

Wake Forest University Faculty Senate Minutes
Wednesday, March 27th 2019
ZSR Library 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, Doug Beets, Steve Boyd, Simone Caron, Anna Cianci, Jay Ford, Anthony Marsh (for Michele Gillespie)*, Nathan Hatch, Omaar Hena, Natalie Holzwarth, Hugh Howards, Ana Iltis, Carrie Johnston, Steve Kelley, Ralph Kennedy, Rogan Kersh*, Christopher Knott, Mark Knudson, Pat Lord, Ellen Makaravage*, Sherry Moss, Wilson Parker, Matthew Phillips, Tim Pyatt*, Wayne Silver, Michelle Steward, Erica Still, Barry Trachtenberg, Neal Walls, Page West

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

1. Call to Order
 - a. President Parker called the meeting to order.
2. Approval of Minutes from February 20, 2019
 - a. The motion to approve the minutes of the February 2019 meeting was made, seconded, and passed.
3. Simone Caron and Mark Knudson: Proposal from the Ad Hoc Committee on Conflicts of Interest Regarding Gifts and Grants [Appendix A]
 - a. After 18 months of work on this document, the committee brings this proposal forward as a seconded motion.
 - b. Discussion included the following points:
 - i. Can a restricted gift remain anonymous if the donor wishes to be unnamed?
 1. Yes, if the committee approves the gift as not hampering academic freedom.
 2. The proposal outlines a process for reviewing the acceptance of gifts so that academic freedom and responsibility are maintained.
 - ii. Has Mark Peterson been consulted on this proposal?
 1. Not specifically, given that this is a Senate matter. However, he was involved in conversations with the committee last year and was favorable to the changes proposed at that time.
 - c. Motion made to move Footnote 1 into the body of the proposal as the final paragraph of section B2.
 1. Motion seconded.
 2. Motion passed: 22 Yays, 1 Nay, 2 Abstentions
 - d. Motion to approve the revised Gift Acceptance Policy passed: 21 Yays, 0 Nays, 4 Abstentions

4. Discussion with President Hatch [see Appendix b for prepared questions from the Senate]
 - a. President Hatch opened his remarks with a statement on diversity and inclusion.
 - i. Better appreciates what some community members are experiencing and is deeply troubled by the ways the University has failed to serve its students of color.
 - ii. Acknowledges that a mistake was made in his acceptance of Martha Allman's apology: not his apology to accept.
 - iii. Affirms his commitment to the infinite dignity of every person and to education as a means of changing attitudes, promoting healing, and fostering transformative dialogue.
 - iv. Affirmed that despite the rise in extremism more broadly, "there is no place on campus for white supremacy," Islamophobia, or anti-Semitism. Likewise, we need to better support Asian students and members of the LGBTQ community.
 - v. Affirmed the need to work together to bridge the gap between our current reality and what we aspire to be.
 - vi. Invited faculty input regarding the establishment of a Presidential Commission on inclusion and reconciliation.
 - b. How is Wake Forest including faculty in its processes for prioritizing initiatives and setting institutional agendas? How are faculty being engaged in identifying budgeting priorities?
 - i. Sometimes planning is comprehensive, such as the revisions in the 2016 Quality Enhancement Plan. Other times planning happens "by opportunity." Examples of such include Wake Downtown, which was made possible due to historic tax credits, and the creation of the Engineering Department.
 - ii. The ongoing curriculum review in the College is an example of faculty involvement.
 - iii. Increased involvement by the Senate in shared governance is welcome. The combined action of the AAUP and the Senate, along with input from the Dean of the College and the Provost, regarding faculty salaries is an example of successful faculty involvement. In response to that effort, a significant increase to the faculty salary pool for the next two years is being recommended to the Board of Trustees.
 - c. In what specific ways is Wake Forest addressing its history of institutionalized racism and the ongoing effects of systemic inequities?
 - i. The "Histories of WFU" project has been underway for the past year addressing stories that have not been told, such as slavery. Wake Forest also joined the Universities Studying Slavery Consortium.
 1. The Histories of WFU project includes several components, including areas such as studying slavery and its legacy at Wake Forest (including, for example, an examination of building names on the Reynolda Campus), collecting oral histories and other primary sources, supporting the work of Andrew Canaday as he writes a history of Wake Forest, and an advisory curriculum group.
 2. This work needs to be made more public, and more faculty need to be invited into the process.
 - ii. The Medical School is also focusing on inclusion through efforts such as intentional mentoring and bias training.
 - d. What models or best practices has Wake Forest consulted in attempting to address the ongoing tensions within the campus climate and to build a more inclusive community?

- i. An internal framework focuses on programming, policy, and practice.
- ii. An external framework being considered is the Truth, Racial Healing, and Transformation model (offered through the AAC&U and supported by the Kellogg Foundation)

e. How is Wake Forest leveraging its recent gains in diversity to create a more inclusive community?

- i. Multiple areas and/or offices are engaged in these efforts:
 - 1. The Chief Diversity Officer position
 - 2. LGBTQ Center & Women's Center
 - 3. Magnolia Scholars Program
 - 4. "Identity" Awareness weeks and/or programming through the Intercultural Center
 - 5. Bias Incident Reporting System
- ii. Additional efforts are underway:
 - 1. The BIRS is being reviewed.
 - 2. A Campus Life staff position is being created focused on supporting international Asian students.
- iii. Social spaces on campus are being reallocated and a streamlined process for chartering student groups is underway. A lounge space has recently been allocated to the Black Student Alliance.
- iv. Intellectual belonging is being supported in various ways:
 - 1. Mentoring programs (for both students and faculty)
 - 2. Departmental Diversity Action Plans
 - 3. Training through the Office of Academic Advising
 - 4. New Faculty Orientation
- v. Residential colleges are also being considered as an alternative way of creating belonging.
 - 1. Dartmouth's model is one that we might learn from for our own efforts.

f. Our social life is organized around Greek life. How can we make social life less Greek?

- i. In 2015 we created a Director of Fraternity and Sorority life position and a subsequent assistant director position.
- ii. In response to concerns voiced by some that the University was "over-disciplining" Greek life, the Greek Life Advisory Committee is working with outside consultants, alumni, faculty, staff, and students to examine Greek life comprehensively.

g. How is the University negotiating external pressures?

- i. We are in a capital campaign and there is rarely a situation where there are strings attached to gifts. Our donors understand that academic freedom is key to the University. Occasionally, donors want to give restricted gifts, in which cases the University works carefully through those complications.

h. How is the University maintaining its emphasis on the teacher-scholar model and supporting its academic mission?

- i. Though the specific implementation of the model looks different across the schools, at the core a good balance between teaching and research remains. The core identity remains focused on "brilliant faculty deeply committed to students." We are unique among top 30 schools in our focus on being teacher-scholars (rather than scholar-teachers).

- ii. Academic units participate in decision-making based on department needs. Faculty and student momentum drives these decisions.
- iii. Despite the increased professionalization of undergraduate education, Wake Forest is doing reasonably well attracting students beyond that narrow focus. Its vibrant departments across the liberal arts helps make this possible, as does the OPCD and its focus on creating professional paths not bound by one's major.
 - i. How is Wake Forest supporting students' civic involvement?
 - i. There are 130 community partners and 82 individuals that engage in community engagement work. Examples include: pro bono law work, the Freedom School, clinician care, CHANGE program, Campus Kitchen, and Boston Thurmond initiatives
 - ii. The Provost's office is considering producing a fuller report of these activities.
 - iii. Wake Forest did not meet the deadline for providing students with Voter IDs because the law requires that the institution take the students' pictures, but we currently allow students to submit their own pictures. The system will be in place by 2020. .

Questions from the floor: (Some responses given by the Provost [Rogan Kersh] and Chief Diversity Officer [Jose' Villalba]):

What are your thoughts on creating an African American studies program?

- Starting new programs is challenging, and the initiative would need to be led by faculty. However, Dr. Hatch would support this effort.

Is it possible for the school or the senate to get information about the Histories of WFU? Can faculty get involved?

- Yes, communication about this initiative will continue to be improved. Provost Kersh invites folks to contact José Villalba or Kami Chavis if they are interested in participating as the work moves forward.

The WFU board of trustees has a student member, would you support a faculty member on the board?

- Dr. Hatch stated that this structure is not typical of most universities, and we should be mindful of best practices. Nevertheless, it is worth consideration.

Departments were asked to create diversity action plans. Is there is University wide diversity action plan? (response given by José Villalba)

- The Office of Diversity and Inclusion has created a new staff position with responsibility for overseeing the development of DAPs across the University. This staff member will help units to develop plans and programs, to increase transparency, and build capacity for more individuals across the institution to actively engage in the work of fostering inclusion.

We have had target of opportunity/cluster hires. Will there be more support for such hires moving forward? Sociology was afforded the opportunity to do cluster hiring and there has been research in their discipline that supports this work. If there is not a plan to provide funds on the department level how can we move the needle on faculty diversity hires? (response given by Jose' Villalba)

- The research on cluster hires is mixed, so more thought will have to be given to the practice here. The new faculty cohort beginning in 2018 was more diverse than our

incoming student class (with the exception of the medical school). Retention of faculty is equally important, and we currently have solid retention numbers.

Are there any dedicated positions for internal communications at WFU?

- There are some folks in CER (Cheryl Walker, in particular) who work on individual communications. Some individual schools have hired communications specialists.

The bias reporting system was a cause of concern at the community forum (on Feb 21, 2019). The system needs greater clarity and transparency. What is being done to address that?

- The bias reporting system is housed under Campus Life. The forum brought to light that students do not know what happens to those who submit reports. The system provides care and support anyone filing a report. Because the BIRS is not a system of accountability, if appropriate, cases are referred to established systems of accountability (usually the Conduct System or HR).
- Regarding transparency, one challenge is the confidential nature of conduct and HR cases. Ways of reporting on the work of the BIRS without breaching confidentiality needs to be done.
- Matt Clifford and Tanya Jachimiak have been delegated to chair a committee investigating the intersection of bias, expression, and student conduct, and that committee will be helpful in further addressing concerns about the BIRS. Faculty are invited to speak with Jose if they are interested in working with this committee.

Has there been a conversation on KA specifically?

- KA as a national organization has removed confederate symbols from their organization.
 - Two faculty members made the point that KA continues to highlight Robert E. Lee as an important figure for them.
- Work with Tim Wilkinson and Betsy Adams to address questions of diversity and equity in Greek life will continue.

By not holding the KAs responsible, are we sending a message that powerful white people are being protected by other powerful white people?

- If any current members of KA are causing harm it will be handled immediately.
 - A faculty member made the point that faculty are calling for action holding the *group*, not just individuals, accountable.

What would have been a better response to Martha Allman's apology?

- Dr. Hatch acknowledged that he should not have accepted the apology, as he could not speak on behalf of affected parties. He does not believe that she should be fired or asked to resign. Martha Allman is herself meeting with students as well.

What are the long-term plans for distributing the information uncovered by the Histories of Wake Forest project? What will be the outcomes?

- Three subgroups have been formed to examine
 - The original campus and the history of slavery
 - The history of the move to Winston Salem and the use of underpaid laborers
 - The educational possibilities coming out of the project
- This kind of work, which has been underway for the past three years, is slow moving but the intention hasn't been to do it secretly. There is opportunity to expand the group of those directly involved.

What is the diversity competence of the CER staff? Who are their responses for? Is the goal to keep things as quiet as possible?

- One challenge in our context is that every communication is for everyone. The issues raised are fair for us to consider.

Dr. Hatch thanked the senate for questions and thoughts. He is open to holding appointments with anyone who is interested.

5. President Parker

- The senate can serve as a clearing house for faculty, which will allow for more effective communication with and between faculty and the administration. We will continue to work toward this goal.

6. Meeting adjourned

Appendix A [of Senate Minutes]

Final Resolutions on COI/GAC

Introduction

In 2018, the WFU Faculty Senate passed the resolution that the President of the Senate will be added as a permanent member of the Gift Acceptance Committee (GAC). Also in 2018, the Faculty Senate charged a sub-committee to “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” (Senate Minutes, April 18, 2018).

The enclosed resolutions strengthen faculty governance and the decision-making processes of the GAC and fully adhere to AAUP guidelines on academy-industry alliances, the American Council on Education, the Association of Governing Boards’ statement on governance of colleges and universities, SACSCOC accreditation standards, and follow best practices of peer universities such as Cornell University’s faculty document on *Best Practices Concerning Strategic Corporate Alliances*.

Terminology

The WFU usage as defined in Appendix A of the 2013 WFU Gift Acceptance Policy (GAP) notes that:

A **gift** is defined as “a voluntary, irrevocable transfer of cash or other assets to Wake Forest University without consideration of compensation at the time of transfer or any time in the future” (2013 GAP, p. 13).

A **restricted gift** is defined as “a gift made with conditions imposed by the donor; such a gift may be for current, endowment, or capital use. Burdensome conditions may require that the University decline a restricted gift” (ibid, p. 14). See discussion of “problematic gift” below.

A **grant** is defined as “an allocation of assets to Wake Forest University from a foundation, corporation, or government agency. Usually, a grant is made for a specific purpose, for a defined

period of time, and delineated by a formal agreement between the University and the donor. It is usually subject to reporting requirements” (ibid, p. 13).

Current Gift Acceptance Policy Statements Concerning Faculty Governance

The current GAP includes issues of faculty governance and the related domains of academic freedom and responsibility in five main categories. The recommendations submitted to the Faculty Senate for review intend to strengthen current GAP guidelines by applying a robust model of faculty governance to each step of gift acceptance and review oversight in these five domains in accordance with WFU Policy Resolution 3.2.1-3.2.3 regarding the sharing of faculty academic and governance authority with university governing boards and administrators.

1. “Problematic Gift” Clause

The definition of problematic gifts (p. 3) include the following areas of donor influence that affect the integrity of faculty governance:

endowment for courses that are not academic priorities;
new institutes or centers that are not academic priorities;
new programs that are not academic priorities;
new facilities that are not academic priorities;
unacceptable restrictions on academic freedom and responsibility.

2. Access or Disclosure to Employees Clause

GAP explicitly notes that “gift records at WFU ... may... be accessed or disclosed to employees with a need to know the information.” (p.3).

3. Undue Burden Clause

GAP Guidelines stipulate that “no gift will be accepted that would constitute an undue burden on the University.”(p. 9) Undue burdens listed in the documents that affect faculty governance and academic freedom and responsibility include, but are not limited to:

“matching” requirements
commitment to continue a project after a gift has been terminated or exhausted
financing and/or administering a project outside of the routine functions of the University or outside its mission.

4. Responsibility to Clearly and Regularly Communicate GAP

GAP guidelines stipulate that “Director, Department Head, or Dean [...] communicate(s) the GAP and related policies to faculty and staff (an annual distribution is recommended)” (p.10) and that “appropriate review procedures to ensure compliance with GAP” are put into place (p.10).

5. Role of University President

GAP states that “final responsibility for acceptance of all gifts rests with the President” (p.11).

Recommendations for Faculty Governance in Implementing GAC

A. Formation of an Ad Hoc Sub-Committee of CAFR (“Sub-Committee”).

The existing standing *Committee for Academic Freedom and Responsibility* (CAFR), whose membership is constituted by representatives from each of the six schools of the University and the Library, will be charged on an ad hoc basis to support the work of the COI/GAC process as the overall focus on academic freedom and responsibility constitutes the mission of CAFR. A subcommittee of CAFR will be formed to include one representative from each of the six schools of the University and the Library. These representatives will be selected by the senators and the CAFR chairperson.

B. Purpose, Role, and Function of the Committee

The purpose of the committee is to protect academic freedom and responsibility and to exercise the faculty powers and duties as stipulated in the WFU faculty handbook. Following the current GAP references to faculty governance domains as noted above, areas of faculty concern include donor restrictions on or influence in hiring of staff and/or faculty; recruitment; curriculum; and/or donor restrictions on the ownership of research data, findings, publications and/or presentations. If the faculty recipient at any point believes a conflict of interests arises or academic freedom and responsibility is threatened, the faculty member will contact CAFR.

(1) For any gift over \$50,000 and when any member of the GAC (including the Senate president) raises a concern about academic freedom and responsibility as identified in Appendix A, the GAC shall refer to CAFR all such donor agreements. The subcommittee will review and submit its analysis to GAC and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for any gift proposal that impacts curricular and research domains, as set forth in subsection (1). 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.

(2) In line with the current GAP that “gift records at WFU ... may...be accessed or disclosed to employees with a need to know the information.” (p.3), the subcommittee has also the right to request further information to make their decision. In the spirit of this

guiding principle and to ensure full transparency, should a gift or grant larger than \$50,000 be accepted, it will be prominently displayed in all communications referencing use of this gift (research, conferences, websites, etc.). Such disclosure has become the industry standard, or, according to the AAUP, a “standard of sound academic practice.” AAUP Foundation, Recommended Principles to Guide Academy-Industry Relationships (Washington DC: University of Illinois Press, 2014)

(3) 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 within a reasonable period of time. Confidentiality will be maintained throughout this step of the process.

(4) The sub-committee will make their decision related to the acceptability or problematic nature of the gift known within thirty days of receiving all requested information. The decision will be shared with the GAC and the Senate Executive Committee.

(5) The sub-committee will meet with the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs to share, discuss, and if necessary, amend core documents and guidelines affecting domains of faculty primacy with the purpose of ensuring that ORSP and GAC/COI are fully aligned according to the guidelines and principles expressed in this document.

(6) If the GAC or the President of the University accepts the gift against the recommendation of the CAFR Subcommittee, the President of the Senate will make that fact known to the full Senate because of grave concerns that could compromise Wake Forest University’s standing with SACSCOC, its academic reputation, and the public trust.

Appendix A

Contractual Concerns in Donor Agreements: Ensuring University Primacy in the Protection of Academic Freedom and Responsibility

To comply with faculty primacy in the areas listed below, no restricted gift with **contractual concerns** shall be accepted by GAC without an extensive review of the CAFR faculty subcommittee. The CAFR subcommittee review is to be submitted in written form and will comprehensively address all areas of contractual concern listed below.

The Senate President, as a permanent member of GAC, must immediately notify the Senate of the need to establish the Ad Hoc CAFR sub-committee if the gift agreement includes any of the criteria listed below.

A. Contractual Concerns Related to University Governance

Faculty Status

Has the university reserved full governance to enforce and monitor standard university procedures in hiring and recruiting, appointing or selecting, terminating, and annually reviewing faculty fellows and faculty (including but not limited to short-term appointments, tenure track, tenured, and leadership positions) that are funded by the donor contract?

Curriculum Development

Is the university faculty granted full governance according to its powers and duties in the educational and curricular domains of the contract?

Research Data, Findings, Publications and/or Presentations

Are faculty granted full ownership of research data and findings? Are faculty granted unrestricted rights to publish and present their research data?

Conflict of Interest

Has the university, including its faculty, centers, programs, and institutes, reserved full governance in publicizing donor identity and amount of grant or gift to avoid any appearance of conflict of interest?

B. Contractual Concerns Related to Donor Influence and Prerogatives

Faculty Status

Does the contract require the university to take responsibility for paying for faculty fellows, short- term appointments, tenure-track and tenured faculty positions if the donor rescinds agreement to pay for such positions on short notice?

Does the donor make the donation dependent upon donor choice of faculty and/or faculty fellows, including faculty leadership?

Review Process

Does the donor reserve final decisions for advisory board membership and review of advisory board activities?

Does the donor stipulate approval of the outcome of regular university faculty and faculty fellows review procedures?

Curriculum Development

Does the donor retain sole control/approval rights over educational and curricular programs?

Does the gift mandate funding for courses, programs, centers, institutes, or facilities that are not academic priorities?

Research Data, Findings, Publications and/or Presentations

Does the donor in any way restrict faculty ownership of research data and findings, and their right to publish and present their research data as they choose?

Conflict of Interest

Has the donor unduly limited the right to publicize donor identity and amount of a restricted gift?

Appendix B [of Senate Minutes]

March 21, 2019

Dear President Hatch:

The Faculty Senate is pleased to have you join us on Wednesday, March 27, 2019 for what we expect to be a rich and productive conversation. Under the leadership of Senate President Wilson Parker, the Senate has continued its work to ensure that Wake Forest University remains an institution of integrity and excellence in its teaching, research, and service. In recognition of the opportunity and responsibility inherent in that work, we have focused much of our attention this year on clarifying both the vision and practice of shared governance—we are examining our own expectations and procedures for sustaining a fruitful working relationship with the senior administrative leadership and the Board of Trustees.

Now more than ever, we hold participation in the shared governance of Wake Forest University as a critical function of the Senate, and therefore we are deeply committed to identifying areas where we can bring the expertise, experience, and engagement of the faculty to bear on institutional decisions. We seek to be active partners in the shaping and leadership of our

academic community, and in that spirit, we present the following questions for dialogue. We are confident that together we can continue to fulfill the vision and potential of Wake Forest as a place of inclusive community, intellectual rigor, and intentional service to the greater good.

A. Shared Governance and Decision-Making

1. How is Wake Forest including faculty in its processes for prioritizing initiatives and setting institutional agendas? How are faculty being engaged in identifying budgeting priorities?

i. For example, how does the process for determining administrative and faculty salaries provide opportunity for greater faculty input? What processes are in place for the acceptance of gifts and grants related to the academic mission of Wake Forest? How can the Senate's Resources, Compensation, and Fringe Benefits standing committees be consulted in such practices? How can the faculty be in better conversation and collaboration with the Board of Trustees?

B. Inclusion & Accountability

2. In what specific ways is Wake Forest addressing its history of institutionalized racism and the ongoing effects of systemic inequities? Who is involved in these particular (and appropriately varied) initiatives, and who else might be brought into such efforts? What is Wake Forest doing to be increasingly proactive in fulfilling its responsibility for confronting both historical and contemporary instances of oppression, discrimination, bias, and inequity?

i. For example, how are faculty being invited into the work now underway as part of the institution's participation in the Universities Studying Slavery (USS) Consortium? What resources are being expended, in terms of both personnel and financial commitments? What is the expected outcome—how will the findings of that historical uncovering be documented and distributed? What is the anticipated timeline for the work and its completion?

3. What models or best practices has Wake Forest consulted in attempting to address the ongoing tensions within the campus climate and to build a more inclusive community?

Where and/or to whom are we looking for insight and ideas? What are we learning from those sources and how are we working to adapt such models to fit our own particular context?

i. For example, where might we find examples of successful truth-seeking and reckoning with troubling historical remnants such as yearbook photos? Are there processes for communal forums or conversations that might be utilized here?

4. How is Wake Forest leveraging its recent gains in diversity (as represented by increased numbers of students and faculty from a range of underrepresented groups) to create a more vibrant, inclusive community—one that goes beyond merely sharing a campus? How are we defining "inclusion" and how are we actively working to increase it? What

specific programs, policies, and behaviors are being developed and engaged to facilitate a sense of belonging for the entire population working, learning, and living in this shared space?

i. For example, how are policies regarding available social spaces being examined and reimagined to better support a broad range of student groups and activities? How are academic programs being supported in creating spaces of intellectual belonging? How are faculty being supported in mentoring students who have traditionally been overlooked and/or underserved? How are faculty themselves being mentored?

5. What is Wake Forest doing to identify and mitigate the harm perpetuated by systems such as Greek life (though certainly such harm is not exclusive to these organizations)?

i. For example, how are faculty being engaged in reviews of the Greek organizations on campus, and what weight are those reviews given in decisions about ongoing campus affiliations? What systems are in place for examining the social inequities, sexual misconduct, and racial and gender exclusions often created and sustained by Greek organizations?

6. How is Wake Forest wrestling with the tensions inherent in addressing the expectations of external influences (alumni, donors, potential applicants, etc.) while remaining forward-looking and courageous in its pursuit of excellence and inclusion? When the desires and pressures of external influences, generally well-intentioned as they may be, conflict with the vision Wake Forest has cast for itself, what priorities and standards are we using in our decision-making?

i. For example, how is Wake Forest negotiating its relationship with organizations, especially those with strong ties to the institution, that have histories of exclusion and/or various forms of harm? Are such organizations being required, or even encouraged, to conduct their own truth-seeking and reckoning processes? How is Wake Forest exercising integrity in its acceptance and management of external influences, whether they be financial or social, private or public?

C. Academic Vision and Priority Setting

7. How is Wake Forest working to integrate its various educational opportunities so that it maintains its strengths as a place of both teaching and research? How are the academic units being represented in the decision-making, especially regarding the institution's academic priorities and future?

i. For example, in the midst of increasing focus on the professionalization of undergraduate education, what is Wake Forest doing to keep the values of a liberal arts education at the heart of its mission? How are faculty being engaged in the decision-making process regarding the expansion of online education at Wake Forest? How are the long term needs of our graduate programs being considered and met?

D. Civic Responsibility

8. How is Wake Forest using its resources to support students' civic engagement?

i. For example, while Duke and UNC were able to achieve compliance with new voter ID laws by the March 13th deadline, Wake Forest was not. What are we doing, therefore, to ensure that students who wish to participate in the 2020 elections are able to do so?

As we hope is apparent in the forward-looking and action-focused nature of these questions, the Faculty Senate remains committed to sustaining Wake Forest's culture of continuous growth and improvement. That calls for honest reckoning with our histories, bold engagement with our current challenges, and visionary leadership into our future. All of our resources will be necessary for such an ambitious effort. In that spirit, we stand as ready and willing partners in the work of shared governance.

Thank you,

The Faculty Senate