twelfth member of the committee. Committee members need not be members of the Senate and will serve 3-year staggered terms. This committee will recommend policy for center and institute creation, review, and renewal, and will have oversight of the creation and renewal of centers and institutes. Additionally, in cooperation with the Provost's Office, it will conduct an annual review of each center and institute and lead the more indepth reviews of the directors and centers and institutes on a scheduled five-year cycle. It will report on its work annually to the senate and bring any substantial policy changes to the senate for approval at that time. It will work with other campus entities as needed to fulfill its role. Its full proposed charge is detailed in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee.

Full Report

Preface

As this Ad Hoc Committee began its work, the members soon recognized that the development of clear policies and procedures in areas such as the development and oversight of centers and institutes had not kept pace with the tremendous growth of facilities, faculty, and academic programs during the last two administrations.

In addition to the March 2017 Ad Hoc Report, the April 2017 <u>Sub-Committee of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility</u> recommended that "the Faculty Senate, Deans, and the Associate Provost for Research undertake in a timely manner the establishment of university guidelines in accordance with the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and <u>The Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges</u> (SACSCOC) standards and guidelines as they relate to a minimum of five domains: (1) the term, review, appointment, and reappointment of institute directors, (2) curriculum influence and teaching assignments;(3) institute conferences, symposia, research seminars, and other institute research activities as a potential channel of undue donor influence, including the responsible reporting of institute research findings; (4) the term, review, appointment, and reappointment of all institute staff and faculty; (5) the primacy of faculty governance as related to academic responsibility and freedom of inquiry." In addition, since Wake Forest institutes are "currently operational without any explicit guidelines," the committee recommended that donor agreements and MOU "be made public immediately" and that "AAUP guidelines of full Senate participation in drafting, reviewing, and completing SCA [Strategic Corporate Alliance] contracts be adopted without delay."[1]

Further, in order "to adhere to the mission and goals of Wake Forest University as approved by its SACSCOC, accreditation process", the Sub-Committee recommended: 1. "all existing and future contracts with external donors to establish University institutes are transparent and meet the standards…academic freedom, integrity and governance as set forth by the WFU mission statement and bylaws and by SACSCOC accreditation standards."[2] The SubCommittee recommended one way to achieve this was to develop "a faculty-led review process…, including early considerations as proposed by the Office of Development [Advancement and Communication], that establishes transparent policies regarding what donors can and cannot expect regarding hiring, research, and curriculum decisions at WFU[3]; 2. "…all

---

[1] According to the AAUP, A Strategic Corporate Alliance (SCA) is a "formal, comprehensive, university-managed research collaboration with one or more outside company sponsors, centered around a major, multi-year financial commitment involving research, programmatic interactions, 'first rights to license' intellectual property, and other services." *Summary of Recommendations: 56 Principles to Guide Academy-Industry Engagement*

[2] SACSCOC: 3.7.5 The institution publishes policies on the responsibility and authority of faculty in academic and governance matters. (Faculty role in governance)

[3] *Summary of Recommendations: 56 Principles to Guide Academy-Industry Engagement*
Principle 1-Faculty Governance: The university must preserve the primacy of shared academic governance in establishing campus-wide policies for planning, developing, implementing, monitoring, and assessing all donor agreements and collaborations, whether with private industry, government, or nonprofit groups. Faculty, not

institutes have faculty-governed procedures for appointing faculty and determining teaching assignments in keeping with SACSCOC standard 3.7.1[4]; and 3. "to ensure that Institute research practices contribute to University's overall research mission and have clear assessment processes in place that are in keeping with University's research mission." (Standard 3.3.1.4).[5]

  Therefore, this Committee cites, at length, above, some of the principles and guidelines from the SACSCOC and the AAUP that have guided our work on the policies and procedures the Senate asked of us. We do so, because we agree with the 1994 AAUP Statement On the Relationship of Faculty Governance to Academic Freedom, "…sound governance practice and the exercise of academic freedom are closely connected, arguably inextricably linked" and that "a sound system of institutional governance is a necessary condition for the protection of faculty rights and thereby for the most productive exercise of essential faculty freedoms."[6] There are no more important issues demanding our attention than those involving academic freedom and

Principle 2: Academic Freedom, Autonomy, and Control: The university must preserve its academic autonomy—including the academic freedom rights of faculty, students, postdoctoral fellows, and academic professionals—in all its relationships with industry and other funding sources by maintaining majority academic control over joint academy-industry committees and exclusive academic control over core academic functions (such as faculty research evaluations, faculty hiring and promotion decisions, classroom teaching, curriculum development, and course content).

Principle 36—Shared Governance and Strategic Corporate Alliances (SCAs): Faculty senates should be fully involved in the planning, negotiation, approval, execution, and ongoing oversight of SCAs formed on campus. The senate should appoint a confidential committee to review a first draft of a memorandum of understanding (MOU) pertaining to newly proposed SCAs. All parties' direct and indirect financial obligations should be made clear from the outset. Before an agreement is finalized on a broad SCA, the full faculty senate should review it. Formal approval of broad SCAs should await both stages in this process. All approved SCA agreements should be made available to faculty, academic professionals, and the public.

Principle 31—Conflict of Interest (COI) Transparency: Public Disclosure of Financial Interests and COI Management Plans: University COI policies should require faculty, administrators, students, postdoctoral fellows, and academic professionals to disclose to all journal editors all significant personal financial interests that may be directly or indirectly related to the manuscripts they are submitting for consideration. COI disclosure on publications should summarize all related funding sources received during the past five years, not simply for the project at hand. The same COI disclosure requirements should apply to oral presentations delivered in conferences, courts, and legislative chambers.

[4] SACSCOC 3.7.1: The institution employs competent faculty members qualified to accomplish the mission and goals of the institution. When determining acceptable qualifications of its faculty, an institution gives primary consideration to the highest earned degree in the discipline. The institution also considers competence, effectiveness, and capacity, including, as appropriate, undergraduate and graduate degrees, related work experiences in the field, professional licensure and certifications, honors and awards, continuous documented excellence in teaching, or other demonstrated competencies and achievements that contribute to effective teaching and student learning outcomes.

For all cases, the institution is responsible for justifying and documenting the qualifications of its faculty. (See Commission guidelines "Faculty Credentials.") (Faculty competence) And 3.4.10 "The institution places primary responsibility for the content, quality, and effectiveness of the curriculum with its faculty." (Responsibility for curriculum)

outside sponsors, should retain majority control over the campus management of such agreements and collaborations.

[5] "The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in" following area: (Institutional Effectiveness) SACSCOC 3.3.1.4: research within its mission, if appropriate.

[6] AAUP Redbook, 2015 Edition, 123-126.
integrity, the financial well-being of Wake Forest, the specific decision-making responsibilities of its components and the effects of these on the public trust in our joint educational mission.[4]

Our work was informed not only by AAUP documents on faculty governance. We queried 25 colleges and universities to obtain their institutional policies regarding centers and institutes. Whenever possible, we obtained documents available on their websites. When we were unable to locate these, we contacted administrative offices (usually Provosts' offices) to ask for copies of policies. We were able to obtain policies from many institutions, and several others were willing to answer questions but did not have policies available for us to review. We found a wide range of policies and practices. These informed our discussions. We solicited information from institutions that often are listed as peer institutions for various purposes at Wake Forest University as well as other institutions that have centers and institutes: Boston College, Boston University, Drexel University, Duke University, East Carolina University, Elon University, Emory University, Georgetown University, Harvard University, Rice University, University of Arkansas, University of Colorado, University of Georgia, University of Houston, University of Indiana, University of Michigan, University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina - Charlotte, University of Notre Dame, University of Richmond, University of Virginia, Vanderbilt University, Villanova University, Wayne State University, and Western Carolina University.

Defining Centers and Institutes

Centers and institutes will enable faculty to accomplish scholarship and creative work that they otherwise could not have accomplished without reaching out to other scholars or artists for additional insight, inspiration, and assistance. Centers and institutes should help build the academic reputation of the institution in the focus area of the center or institutes, and they should build intellectual community and engagement among faculty and students. Once centers or institutes are started they should have a spillover effect in attracting and mentoring new members with interests that can mesh with, and enhance, center or institute programs.

[4] "The variety and complexity of the tasks performed by institutions of higher education produce an inescapable interdependence among governing board, administration, faculty, students, and others. The relationship calls for adequate communication among these components, and full opportunity for appropriate joint planning and effort." Further, "…important areas of action involve at one time or another the initiating capacity and decisionmaking participation of all the institutional components, and differences in the weight of each voice, from one point to the next, should be determined by reference to the responsibility of each component for the particular matter at hand."
(AAUP, 1966 Statement Shared Faculty Governance, Redbook, 2015 Edition, 117-123)

Successful centers and institutes will engage faculty and students across disciplines, departments and/or schools, and attract funding and scholars from both Wake Forest and other sources. They will be led by interdisciplinary faculty teams. A working definition of "interdisciplinary" is: two or more academic, scientific, or artistic disciplines that each bring a unique perspective to the scholarly or creative focus of the center or institute.

Planning for and Creation of Centers and Institutes

Wake Forest University currently has a clearly defined process for creating new centers but not for creating institutes. The recommendations below for the creation of centers and institutes are informed by the current WFU policy on centers.

The Provost's Office will determine when to issue calls for centers and institutes; faculty may also continue to bring ideas for centers or institutes to the Provost's Office or to the CIC for discussion and planning. Once the decision is made to formally apply for the creation of a new center or institute, the process will proceed in two phases. The proposed application process is described in more detail in Appendix 1.

Planning: Applications will be reviewed by the CIC and the Provost's office, with administrative support from the Provost's Office.

Center and Institute Planning Proposals will be reviewed by the Center and Institutes Committee. The CIC will submit its recommendation to the Provost's Office; the Provost's Office will make the final determination on approval of a planning period. Funding for this planning period may come from the Provost's Office or from other sources. Applications should be submitted by three or four tenure-stream faculty representing multiple schools of the university or from at least two divisions in the College. Faculty should be willing to commit substantial time and effort to the development of the center or institute. The planning periods should be used to develop and submit a five-year plan for a new center or institute. The application will need to clearly define the topics or questions that will be addressed by center or institute faculty and to demonstrate why the proposed center or institute faculty are uniquely qualified to lead this work. If the topics or questions to be addressed are not fully developed, the proposal must provide the details of how this will be accomplished in the planning phase.

Creation: Twelve months after the beginning of the planning period, the proposed center or institute faculty will submit a full proposal for the creation of the center or institute. Center or Institute proposals will be reviewed by the CIC, which will then submit its recommendation to the Provost's Office, who will make the final determination. Evaluation of center and institute proposals will take into consideration the academic mission of the proposed center or institute, the extent to which the proposed entity has been developed by the faculty and will be facultyled, innovation, collaboration, cross-disciplinary nature of the proposed work, and the need for cross-disciplinary collaboration through a center or institute to complete the work. Other aspects to be considered in the evaluation include the proposed governance structure; local, regional, and national significance of intended contributions; assurance that the center or

institute does not duplicate, substantially overlap, or subsume other academic units, institutes or centers. If approved, the center or institute will be formally created at the end of the 18-month planning period, with a five-year term.

Timeline: Planning period applications will be due September 1 each year, and approved planning periods will begin January 1. Creation applications will be due January 1, one year into the planning phase, with creation decisions made by April 15. New centers and institutes will go into full operation on July 1, at the start of the next university fiscal year.

Review and Renewal of Centers and Institutes

Ordinarily, centers and institutes will be approved for five years; if funded by the Provost's office, that funding will ordinarily follow the same five-year cycle. Each center or institute will submit an annual report, which will be reviewed and discussed by the CIC. The format for this proposal will be developed by the CIC and Provost's Office together, and directors will submit one report for review by both the CIC and Provost's Office. Directors will be reviewed in the third year of their terms and every three years after that, as long as they serve as director of a center or institute. The review will be conducted by the CIC and the Provost's Office. In the fifth year of each five-year cycle, the center or institute will be fully reviewed before a decision of renewal or non-renewal is made. The CIC will submit its own assessments to the Provost's Office. Any irreconcilable differences between the CIC and the Provost's Office concerning renewal of a center, institute or director will be referred to the Senate Executive Committee. At any time, the CIC may initiate a full review if it deems such a review necessary. Prior to initiating such a review, the CIC must provide both to the director of a center or institute and to the Provost's Office a clearly written justification for initiating an unscheduled review. After each review, the CIC will forward its recommendation to the Provost's Office.

The CIC will work with the Provost's Office to develop a mutually agreeable process for the annual report and the quinquennial review; no additional reports will be required of centers and institutes, although the specific information requested may change. New processes for these reports will be disseminated at least a year in advance of any changes; until mutually agreeable processes are agreed, the CIC will have access to and discuss the information already being submitted to the Provost's Office on a regular basis.

In the case that a center or institute is not renewed by the Provost's Office, that entity ordinarily will be granted at least one year to complete an orderly dissolution and fulfil its existing obligations.

The Centers and Institutes Committee (CIC)

The ad hoc committee recommends that the work of developing and maintaining consistent faculty governance of centers and institutes be implemented through the formation of a standing faculty committee known as the CIC, described below.

Composition and Leadership: The CIC will be composed of twelve faculty members, with one tenured member of each of the five College divisions elected by the College and one tenured member elected by the faculty of each of the other five schools and one member at the rank of associate or above elected by the faculty of the university library. The Executive Committee of the Senate will select the chairperson of this committee as the twelfth member of the committee. Neither committee members nor the chairperson need be members of the Senate and will serve three-year staggered terms.

Responsibilities:
1. Receive and consider applications for the planning and creation of centers and institutes.
2. Establish criteria by which applications are considered.
3. Ensure alignment of Wake Forest policies for centers and institutes and procedures with other University policies and procedures. Advise the Provost's Office on changes needed to rectify discrepancies.
4. Ensure, in collaboration with Provost's Office, application forms for planning and creating new centers and institutes are current and reflect clearly delineated, current review criteria.
5. Ask for a conflict of interest/commitment review of all funding sources identified in center and institute applications at the planning and creation phase.
6. Review all center and institute planning and creation proposals and forward their recommendations to the Provost's Office.
7. In the case that the Provost's Office decides to fund a center or institute without the approval of the CIC, the CIC will have the right to appeal the decision to the President and Board of Trustees.
8. Receive and review annual reports, director reviews, and center and institute reviews and forward these reports with any additional assessment to the Provost's Office. Any academic unit meeting the description of a center or institute in the introduction to this document and funded by the Provost's Office or receiving significant external funding, should be considered as a center or institute, for the purpose of conducting these reviews.
9. Set and publicize criteria for the review process for planning and creating centers and institutes.
10. Recommend to the Provost's Office the continuation or discontinuation of each center and institute at the end of each five-year cycle.
11. Report annually to the Faculty Senate on its work; bring any significant recommended policy changes to the Senate for approval.

Details on each of these points can be found in [Sub-][5]Appendix 3.

---

[5] The Secretary inserted "[Sub-]" here as it seemed to be required. - RK

Summary

It is our hope that, through this new review process, the policies on centers and institutes at Wake Forest can be clarified, faculty governance principles can be achieved, and the centers and institutes themselves can receive valuable support from colleagues.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sarah Raynor (Chair)
Doug Beets
Steve Boyd
Chris Coughlin
Ana Iltis
Allen Tsang

Sub-Appendix 1: Request for Proposals for 18-month Center or Institute Planning Period

Centers and institutes ordinarily must be developed and approved in two phases. The first of these is a planning phase, which is described in this Appendix.

The Provost's Office will approve 18-month planning periods for new centers and institutes. Each of these proposals will be reviewed by the CIC; the CIC will recommend approval, changes, or disapproval to the Provost's Office prior to that office's approval of a planning period. That planning period should be used to develop and submit a five-year plan for a new center or institute. The Provost's Office has funded planning grants of up to $50,000 each in the past. New centers and institutes should be developed through this planning process regardless of the funding source.

Centers and institutes should enable faculty to accomplish scholarship, research, and creative work that they otherwise could not have accomplished working alone. Centers and institutes should help build the academic reputation of the institution in the focus area of the center or institute, they should build intellectual community and engagement among faculty and students, and they should not replicate the work of any existing academic department, program, or unit. Once centers or institutes are started they should have a spillover effect in attracting and mentoring new members with interests that can mesh with, and enhance, center/institute programs.

Successful centers and institutes will engage faculty and students across disciplines, departments and/or schools, and attract funding and scholars from both Wake Forest and other sources. They will be developed and led by interdisciplinary faculty teams working to foster scholarship, research, or creative work that requires the structure of a center or institute for success. A working definition of "interdisciplinary" is: two or more academic, scientific, or artistic disciplines that each bring a unique perspective to the scholarly or creative focus of the center. The planning application should speak to these factors. In particular, it must address the following question: What important topics or questions will you address that will not and cannot be addressed without this funding? If the topics or questions to be addressed are not fully developed, the proposal must provide the details of how this will be accomplished in the one-year planning phase.

Proposals for the planning and creation of a new center or institute should be co-led by tenure-stream faculty from multiple schools within Wake Forest University or at least two divisions of the College. Centers should be co-led by two or four faculty members from at least two disciplines; Institutes should be co-led by three to four faculty members from at least three disciplines. Ordinarily, centers will include faculty from at least two divisions of the college or two schools; institutes should cut across school lines. Additional primary faculty must be identified as specified in the relevant application forms.

Planning Proposals will be reviewed by the Center and Institutes Committee. The CIC will submit its recommendation to the Provost's Office, who will make the final determination

on funding. If the Provost approves a proposal which the CIC has rejected, the CIC will have the right to appeal to the President and Board of Trustees. Planning Proposals will be reviewed on criteria such as academic mission, being faculty-led, innovation, collaboration, cross-disciplinary nature, and necessity of the collaboration to get necessary, innovative work done.

Applications for Center or Institute Planning Periods should contain:

Title: The proposed title of the center or institute.

Description (two pages): A brief description of the intellectual/creative focus and mission of the center or institute and of how the center or institute will advance the teaching/research or creative work at Wake Forest University and beyond the University. This should include the proposed governance structure of the center or institute, the local, regional, and national significance of intended contributions, and an assurance that institute does not duplicate or substantially overlap with other academic units, institutes or centers. This should also include a statement of the relevance of the center or institute's mission to Wake Forest University.

Faculty and CVs: Names and affiliations of the principal WFU faculty (no more than four faculty) proposing the center or institute, with a two-page CV for each. Name of the director of the proposed center or institute, who must be a tenured faculty member. Names and affiliations of others who have agreed to be major participants if the center or institute is created.

Plan (four pages): A plan for how the four critical success factors for centers and institutes will be determined, evaluated, and developed over the 18-month planning period.

Budget: The proposed budget for the planning period. Eligible budget items include travel and (if necessary) modest honoraria for visitors, budgets for proposed site visits/workshops/seminars to determine best practices, and a course release for one member of the research team to lead the development of the full five-year center or institute operational plan. These budgets are expected to comply with academic year salary and additional compensation policies posted on the ORSP web site (http://www.wfu.edu/rsp/policies.html).

Department Chair Approval: Signatures of the department chairs or deans, if appropriate, of proposing faculty members.

Statement of Potential Conflicts of Interest and Commitment: Each proposing faculty member should describe any other significant funding sources or commitments that could create a conflict of interest.

The completed planning period application should be submitted electronically to the Provost's Office by September 1. These proposals are reviewed by the CIC, which forwards its recommendation to the Provost's Office by October 15. Notification of the results of the application will occur by November 15.

Sub-Appendix 2: Proposals for Creating a New Center or Institute at Wake Forest University

Centers and Institutes ordinarily must be developed and approved in two phases. The first is a planning phase described in Appendix 1. The second is a creation phase described in this appendix.

In the 12th month of the approved planning period, the proposing faculty should submit a complete application for the creation of a new center or institute to the CIC. The CIC will review this application and send its recommendation to the Provost's Office. Proposals to create a center or institute cover a five-year period of proposed activity. Proposals will be reviewed based on criteria such as those used in the planning phase, plus budgetary realism, fiscal responsibility, and achievability of goals.

Applications for Center or Institute Creation should contain:

> **Title Page or Cover Sheet:** Title of proposed center or institute; name, address, and contact information of the primary proposing faculty; inclusive dates of proposed project and submission date; list of proposed funding sources and total budget for each.
>
> **Abstract (250-500 words):** Brief review of the major points in your statement of need or problem statement, your objectives, your plans, evaluation and dissemination processes if necessary. Identify the end products of the proposed work and present it in non-technical language.
>
> **Summary/Problem Statement or Statement of Needs, Questions to be Answered (one page):** Summary of the significance, relevance, innovativeness, timeliness, generalizability, and benefits of the proposed center or institute. This should emphasize the **intellectual merit** of the proposed work as well as the **broader impacts** of the proposed center or institute. Explain how faculty and students in different parts of the university benefit from the proposed center or institute and any possible benefits beyond Wake Forest.
>
> **Objectives, Specific Aims, Measurables, Expected Outcomes, Hypotheses (one page):** A numbered list of steps to be taken to address topics or questions to be explored. These steps need to be framed in operational language with specific near term and longerterm endpoints.
>
> **Introduction or Background (sections 5-7 are limited to a combined total of 15 pages):** Describe the mission or focus of the proposed center or institute. This section should include background information on prior related work and information on any previous collaborative work among center or institute faculty. It also should explain why a center or institute is required to accomplish the stated goals.

Methods, Activities, Operating Plans, Action Plan, Strategies, Procedures, and Governance: Explain how the topics are going to be addressed or questions answered. Detailed plans must be presented. Details about the qualifications of the faculty who will work on the topics/questions must be presented as well as proposed operational guidelines for the center or institute. This should include a clearly delineated organizational and governance structure. It should also identify opportunities, milestones, and anticipated roadblocks. Identify what is needed from the administration to be successful in achieving goals.

Curriculum Vitae: A **two-page** CV for each of the four proposing faculty and up to eight other faculty who will constitute the founding core faculty of the center or institute.

Resources: A detailed description of the resources required to accomplish the center or institute's goals is required. If the resource(s) do not exist, a plan must be provided that explains how the resource(s) will be acquired or accessed. This includes information about required space.

Budget: A proposed budget for the full five years of the center or institute must be presented. All sources of funding and plans for seeking funding should be identified and plans for long-term sustainability of the proposed center or institute explained. A detailed budget must be presented year by year with cumulative budget totals and sources.

The proposed budget should cover all expenses. This includes money that will be allocated to faculty, staff, students, supplies, equipment, and space. The budget may include items such as salary for the director and support for staff; competitive summer stipends for faculty; money for Visiting Fellows from other institutions for visits; seminar support; graduate student or postdoctoral fellowships, money for center or institute members' release time; equipment; a mini-grants or seed-money grants program. These budgets are expected to comply with academic year salary and additional compensation policies posted on the ORSP web site (http://www.wfu.edu/rsp/policies.html). The proposal should explain how decisions will be made regarding awarding of funds to faculty or students.

Letters of Support/Collaboration: If the center or institute proposes overlap with departmental/school functions and faculty or in-kind support from departments or schools, explanation for the overlap and the details of any collaboration and support should be addressed in a letter from the relevant department or school.

Statement of Potential Conflicts of Interest and Commitment: Each proposing faculty member should describe any other significant funding sources or commitments that could create a conflict of interest.

The completed application should be submitted electronically to the Office of the Provost by January 1. The Provost's office will forward all applications to the CIC, which will complete its

review of the application by March 1. The Provost's Office will then make the final decision, and the proposed center or institute director will be notified by April 1.

Sub-Appendix 3: The Centers and Institutes Committee (CIC)

The Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Centers and Institutes recommends that the work of developing and maintaining consistent faculty governance of centers and institutes be implemented through the formation of a standing faculty committee known as the Centers and Institutes Committee [CIC], described below.

> **Composition and Leadership**: The CIC will be composed of twelve faculty members, with one tenured member representing each of the five divisions of the College, elected by the faculty of the College, one tenured member elected by the faculty of each of the other five schools and one member at the rank of associate or above elected by the faculty of the university library. The Executive Committee of the Senate will select the chairperson of this committee as the twelfth member of the committee. Neither Committee members nor the chairperson need be members of the Senate. They will serve 3-year staggered terms.

> **Responsibilities**:
> Receive and consider applications for planning and creating institutes and centers. These applications are considered in two phases:
> > i) Planning Phase
> > ii) Creation Phase
>
> Establishes criteria by which applications are considered. For example, iii) Successful institute and center applications may demonstrate evidence of the following:
> > (1) Research, scholarship, or creative work collaborations that require the formation of a center or institute;
> > (2) Co-curricular, non-credit bearing teaching/instruction/training that would offer new and important benefits to faculty, staff, or students;
> > (3) Service to campus and wider community;
> > (4) Demonstration that the mission and plan of the center or institute furthers the mission of Wake Forest in significant and measurable ways that would not be possible without the work of the center or institute;
> > (5) The potential for local, regional and national impact;
> > (6) Explanation of why the objectives of the initiative cannot achieved within existing institutional structures;
> > (7) A critical mass of faculty engagement, as reflected in breadth of faculty affiliation across multiple Wake Forest schools and depth/impact of interdisciplinary research that has been facilitated by the initiative/center;
> > (8) Effectively partner with core Wake Forest units – multiple schools, departments, and other institutes, where appropriate -- that show a commitment to integration rather than turf/silo creation; and

(9) A robust plan for furthering Wake Forest's goals of diversity and inclusiveness with regard to faculty, students, and staff, whether through recruitment of/professional development for faculty, investment in diversifying the population of students exploring relevant fields of inquiry, or otherwise.

iv) Unsuccessful institute and center applications will include, among other things, plans to:

    a. Duplicate, significantly overlap with, or subsume the mission of existing academic units, centers, institutes, or other initiatives

    b. Confer degrees

    c. Appoint faculty members through their agency alone, without regular selection processes of established academic units

    d. Confer tenure.

Ensure alignment of WFU's Centers and Institutes Policies and Procedures with other University Policies and Procedures. Advise the Provost on changes needed to rectify discrepancies.

Ensure, with the administrative support from the Provost's Office, that the Provost's Office has up-to-date application forms for planning and creating new centers and institutes and that clearly delineated, current review criteria are communicated to that office.

2) **Role in Review of Funding:**

In the Planning Phase, ask for a preliminary conflict of interest/commitment review from University Conflict of Interest and Commitment [COIC] Committee. In the Creation Phase, ask for a full conflict of interest/commitment review of all funding sources identified in Planning Phase.

3) **Powers and Constraints**

Consultation: The CIC is authorized to consult with any committee or office at the University regarding Center and Institute planning or creation proposals as well as the ongoing review of Centers and Institutes. This might include consultation with the Research Advisory Council, for example, about proposals for research-centric centers.

Remuneration of the Board members: Current membership on the CIC should not result in any form of remuneration; current board members are not eligible for significant grants or other funding from any WFU center or institute. Such service by a faculty member should be recognized as a part of their annual service contribution to the university.

Conflict of Interest: CIC members who have a conflict of interest with a proposal will recuse themselves from the CIC deliberation on the proposal. A current center or institute director may not serve on the CIC.

4) **Role in Approval Processes**

CIC receives proposals and does a review, with administrative support from the Provost's office. This review will include:

i) Sending the proposal to the Provost's Office for time-limited review and comment ii) Sending the proposal to the Senate for time-limited review and comment iii) Reviewing application as well as comments from the Provost's Office and the Senate

    iv) Recommending approval or disapproval of the application and sending all applications received along with approval/disapproval recommendations and justifications for those recommendations to the Provost's Office. The recommendations of the CIC and its justifications will be shared with the proposing faculty in a timely fashion.

    v) Should the Provost approve a center or institute which the CIC recommended not be approved, the CIC can refer the matter to the Senate Executive Committee, which will have the right to appeal to the President and Board of Trustees.

5) **Role in Evaluation**

Annual: Receive and review the annual report of each center and institute. The CIC delivers the report with its own assessment to the Provost's Office.

Director Review: To be conducted by CIC in the third year of a director's term and every three years thereafter, in collaboration with the Provost's Office. The CIC delivers a report with its own assessment to the Provost's Office. Should the assessments of the CIC and Provost's Office conflict, the CIC may refer the matter to the Senate Executive Committee.

Comprehensive, Five-Year Review: Each active center and institute shall undergo a comprehensive review by the CIC every five (5) years to evaluate ongoing alignment with departmental, college and/or institutional missions and resources, success in accomplishing stated objectives, and sound fiscal status and practices. Criteria for the review process will be delineated clearly and made available to the University community. The CIC will submit a recommendation of renewal or non-renewal to the Provost's Office.

Early Review: The CIC may initiate a comprehensive review at any time for cause. The justification for this unscheduled review must be provided in writing to the Provost's Office and the center or institute director.

Renewal: Following the completion of each comprehensive review, the CIC recommends to the Provost's Office the continuation or discontinuation of each center and institute. If continued, another five-year cycle will begin.

6) **Role in Discontinuing Institutes or Centers:** The President, the Provost, or the CIC may recommend, at any time, the discontinuation of a center or institute. Upon agreement among these three, the dissolution of the center will be undertaken by the Provost's Office; a recommendation to dissolve an institute will be made by the Provost to the President. If approved by the President, it will be submitted to the appropriate trustee committee. A center or institute may be discontinued for a variety of reasons, including but not limited to a lack of financial resources for sustainability, termination of a supporting grant or award,

lack of fit with departmental, college or institutional missions or objectives, or a change in institutional priorities, no longer making sufficient contributions in the areas for which it was created, or, having become defunct or no longer having the support of the participating faculty or the administrator to which it reports.

Upon approval by the Provost (center) or the Board of Trustees (institute), the Office of the President or Provost shall notify the center or institute of the discontinuation of a center of institute prior to discontinuation. Ordinarily, a discontinued institute or center will have one year to complete an orderly dissolution.

Closing a center or institute may involve a substantial degree of administrative effort and the process should follow procedures agreed upon in the document establishing the center or institute with respect to the redirection, redistribution, or disposal of resources and assets (line, equipment, space, funding staff, etc.). Administrative efforts should include:
- i) Completing remaining grant/contract obligations.
- ii) Determining IT transitions (website, databases, servers, etc.). iii) Providing bridging or other transition funds for dislocated staff. iv) Assisting in placement, relocation or outsource activities for affected staff.
- v) Covering tenure obligations to academic faculty partially appointed to the center.
- vi) Decommissioning facilities, especially specialized laboratories.
- vii) Transferring facilities and space back to the University.

7) **Administrative Support:** Administrative support of the work of the CIC will be provided by the Provost's office.

APPENDIX II

2018 Compensation Committee Report to Faculty Senate
April 2018

Salary Comparisons with 9 Joint-Admit Schools
(Davidson, Duke, Emory, Richmond, UNC, UVa, Vanderbilt, W&L, and William and Mary)

PROFESSOR

- 2017-18: -8%   adjusted for CoL: -4%
- 2016-17: -7.4%;   adjusted for CoL: -3.3%
- 2011-12: -2.2%
- 2006-07: -10.6%

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

- 2017-18: -10%   adjusted for CoL: -6%
- 2016-17: -10.7%;   adjusted for CoL: -6.7%
- 2011-12: -2.8%
- 2006-07: -4.1%

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

- 2017-18: -19%   adjusted for CoL: -15%
- 2016-17: -15.3%;   adjusted for CoL: -11.5%
- 2011-12: +1.3%
- 2006-07: -13 %

Salary Comparisons with the Colonial Group
(BC, BU, Brandeis, GW, Lehigh, NYU, Northeastern, SMU, Syracuse, Tufts, Miami, Notre Dame)

PROFESSOR

- 2017-18: -10%   adjusted for CoL: +24%
- 2016-17: -8.1%;   adjusted for CoL: +20.8%

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

- 2017-18: -10 %   adjusted for CoL: +24%
- 2016-17: -10.1%;   adjusted for CoL: +18.4%

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

- 2017-18: -24%   adjusted for CoL: +4%
- 2016-17: -19.5%;   adjusted for CoL: +5.4%

College Only Salary Comparisons with "Comparable" Colleges
(Bryn Mawr, Bowdoin, Davidson, Dickinson, Furman, Kenyon, Pomona, Swarthmore, Williams)

PROFESSOR

- 2017-18: -2%;   adjusted for CoL: +25%
- 2016-17:-2.1%;   adjusted for CoL: +26.9%

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

- 2017-18:-8%   adjusted for CoL: +5%
- 2016-17: -11.5%;   adjusted for CoL: +9.4%

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

- 2017-18: -6%;   adjusted for CoL: +4%
- 2016-17:-4.4%;   adjusted for CoL: +9.2%

Wake Forest University Salaries* (in thousands) Compared with The Colonial Group
2016-17 and 2017-18
Includes Unadjusted _and_ Cost of Living (COL) Adjusted Salary Data

Institution / COL Region	COL Factor†	Professor Unadjusted 2016-17	2017-18	Change	Professor COL Adjusted 2016-17	2017-18	Change	Associate Unadjusted 2016-17	2017-18	Change	Associate COL Adjusted 2016-17	2017-18	Change	Assistant Unadjusted 2016-17	2017-18	Change	Assistant COL Adjusted 2016-17	2017-18	Change
Boston College — Boston, MA	148.2	177.9	182.8	2.8%	120.0	123.3	2.8%	114.5	118.5	3.5%	77.3	80.0	3.5%	105.8	109.3	3.3%	71.4	73.8	3.3%
Boston University — Boston, MA	148.2	177.4	183.6	3.5%	119.7	123.9	3.5%	120.0	124.8	4.0%	81.0	84.2	4.0%	101.1	105.0	3.9%	68.2	70.9	3.9%
Brandeis University — Boston, MA	148.2	148.1	151.9	2.6%	99.9	102.5	2.6%	106.3	108.1	1.7%	71.7	72.9	1.7%	88.5	90.5	2.3%	59.7	61.1	2.3%
George Washington U — Washington, D.C.	155.7	174.6	179.4	2.7%	112.1	115.2	2.7%	115.0	117.0	1.7%	73.9	75.1	1.7%	92.7	96.2	3.8%	59.5	61.8	3.8%
Lehigh University — Scranton, PA	98.5	155.9	159.3	2.2%	158.3	161.7	2.2%	104.3	107.0	2.6%	105.9	108.6	2.6%	97.5	101.1	3.7%	99.0	102.6	3.7%
New York University — New York, NY	238.6	209.7	214.5	2.3%	87.9	89.9	2.3%	122.8	124.9	1.7%	51.5	52.3	1.7%	117.5	115.2	-2.0%	49.2	48.3	-2.0%
Northeastern University — Boston, MA	148.2	175.3	179.9	2.6%	118.3	121.4	2.6%	121.8	124.1	1.9%	82.2	83.7	1.9%	110.7	112.3	1.4%	74.7	75.8	1.4%
Southern Methodist U — Dallas, TX	102.1	159.7	165.7	3.8%	156.4	162.3	3.8%	110.3	110.2	-0.1%	108.0	107.9	-0.1%	99.4	103.7	4.3%	97.4	101.6	4.3%
Syracuse University — Rochester, NY	98.2	134.7	129.9	-3.6%	137.2	132.3	-3.6%	97.7	97.4	-0.3%	99.5	99.2	-0.3%	79.6	80.9	1.6%	81.1	82.4	1.6%
Tufts University — Boston, MA	148.2	152.5	154.4	1.2%	102.9	104.2	1.2%	107.2	109.5	2.1%	72.3	73.9	2.1%	90.5	92.2	1.9%	61.1	62.2	1.9%
Tulane University — New Orleans, LA	101.2	152.3	149.7	-1.7%	150.5	147.9	-1.7%	92.3	92.5	0.2%	91.2	91.4	0.2%	93.2	93.3	0.1%	92.1	92.2	0.1%
Univeristy of Miami — Miami, FL	114.6	165.0	164.2	-0.5%	144.0	143.3	-0.5%	108.3	110.6	2.1%	94.5	96.5	2.1%	98.0	98.2	0.2%	85.5	85.7	0.2%
University of Notre Dame — South Bend, IN	96.0	175.5	180.9	3.1%	182.8	188.4	3.1%	116.6	119.2	2.2%	121.5	124.2	2.2%	104.0	107.0	2.9%	108.3	111.5	2.9%
Wake Forest University — Winston-Salem, NC	92.7	149.3	151.7	1.6%	161.1	163.6	1.6%	98.5	101.9	3.5%	106.3	109.9	3.5%	77.9	76.2	-2.2%	84.0	82.2	-2.2%
MEDIAN (excluding WFU; "Change" median reflects the median of values in column above)		165.0	165.7	2.6%	120.0	123.9	2.6%	110.3	110.6	1.9%	82.2	84.2	1.9%	98.0	101.1	2.3%	74.7	75.8	2.3%
MEAN (excluding WFU; "Change" mean reflects the mean of values in column above)		166.0	168.9	1.6%	130.0	132.0	1.6%	110.5	112.6	1.8%	87.0	88.5	1.8%	98.3	100.4	2.1%	77.5	79.2	2.1%
WFU Deviation from Mean		-10%	-10%		24%	24%		-11%	-10%		22%	24%		-21%	-24%		8%	4%	

Wake Forest University Salaries* (in thousands) Compared with Nine Joint Admittee Institutions
2016-17 and 2017-18
Includes Unadjusted _and_ Cost of Living (COL) Adjusted Salary Data

Institution / COL Region	COL Factor†	Professor Unadjusted 2016-17	2017-18	Change	Professor COL Adjusted 2016-17	2017-18	Change	Associate Unadjusted 2016-17	2017-18	Change	Associate COL Adjusted 2016-17	2017-18	Change	Assistant Unadjusted 2016-17	2017-18	Change	Assistant COL Adjusted 2016-17	2017-18	Change
Davidson — Charlotte, NC	96.2	129.7	130.4	0.5%	134.8	135.6	0.5%	100.6	98.8	-1.8%	104.6	102.7	-1.8%	73.2	74.8	2.2%	76.1	77.8	2.2%
Duke — Durham, NC	90.2	204.2	209.7	2.7%	226.4	232.5	2.7%	134.6	138.8	3.1%	149.2	153.9	3.1%	114.0	114.1	0.1%	126.4	126.5	0.1%
Emory — Atlanta, GA	99.0	172.0	177.3	3.1%	173.7	179.1	3.1%	118.4	122.0	3.0%	119.6	123.2	3.0%	104.9	109.8	4.7%	106.0	110.9	4.7%
Richmond — Richmond, VA	96.1	157.4	158.3	0.6%	163.8	164.7	0.6%	105.7	108.8	2.9%	110.0	113.2	2.9%	88.5	90.9	2.7%	92.1	94.6	2.7%
UNC-Chapel Hill — Chapel Hill, NC	94.0	155.2	159.3	2.6%	165.1	169.5	2.6%	104.9	105.7	0.8%	111.6	112.4	0.8%	91.2	95.7	4.9%	97.0	101.8	4.9%
UVA — Charlottesville, VA	107.8	172.4	177.3	2.8%	159.9	164.5	2.8%	115.7	118.7	2.6%	107.3	110.1	2.6%	96.0	90.6	-5.6%	89.1	84.0	-5.6%
Vanderbilt — Nashville, TN	96.7	190.6	198.8	4.3%	197.1	205.6	4.3%	114.7	119.6	4.3%	118.6	123.7	4.3%	97.0	102.5	5.7%	100.3	106.0	5.7%
Wake Forest — Winston-Salem, NC	92.7	149.3	151.7	1.6%	161.1	163.6	1.6%	98.5	101.9	3.5%	106.3	109.9	3.5%	77.9	76.2	-2.2%	84.0	82.2	-2.2%
Washington and Lee — Lexington, VA	96.1	141.5	145.1	2.5%	147.2	151.0	2.5%	99.6	105.3	5.7%	103.6	109.6	5.7%	83.8	90.1	7.5%	87.2	93.8	7.5%
William & Mary — Hampton Roads-SE VA	100.6	128.6	135.4	5.3%	127.8	134.6	5.3%	99.0	101.3	2.3%	98.4	100.7	2.3%	79.3	75.8	-4.4%	78.8	75.3	-4.4%
MEDIAN (excluding WFU; "Change" median reflects the median of values in column above)		157.4	159.3	2.7%	163.8	164.7	2.7%	105.7	108.8	2.9%	110.0	112.4	2.9%	91.2	90.9	2.7%	92.1	94.6	2.7%
MEAN (excluding WFU; "Change" mean reflects the mean of values in column above)		161.3	165.7	2.7%	166.2	170.8	2.7%	110.4	113.2	2.6%	113.7	116.6	2.6%	92.0	93.8	2.0%	94.8	96.7	2.0%
WFU Deviation from Mean		-7%	-8%		-3%	-4%		-11%	-10%		-7%	-6%		-15%	-19%		-11%	-15%	

Source of Salary Data: The American Association of University Professors, The Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession, 2017-18;

https://www.aaup.org/report/annual-report-economic-status-profession-2017-18

*Salary figures include all non-medical professional schools.

†All salaries are indexed to a national average. COL Factor Source: Cost of Living Index, The Council for Community and Economic Research (C2ER), 2017 Annual Average Data, Published January 2018

Wake Forest COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES Salaries* (in thousands) Compared with Select Institutions
2017-18
Includes Unadjusted and Cost of Living (COL) Adjusted Salary Data

| Institution | COL | Professor | | Associate | | Assistant | |
| | | Unadjusted | COL Adjusted | Unadjusted | COL Adjusted | Unadjusted | COL Adjusted |
COL Region	Factor†	2017-18	2017-18	2017-18	2017-18	2017-18	2017-18
Bryn Mawr							
Philadelphia, PA	117.2	139.6	119.1	97.0	82.8	78.2	66.7
Bowdoin							
Brunswick, ME	113.6	146.6	129.0	107.5	94.6	87.4	76.9
Davidson							
Charlotte, NC	96.2	130.4	135.6	98.8	102.7	74.8	77.8
Dickinson							
York-Hanover, PA	97.1	111.4	114.7	88.5	91.1	72.4	74.6
Furman							
Greenville, SC	94.7	106.9	112.9	79.8	84.3	77.2	81.5
Kenyon							
Columbus, OH	89.7	102.4	114.2	83.5	93.1	68.6	76.5
Pomona							
Los Angeles, CA	148.0	156.5	105.7	114.1	77.1	93.3	63.0
Swarthmore							
Philadelphia, PA	117.2	153.1	130.6	108.7	92.7	84.4	72.0
Williams							
Pittsfield, MA	109.9	146.9	133.7	104.0	94.6	85.4	77.7
Wake Forest COLLEGE							
Winston-Salem, NC	92.7	137.5	148.3	90.5	97.6	73.9	79.7
MEDIAN (excluding WFU)		132.6	121.7	98.0	90.3	80.2	74.1
MEAN (excluding WFU)		139.6	119.1	98.8	92.7	78.2	76.5
WFU Deviation from Mean		-2%	25%	-8%	5%	-6%	4%

Source of Salary Data: The American Association of University Professors, The Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession, 2017-18;
https://www.aaup.org/report/annual-report-economic-status-profession-2017-18

*Salary figures for Wake Forest University reflect only those faculty in the College and the Graduate School of Arts & Sciences

†All salaries are indexed to a national average. COL Factor Source: Cost of Living Index, The Council for Community and Economic Research (C2ER), 2017 Annual Average Data, Published January 2018