

**Wake Forest University Faculty Senate Minutes**  
**Wednesday, April 24th 2019**  
Tribble Hall, DeTamble Auditorium

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

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

**In Attendance:** Jane Albrecht, Steve Boyd, Arjun Chatterjee, Christine Coughlin, Jay Ford, Omaar Hena, Allyn Howlett\*, Ana Iltis, Carrie Johnston, Steve Kelley, Rogan Kersh\*, Christopher Knott, Ellen Makaravage\*, Ananda Mitra, Wilson Parker, Matthew Phillips, Tim Pyatt\*, Sarah Raynor, Michelle Steward, Erica Still, Barry Trachtenberg, Neal Walls, Lisa Washburn

(\*) denotes non-voting members

19 voting members in attendance, a quorum

1. Call to Order
  - a. President Parker called the meeting to order.
  - b. There was not a quorum at this point in the meeting.
2. Matthew Phillips: Report, Ad Hoc Committee on Administrator Evaluation
  - a. In response to the Faculty Senate resolution of April 2018, an ad hoc committee was created to investigate and recommend best practices regarding faculty evaluation of administrators. The presented report outlines the committee's work and final recommendations. [SUBMITTED REPORT: APPENDIX A]
  - b. Major finding:
    - i. Wake Forest University currently conducts administrator evaluations at or exceeding levels of best practices.
  - c. Further action:
    - i. The ad hoc committee recommends no further or additional action by the Faculty Senate.
3. Matthew Phillips: Report and Motion, Compensation Committee on Peer School Selection Process
  - a. In response to concerns regarding the various methods by which peer schools were identified (which seemed to serve different interests at different times), the compensation committee undertook the effort to identify and present a more

relevant, reliable, and standardized process. The presented report outlines the committee's work and proposed action. [SUBMITTED REPORT: APPENDIX B]

- b. Motion: That the Senate approve the committee's proposed method of identifying peer schools so that the compensation committee can then use it to generate a reasonably objective and relevant list of peer schools.
  - i. Conversation included the following points:
    - 1. A member noted that it is necessary to acknowledge that even this mathematical equation is not without a degree of subjectivity, and therefore it should be understood as a good but not imperfect model.
    - 2. Should the model be accompanied by "expertise in the room" (in other words, should the list generated by the model be adjusted according to faculty input)?
      - a. Response: the criteria outlined by the AAUP, IR, and Senate feedback already accounts for faculty input
    - 3. Should the model be used as a starting point, with adjustments made to the list as the results are produced?
      - a. Response: important to be careful about not creating shifting baselines, which would work to nullify the degree of objectivity achieved by the new process
    - 4. This proposed mechanism helps to give a name and method to work that has been done in uneven and varied ways for the last 20 years. It should be employed for 5 (or so) years before significant adjustments are made.
  - ii. Quorum was established at 4:56pm
  - iii. Motion was seconded and voted on
    - 1. Yes (approve the model): 17
    - 2. No (do not approve the model): 0
    - 3. Abstentions: 3
  - iv. Motion approved
  - v. Further action: Matthew Phillips agreed to have IR initiate the model and produce the list. [results included in final report, which is appendix B]

4. Wilson Parker: Approval of Minutes from March 27, 2019 meeting

- a. Motion seconded
- b. Motion approved

5. Wilson Parker: Report & Motion, Nominations Committee Ballot for Officers

- a. Paper ballots distributed, with results to be tallied post-meeting

6. Wilson Parker: Year in Review

- a. Senate Executive Committee has tried, particularly through the retreat in February, to assess where the Faculty Senate is regarding its institutional practices and effectiveness. A central focus was increasing faculty involvement in

shared governance in meaningful ways. Several important points came out of that work:

- i. Review of and recommendations for Senate representation on and interactions with the Board of Trustees
- ii. Degree of awareness and/or confusion about the Senate's role in shared governance; need to build better levels of communication with constituents
- iii. Need for increased "institutional discipline" within the Faculty Senate, such that work is assigned to particular roles, rather than individuals (who often take on projects, beyond their assigned duties, for the good of the group)
  1. In light of this need, President Parker called for an ad hoc committee to review the Senate by-laws and make appropriate recommendations for strengthening its organization, practice, and effectiveness
  2. Response: Steve Boyd, Steve Kelley, Erica Still volunteered to serve on such a committee
- iv. Need to consider a policy regarding the role of Senators who are appointed to (temporary) administrative positions during their term in the Senate
- v. Updates regarding the proposal put forward by the Gift Acceptance Committee (GAC) will be provided in Fall 2019
- vi. Need to consider how to make the Resources Committee more meaningful, perhaps by implementing a resources advisory group, for example
- vii. Imperative to be reflective about Senate practices and to think broadly and creatively in order to achieve goals and aims in the best interest of the university

7. Wilson Parker: Adjournment

- a. Motion to adjourn made and seconded
- b. Meeting adjourned

## **APPENDIX A: COMPENSATION COMMITTEE REPORT ON ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION**

Faculty Senate

Ad Hoc Committee on Administrator Evaluation

### **Report: Administrator Evaluation at Wake Forest**

In April 2018, the Faculty Senate adopted the following resolution:

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.

Because the resolution had relatively few guidelines or particulars, Senate President Wilson Parker established an ad hoc committee to explore best practices, current university processes, and consider patterns for the evaluation imagined in the resolution. The members of this committee are Steve Kelley (ZSR), Matthew Phillips (Business, chair), Stephen Robinson (Math), and Amy Wallis (Business, advisory to the Senate).

The Committee reviewed current practices at Wake Forest, consulted with Dr Wallis (whose industry experience and academic training includes performance management), and collected best practices information from several schools traditionally listed as Wake Forest peers.

- Administrative review components should be useful to the reviewed individual and to other administrators (a real review process).
- Faculty feedback should be relevant to what faculty can effectively evaluate (e.g. faculty engagement rather than fundraising).
- Faculty involvement should overlay easily onto current performance measurement and should not create requirements for onerous new faculty service.

### Industry Standards

- Numerous tools exist for determining the appropriate categories for review and then for rating reviewed individuals.
- Best practices would mandate that performance review results should be confidential (and thus focused on development).
- Review should happen in conversation with the published/accepted job description to preserve the value of the reviews and provide productive feedback.

### Peer School information

- Duke University: appointed committees (including faculty) are appointed to conduct reviews in the 4th year of a 5 year contract period.
- Notre Dame: An open survey, available to the full community, is part of each administrative review, so there is no particular provision for faculty voice.
- University of California system: a survey is conducted of department chairs.
- University of Miami: regular faculty (tenured and tenure-track) fill out review forms for the deans and provost on 4-year cycles per the UM faculty manual (SS A 13.5—13.10).
- University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill: an appointed faculty committee conducts a review in the fourth year of a five year period; each committee is appointed specifically for the reviewed administrator.
- Washington & Lee University: a committee of elected faculty control the evaluation process for all administrators, who are on 4 year cycles. Faculty in each division give feedback on the respective deans, and the faculty committee synthesizes with interviews to develop a report. Surveys for the provost's review go to all faculty. The president is not reviewed in this process.
- Tufts, University of Virginia, William & Mary: there is no established process for faculty review.
- Summary of peer school best practices: a contract period review that includes faculty perspective, sometimes featuring survey responses. These reviews are managed administratively.

### AAUP Guidelines

- The AAI.JP has a site on faculty evaluation of administrators.

### Summary of Collected Data

- Universal surveys (i.e. of all faculty) would require significant oversight, likely by a new appointed faculty committee, and would provide minimal benefit over a sampling

approach. This approach violates our standards because (1) it would not overlay onto the current process easily and (2) it would create onerous new requirements for faculty service.

- Review processes fall into a matrix of options:

	Universal (all faculty)	Sampled (subgroup of faculty)
Annual review	[Apparent intent of Senate]	
Periodic (Yr 4/5) Review	[Minority of peers]	[Majority of peers] [Committee's view of best practice]

#### Annual reviews

Each dean prepares an academic plan annually with 1-, 3-, and 5-year windows, containing about 30 pages of explanation and support.

- The review culminates in a 2-hour meeting with Provost in the summer.
- Academic plans contain specific questions about faculty climate and how the dean is collecting and assessing faculty feedback.

#### Contract period reviews

- Sara King, formerly of the Center for Creative Leadership, conducts a 360<sup>o</sup> evaluation in the next-to-last year of administrative contracts (typically at the beginning of the 5th year of a 5 year contract) per contract terms.
- The review includes detailed conversations with other administrators, faculty (including, in most cases, a member of the faculty senate), and outside peers. The resulting report goes to the reviewed individual, that person's supervisor, and is further distributed in consultation with those two people.

#### HERI Survey

- Wake Forest takes part in the Higher Education Research Initiative (HERI) Faculty Survey, which includes pedagogical practices, views on institutional priorities, campus climate, and areas for growth and improvement for the institution and its leaders.
  - HERI results (including Wake Forest data and data from other participating institutions) are assembled by the assistant provost for institutional research and shared with campus leadership.
- The HERI survey was last distributed to faculty in 2017. It is distributed every 2—3 years. The university also participates in the ModernThink Great Colleges survey.

## **Informal Data-Gathering**

The Provost attends (1) every Faculty Senate meeting, (2) every College faculty meeting, and (3) at least one faculty meeting each year for each professional school.

The Committee finds that Wake Forest University currently has a best-practices-level process for faculty involvement in the review of administrators that ensures faculty voice and maximizes the quality and usability of feedback.

The industry and peer school best practices suggest that it is appropriate to have:

- One comprehensive review at the contract period (in the 4th or 5th year of a 5-year contract). Wake Forest conducts reviews in the 5th year, including a 360° interview process administered by an external professional.
- Faculty involvement in the review process. Faculty members, and where possible a member of the faculty senate, are involved in every administrative review. • Opportunities for broader data-gathering about performance and/or organizational climate. Wake Forest participates in the HERI Faculty Survey and uses other tools to gain broad information. Deans are also specifically asked about faculty climate at each annual review.

Wake Forest's current processes are professionally conducted and designed for maximum utility (in terms of feedback to the reviewed administrator) and minimal costs to faculty as participants in the process (avoiding, for example, the onerous burden that faculty carry at schools where the entire process is managed by faculty).

The ad hoc committee finds that Wake Forest's current processes substantially fulfill or exceed the standards hoped for in last year's resolution. The committee recommends no further legislative action by the faculty senate. The committee applauds the faculty senate volunteers who have taken an active role in administrative reviews in the past and who will continue to do so in the future.

Respectfully submitted:

Steve Kelley  
Matthew Phillips, chair  
Stephen Robinson  
Amy Wallis

## **APPENDIX B: COMPENSATION COMMITTEE, PEER SCHOOL SELECTION PROCESS**

### **Compensation Committee Final Report: Peer School Process**

#### **Issue**

The Compensation Committee's primary charge is to gather data and report to the Senate on compensation, contextualized with data from peer institutions. Peer salary data is used for a wide range of purposes on the campus, but the Compensation Committee shares the concerns raised by others in the past year that the peer school grouping may not be effectively identified.

Over the past few decades, Wake Forest has used a small group of peer school lists ("Cross-Admits," "The Colonial Group," "IPEDS Comparison Group," and a more recent draft list created by the Office of the Dean of the College that is a composite of the others). The nature of these lists and the schools included on them is, of course, critical to the integrity of salary comparison data.

#### **Process**

The Compensation Committee, in consultation with AAUP representatives and Phil Handwerk, the assistant provost for institutional research, determined that it would be appropriate to develop a new peer group.

The AAUP has presented on the topic of peer group identification, suggesting a list of factors that should be used to identify peers (that list is represented in the table below).

In conversation with Phil Handwerk, the compensation committee learned about a unique approach to identifying peer schools that would use this AAUP list (and other data that we believe to be important) in order to create a list. School data, which is available through the Department of Education's Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System ("IPEDS"), could be compared across multiple dimensions to derive a Euclidean distance between Wake Forest and other institutions, leading to a ranking of institutional similarity from which the top 12–20 schools could be culled as a data-supported peer group.

This multi-dimensional comparison allows us to find institutions that "feel" like Wake Forest in many ways, not just cross-admits or some other single comparison point.

Once the algorithm is run to develop the "closest" comparable schools for Wake Forest, that will be our peer list, and salary comparisons can then be derived from AAUP's collected data.

#### **Comparison Factors and Weighting Recommendations**

The following list shows the comparison factors suggested by AAUP (which is not tied to the data fields used in IPEDS), along with additional fields suggested by the Committee members and the administration.

IPEDS data was pulled for U.S. degree-granting Public 4-year or above and Private not-for-profit 4 year and above institutions (n=2400). Where possible, data was pulled from 2017, 2016,



and 2015 and then averages (to eliminate irregularities for any one particular year at any one particular school).

The Committee met to determine recommended weightings for each variable. The approach was to weight most highly (a multiple of three) those factors which are most typical in University peer studies and evaluations. The next category (standard weight, or a multiple of two) was used for factors that get at the core feeling and character of Wake Forest. Additional criteria, which were determined to be relevant but less critical in distinguishing this University from others, were weighted at a multiple of one.

1. Highest Weight (x3)
  - a. Undergraduate Tuition and Fees
  - b. Student Headcount
  - c. Full-Time to Part-Time Ratio of Instructional Faculty
  - d. Percentage of Undergraduate Full-Time Equivalent ("FTE") Students
  - e. Endowment per FTE
  - f. Admissions Yield Rates (Selectivity)
2. Standard Weight (x2)
  - a. Percentage of Direct Instructional Expenditure
  - b. Percentage Minority
  - c. Percentage on Institutional Grant Aid
  - d. Percentage of Faculty on Tenure Track
  - e. Research Priority (% Total Core Expenses)
  - f. Percentage International Students
  - g. Percent Undergraduates who are First-Time, Full-Time, Degree Seeking
  - h. Percent of Degrees in Humanities
3. Low Weight (x1)
  - a. Retention Rate
  - b. Six-Year Graduation Rate
  - c. Number of Degrees Awarded
  - d. Percentage on Student Loans
  - e. Percentage on Pell Grant
  - f. Percent of Degrees in Business
  - g. Percent of Degrees in Social Sciences
  - h. Percent of Degrees in Education
  - i. Percent of Degrees in STEM

## **Resulting Peer Set**

During the Faculty Senate meeting on Wednesday, April 24, 2019, the Senate voted to accept the process and weighting recommendations above as recommended by the Compensation Committee. After the meeting, Matthew Phillips confirmed the recommended weightings in the model and ran the distance

sorting. The following list resulted. The peer list is the top 15 (15 was the default number and is reconfirmed in the analysis because it's also the natural break in Euclidean distances between 12 and 20). For reference, comparison to previous peer lists is included.

Peer Rank	Institution	Squared Euclidean Distance	Hist. Cross-Admits	Colonial Group	IPEDS Comp. Group	2017 ODOC Draft List
0	Wake Forest University	0				
1	Dartmouth College	13				
2	Tufts University	15				
3	Vanderbilt University	16				
4	Southern Methodist University	16				
5	University of Richmond	16				
6	University of Miami	17				
7	Lehigh University	18				
8	University of Notre Dame	19				
9	Brown University	19				
10	Pepperdine University	20				
11	American University	20				
12	Emory University	21				
13	Tulane University of Louisiana	21				
14	Santa Clara University	21				
15	Brandeis University	21				

**Wake Forest University Salaries\* (in thousands) Compared with University Senate Selected Peers 2017-18 and 2018-19**  
**Includes Unadjusted and Cost of Living (COL) Adjusted Salary Data**

Institution	COL Region	COL Factor†	Professor						Associate						Assistant					
			Unadjusted		COL Adjusted				Unadjusted		COL Adjusted				Unadjusted		COL Adjusted			
			2017-18	2018-19	Change	2017-18	2018-19	Change	2017-18	2018-19	Change	2017-18	2018-19	Change	2017-18	2018-19	Change	2017-18	2018-19	Change
American University	Washington, D.C.	162.6	166.4	172.8	3.8%	102.3	106.3	3.8%	108.4	110.2	1.7%	66.7	67.8	1.7%	87.6	91.5	4.5%	53.9	56.3	4.5%
Brandeis University	Boston, MA	150.0	151.9	158.3	4.2%	101.3	105.5	4.2%	108.1	112.7	4.3%	72.1	75.1	4.3%	90.5	93.1	2.9%	60.3	62.1	2.9%
Brown University	Providence, RI	122.3	183.9	187.7	2.1%	150.4	153.5	2.1%	120.1	124.4	3.6%	98.2	101.7	3.6%	97.4	99.7	2.4%	79.6	81.5	2.4%
Dartmouth College	Manchester, NH	109.2	196.6	207.8	5.7%	180.0	190.3	5.7%	128.4	135.8	5.8%	117.6	124.4	5.8%	103.9	104.7	0.8%	95.1	95.9	0.8%
Emory University	Atlanta, GA	101.8	177.3	183.9	3.7%	174.2	180.6	3.7%	122.0	121.4	0.3%	119.8	120.2	0.3%	109.8	111.7	1.7%	107.9	109.7	1.7%
Lehigh University	Allentown, PA	105.9	159.3	161.7	1.5%	150.4	152.7	1.5%	107.0	109.2	2.1%	101.0	103.1	2.1%	101.1	101.0	-0.1%	95.5	95.4	-0.1%
Pepperdine University	Los Angeles, CA	148.2	143.1	143.9	0.6%	96.6	97.1	0.6%	116.7	117.6	0.8%	78.7	79.4	0.8%	89.1	96.5	8.3%	60.1	65.1	8.3%
Santa Clara University	Oakland, CA	154.5	157.5	161.5	2.5%	101.9	104.5	2.5%	115.2	118.4	2.8%	74.6	76.6	2.8%	95.4	95.6	0.2%	61.7	61.9	0.2%
Southern Methodist U	Dallas, TX	105.4	165.7	170.9	3.1%	157.2	162.1	3.1%	110.2	111.1	0.8%	104.6	105.4	0.8%	103.7	107.0	3.2%	98.4	101.5	3.2%
Tufts University	Boston, MA	150.0	154.4	155.2	0.5%	102.9	103.5	0.5%	109.5	111.1	1.5%	73.0	74.1	1.5%	92.2	94.0	2.0%	61.5	62.7	2.0%
Tulane University	New Orleans, LA	100.7	150.1	155.9	3.9%	149.1	154.8	3.9%	93.5	95.3	1.9%	92.9	94.6	1.9%	97.9	108.5	10.8%	97.2	107.7	10.8%
University of Miami	Miami, FL	116.2	164.2	166.6	1.5%	141.3	143.4	1.5%	110.6	113.6	2.7%	95.2	97.8	2.7%	98.2	99.6	1.4%	84.5	85.7	1.4%
University of Notre Dame	South Bend, IN	97.7	180.9	185.7	2.7%	185.2	190.1	2.7%	119.2	124.4	4.4%	122.0	127.3	4.4%	107.0	110.0	2.8%	109.5	112.6	2.8%
University of Richmond	Richmond, VA	94.9	158.3	162.2	2.5%	166.8	170.9	2.5%	108.8	110.3	1.4%	114.6	116.2	1.4%	90.9	94.2	3.6%	95.8	99.3	3.6%
Vanderbilt University	Nashville, TN	99.2	198.8	205.9	3.6%	200.4	207.6	3.6%	119.6	120.9	1.1%	120.6	121.9	1.1%	102.5	105.1	2.5%	103.3	105.9	2.5%
Wake Forest University	Winston-Salem, NC	92.8	151.7	152.0	0.2%	163.5	163.8	0.2%	101.9	103.9	2.0%	109.8	112.0	2.0%	76.2	85.0	11.5%	82.1	91.6	11.5%
MEDIAN (excluding WFU; *Change" median reflects the median of values in column above )			164.2	166.6	2.7%	150.4	153.5	2.7%	110.6	113.6	1.9%	98.2	101.7	1.9%	97.9	99.7	2.5%	95.1	95.4	2.5%
MEAN (excluding WFU; *Change" mean reflects the mean of values in column above )			167.2	172.0	2.8%	144.0	148.2	2.8%	113.2	115.8	2.3%	96.8	99.0	2.3%	97.8	100.8	3.1%	84.3	86.9	3.1%
WFU Deviation from Median			-7.6%	-8.8%		8.7%	6.7%		-7.9%	-8.5%		11.8%	10.1%		-22.2%	-14.7%		-13.7%	-4.0%	

Source of Salary Data: The American Association of University Professors, Faculty Compensation Survey \*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), 2018 Annual Average Data, Published January 2019

Office of Institutional Research, 4/29/2019

