Wake Forest University Faculty Senate Minutes -- Amended
Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Tribble Hall, DeTamble Auditorium

Minutes prepared by Sophie Leruth 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 recorded here 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.)


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

I. President Mark Knudson: Call to Order

II. Knudson: Approval of Minutes from October 16, 2019

a. The motion to approve the minutes of the October 2019 meeting was made, seconded, and passed.

III. Presentation on the Role of the Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR)

a. Peter Brubaker (Professor and Dept. Chair Health and Exercise Science) and John Currie (Athletic Director) gave a presentation with guest student athlete Sage Surrat (Football)

b. Brubaker: Roles of the FAR:

   • Academic Integrity/Oversight,
   • Student Athlete Wellbeing, and
   • Institutional Control & Governance of Athletics
   • Engages with student-athletes in various ways, such as scholarship nominations, monthly meetings with student-athlete advisory committee, exit interviews, athletic department audits, investigations of NCAA violations, etc.

c. Contact Pete Brubaker-- brubaker@wfu.edu – if you have issues with student athletes

d. Currie: Overview of Athletics Program

   • Currie graduated from WFU in 1993 and holds an MS in Sport Management from the University of TN in 2003.
   • Basic philosophy that college athletics is an enterprise with some business principles
• Demographics:
  i. 18 sports at WFU; 420 student athletes; ~800 students involved in some capacity
  ii. 56 graduates in 2019
  iii. 2017-2018 saw 8 teams with perfect APR (academic performance rate) scores
  iv. 95% GSR (graduation success rate)

• Vision: A Model Intercollegiate Athletics Program; 5 goals:
  1. A World Class Student-Athlete Experience
  2. Integrity in Academics, Compliance, Finance, Inclusion and Safety
  3. Value to the University, Winston-Salem and Triad Communities
  4. Win Championships
  5. Provide the best fan experience possible

• Safety and Student-Athlete Wellbeing: A lot of what an athletic director does is minimize risk and ensure the health of student athletes. Recent hires to assist with these tasks:
  i. Murphy Grant, Senior Associate Athletic Director, Sports Performance and Athletics Healthcare Administrator
  ii. Ellie Shannon, Associate AD Event Operations.

• Student-Athlete Campus Engagement: Student-Athlete Outreach Group
  i. Unique Deac Day & Forest Friday were opportunities for student-athletes to get involved with peers outside of the athletic context
  ii. 60% student attendance at first football game of the season
  iii. All student-athletes participate in some kind of community service

• Professionalism: Increased attention to developing greater career readiness
  i. More student-athletes engaged in some kind of intentional internships

• New Benefits for Faculty and Staff:
  i. 20% Discount on Regular Season tickets for Men’s Basketball
  ii. 20% percent Discount on Single Game Tickets for Football and Men’s Basketball

IV. Dean Gillespie and Charles Iacovou – Provost Initiative: The Plan for Academic Excellence

  a. Goal: Develop an aspirational statement of what we want academics to be at WFU and to develop a shared vision for the whole university that will guide our plans for individual schools going forward.

  b. Exercise: Positivity sorting activity (identifying various levels of optimism about the future) Test Statement: “I believe WFU is well prepared for the future.”

    o Couple of observations:
      ▪ Positive: relatively speaking it seems that WFU is well-positioned to deal with change; we have extraordinary faculty to guide that change; we have a history of successful change
      ▪ Negative: students in the humanities struggle and we have perhaps lowered standards of students specifically in the humanities
c. Key Points:

   o Critical tasks
     ▪ figuring out commonalities across the university
     ▪ defining academic excellence
     ▪ anticipating ways of adjusting to the multiple changes happening in higher ed at such a fast pace (issues such as access and affordability; technology; economic trends; etc.)
     ▪ identifying our values when it comes to academic excellence and ways of learning

   o Not a strategic plan: document meant to be a reference point for future decisions, so that they can be made in keeping with our values as outlined in this document

   o Four key areas of focus
     1) Educating the whole person
     2) New educational offerings
     3) Knowledge generation and sharing
     4) Culture of Wake Forest

   o Committee composed of area experts who are taking into account the interests of the whole university

   o Comments and Questions:
     ▪ Would like to see more representation from the Graduate School
       • Committee members have been chosen based on areas of expertise and will be careful to consider the entire University
     ▪ How will the committee ensure that this process is evidence-based? How will the necessary data be collected? Are peer schools being considered? What is the deliverable of this process?
       • This process will draw on data available both here and externally, but the focus remains on imagining the future; this experience is designed to give us a positive framework for embracing the future
     ▪ Can a list of committee members be shared with the Senate?
       • Yes; a website will be available as well (currently under construction)

V. Knudson: Benefits

   a. Brief discussion following up on previous meeting information.
     • Would like to see a timeline for the next year’s decision-making process as soon as possible
     • Would like to have a presentation to the entire Senate about the process, so President Knudson will look into this possibility

VI. Knudson: New business

   a. University Priorities Committee—update from Wilson Parker
     • Culmination of the work of a committee composed of former Senate presidents, the provost, the executive vice president, and a former BOT member; set to begin its work in Jan 2020
The move toward this committee came out of discussions during the Faculty Senate Retreat in Feb 2019, when it was clear that the faculty have not had sufficient voice in financial decision-making for the university.

The membership will consist of members from across the University. The Faculty Chair and 7 Faculty representatives will be selected by the Senate Executive Committee and appointed by the University President (for the Chair) or the Provost (7 representatives); they will serve staggered 3 year terms, with the hope of establishing institutional knowledge over a sustained period; Senate Executive Committee is currently working on nominations for the committee:

i. 2 College representatives
ii. 1 Divinity School representative
iii. 1 Law School representative
iv. 1 ZSR Library representative
v. 1 At Large representative
vi. 2 Staff representatives

The committee comes out of the Provost’s Office and is an advisory body to the Provost. It is chaired by a faculty member.

b. Ombudsperson

Executive Committee had a conversation with representatives from the medical campus about their program, which was helpful for understanding how to develop a process for hearing voices of faculty and staff who feel marginalized, discriminated against, harassed, mistreated, etc. but may not want to file a formal grievance.

Discussion among Senators about the desirability of hearing a presentation and discussing such a program further:

i. General interest in hearing more
ii. Could be a way of helping faculty better understand the grievance process (as separate from this process) and avoid getting stuck in either paralysis or litigation
iii. AAUP currently does much of this kind of advising and intervening, but a program like this would be a welcome alternative
iv. An internal person serving in this role could be a good model; should also consider a “mixed model”

President Knudson will follow up on getting the presentation slides (if possible) and bring the issue back for further discussion in Jan 2020.

VII. Knudson: Adjournment