Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting
April 27, 2016

Submitted by Senate Secretary, Claudia Kairoff, Professor of English
Prepared by Amalia Wagner and Claudia Kairoff, Ph.D.

Caveat: Comments recorded are not necessarily verbatim. In order to facilitate open discussion, the identity of most Senators making comments or questions is not recorded. 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., CFO, Provost and College Dean.]

In attendance: Allen Edward, Doug Beets, Susan Borwick, Steward Carter, Arjunm Chatterjee, James Cotter, Kevin Cox, Larry Daniel, Will Fleeson, James Ford, Simeon Ilesanmi, Claudia Kairoff, Molly Keener, Rogan Kersh, Christopher Knott, Mark Knudson, Nina Lucas, Wilson Parker, John Parks, John Pickel, Tim Pyatt, Sarah Raynor, Peter Siavelis, Gale Sigal, Kathy Smith, Beverly Snively, Michelle Steward, Rosalind Tedford, Allen Tsang, Lisa Washburn, Julie Wayne, Jeff Weiner, Mark Welker, Page West.

There were 30 voting eligible Senators present, a quorum.

Welcome

President Parker called the meeting to order. A motion was made and seconded to accept the minutes of the March 16, 24, 2016 senate meeting. Approval by a show of hands was unanimous in favor of approval.

President's report: Wilson Parker

President Parker presented the report from the Senate Nominating Committee. He opened the Senate floor for additional nomination for each office. No additional nominations were made. President Parker noted that write-in nominations on the ballots were welcome. He explained that only Senators from the College could vote for the Chair of the Committee of Collegiate Senators. The same is true for the Chair of the Committee of Medical School Senators: only Medical School Senators are eligible to vote. A late nomination for Chair of the Committee of Collegiate Senators came in after the ballots were created. He asked the Senators to write in Kathy Smith's name next to Sarah Raynor's on the ballot for Chair of the Committee of Collegiate Senators.

The proposed slates of candidates are:

President: James Cotter
Vice President (presumptive President –elect): Stewart Carter
Secretary: Claudia Kairoff
At- large Member: Will Fleeson
Chair, Committee of Collegiate Senators: Sarah Raynor (write in Kathy Smith)
Chair, Committee of Medical School Senators: Jeff Weiner

Ballots were distributed. The results were tallied overnight by Claudia Kairoff, Senate Secretary and were announced the day following the Senate meeting via email. The results are as follows:

President: James Cotter (27 votes)
Vice President (presumptive President –elect): Stewart Carter (29 votes)
Secretary: Claudia Kairoff (29 votes)
At-large Member: Will Feeson (29 votes)
Chair, Committee of Collegiate Senators: Sarah Raynor 8 (including one person who also voted for Jeff Weiner), Kathy Smith 4
Chair, Committee of Medical School Senators: Jeff Weiner 9 (including one person who also voted for Sarah Raynor)

President Parker presented the resolution below regarding House Bill 2. He modeled it after the resolution passed recently by the College. The resolution came as a seconded motion from the Executive Committee.

The Faculty Senate of Wake Forest University opposes North Carolina House Bill 2, enacted on March 23, 2016, which is contrary to our University-wide commitment to diversity and inclusion. The law specifically prevents cities from legally protecting sexual and gender minorities from discrimination, while also preventing transgender people from accessing public restrooms safely. The Senate believes that the bill will negatively affect our current LGBTQ faculty, administrators, staff and students and their friends and family and may negatively affect recruitment of faculty, administrators, staff and students. In addition, as the law prohibits K-12 public schools and publicly-funded universities and colleges in North Carolina from having multi-stall, multi-sex bathrooms, it could jeopardize federal funding for the schools attended by many of our family members, friends and neighbors. Thus, we urge our local government officials to take an active stand against the law, and we urge the North Carolina General Assembly and the Governor to repeal House Bill 2.

President Parker opened the proposed resolution up for discussion and the following ensued:

Comment: I have an issue with due process. I just received the proposal within the last 36 hours. I am not here to vote as an individual, as the bylaws indicate. I have not had a chance to communicate with anyone in my unit regarding the proposal. I move to postpone the voting until we have time to discuss the resolution with our units.

President Parker asked for a second on the motion or further discussion.

Comment: As far as the college is concerned, the college faculty has discussed this in length and approved the proposal.

Comment: In the spirit of due process, I think it is very important and we need to discipline ourselves to consult with our colleagues. I second the motion.

The current motion on the floor was to delay the vote on the House Bill 2 proposal until the first meeting in the Fall. Further discussion ensued.

Q: Is there a meeting scheduled in May?
A: No, but we could schedule another meeting in May.

Q: How many academic units are conducting meetings in the near future, where this proposal could be discussed?
A: The Medical School faculty have drafted something and plan to have a vote soon.

Q: Could we get a sense of the possibility of a May meeting and who could attend?
A: President Parker expressed his concern that in the past there has not been a quorum at May meetings.

Comment: Another option in lieu of an additional meeting would be for the individual units to deliberations among themselves and email President Parker their responses. My friendly amendment would be to conduct an electronic vote once the Senators have had the opportunity to speak with their constituents.

Provost Kersh mentioned that he had been on two former Faculty Senates and they had done a contingency vote. You could say something like, "contingent upon successful meetings of the individual divisions"; then, you could approve the motion.

Comment: I know that to be a representative means to know your constituents. I'm in division 3 of the college and I know that the vast majority of my colleagues would support this without talking to them about this. I support the Provost's idea, but wonder if we are not getting bogged down in procedure when we already know how our constituents will respond.

Comment: As a senator from the Business School, if I am here as a representative, rather than voting my individual conscience, I do not feel that I know the answer to this question.

Comment: In every vote we take in this body, we are voting affirmatively or negatively according to our sense of what the people we represent think or want, without polling everybody. I would welcome a process such as this: as senators you have two weeks to do what you need to do in your own unit, in order to satisfy yourself that you are now doing your job by voting your constituents' views. You can now cast your vote as a representative. Vote yes or no, however we decide to conduct the vote.

The motion on the floor is to postpone the vote until the first meeting in the fall. This motion was amended to conduct an electronic vote within 14 days following this meeting, after senators have polled their constituents. This was seconded and brought to a vote by a show of hands.

25 for and 2 opposed. The motion carries.

The vote will be conducted anonymously via Qualtrics. Roz Tedford volunteered to administer the electronic voting. Each senator will submit one vote.

Comment: Do we want to suggest that all other schools vote on passing a resolution on HB2?

A motion was made and seconded that the university and senate encourage all units of the university to consider passing a resolution condemning HB2. Passed unanimously by a show of hands: 25 in favor.

Reports from Representatives to Board of Trustees Committees

- Simeon Ilesanmi reported on the Administration Committee meeting, which was held on April 14, 2016. He mentioned that the committee has met twice during the academic year. The committee received reports on various projects occurring on campus. The report listed them as completed or currently underway. To view his complete report, refer to Addendum A.

- Chris Knott provided the report for the Finance Committee. He has attended three meetings this academic year. Chris explained that these meetings are where capital expenditures that the university wants to make go for their initial review; bond issues and overall financial direction are also discussed. The meetings are led by the University's financial administration: Hof Milam, Emily Neece, and Brandon Gilland. They present a deluge of information, including many projections and proposals. Much of what occurs at the meetings is the trustees exercising their oversight responsibilities.

  Hof Milam has been very open about saying if there are things the senate needs to know, he will provide information. Everything Chris has seen at the meetings makes him feel that this is a conservatively-run financial operation, working very hard with the rating agencies to keep Wake Forest's bond ratings where they need to be.

- Michelle Steward gave the report for the Advancement and Communication Committee meetings. Michelle expressed her disappointment that she had class during two of the three meetings. However, Mark Peterson spent almost an hour with her on both occasions before the meetings, sharing the materials that would be discussed with the board. She mentioned what an honor it is to serve on this committee and interact with the trustees as a faculty member. Her experience with the trustees was that they are highly engaged, extraordinarily thoughtful and have a deeper care for this university than sometimes we reflect in our own conversations. Michelle encouraged everyone to meet Mark Peterson, the Vice President for University Advancement. She had asked Mark, why do people give to Wake Will? His response was that the number one reason is a connection with a person, and the second reason is a cause. During the first meeting, they discussed the Wake Network. It allows us to stay connected with alumni and friends of the university. The other piece was about Washington, DC, where there are 3,500 alumni and 1,800 parents. They want to be engaged with this university, and the discussion was about how to facilitate this. During the last two meetings, Michelle had class and was unable to attend. Mark Peterson went over the agenda with Michelle and

she asked him what the impact of HB2 would be on fundraising? Mark had thought carefully about this, and he feels the impact will be minimal because of the university's commitment to issues on the topic surrounding diversity.

President Parker thanked all of the representatives for serving on the BOT committees.

Comment: Regarding the issue about the board reps having class during the BOT meetings: the ad hoc committee discussed this issue and thought that maybe the reps could be given the meeting dates in advance so they can obtain a sub for their classes.

Provost Kersh said that they took the recommendation of the ad hoc committee and notified the reps in advance of the meetings. During orientation of the new reps, they are provided with the meeting dates.

Report from the Wake Forest Representative to the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics, Jane Albrecht

Jane Albrecht shared what occurred at the annual meeting of COIA, which was held at the NCAA headquarters. First, she gave a brief history of COIA. COIA is a coalition of Faculty Senates and was started about 15 years ago at the request of the then-president of the NCAA, Myles Brand. It was organized around the issue of academic reform of intercollegiate athletics. WFU was in from the start as a member and also as a steering committee member. In the past 13 years the landscape of intercollegiate athletics has changed and the culture of the NCAA has changed, so COIA has had to evolve.

At this year's meeting, they spent the last part of the weekend reorganizing COIA because those changes in culture and landscape were very stark. Universities have been flooded with money from TV contracts. COIA, at the meeting, decided to move away from solely an advocacy function, advocating with the NCAA about athletic academic reform, and move to a communicative role to raise awareness on our campuses with our faculty about the big issues involving student athletics. They formed ad hoc committees. In the fall, Jane will bring the new COIA structure to the Faculty Senate for a vote. The ad hoc committees are functioning now but will require approval. There will be an administrative committee, which has already established a Facebook page for COIA and is working on a new website. On the new website, the other two committees will post their best practices documents, COIA white papers and other reports that will educate faculty about issues of concern affecting student athletes (such as academic integrity issues, student welfare, concussions, mental health, etc.). COIA is forming an information base and evolving. It isn't giving up entirely on its advocacy role but is moving to embrace a more communicative role.

In the fall, Jane will bring the new governing structure along with the three ad hoc committees to the Faculty Senate for approval. She might also bring a proposal to expand the COIA membership, to include all division I Universities. This would increase the membership from 120 to 325 members.

Report from Senate Athletics Committee, Kathy Smith

This new committee was a very active group. The committee member are: Ed Allen, Jane Albrecht, Omari Simons, Hank Kennedy, and Kathy Smith. They met several times and took a fact-finding role regarding athletics on campus. One of the items the committee followed through with was a resolution that the Faculty Senate passed on March 25, 2015.

The resolution stated: *Based on the COIA best practices, the Faculty Senate resolves that the Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR) to the NCAA should be appointed by the University President based on recommendation by the campus faculty governance body. The FAR appointment should be made for a term of four years and a review of the performance of the FAR should take place prior to reappointment. Such a review should include meaningful participation by the University Faculty Senate.*

Unlike the past, Dr. Hatch asked this committee, the college athletic committee, and the general campus community for nominations to the FAR position. The committee met and presented four nominations, but two nominees declined due to other commitments. The other two nominations, Gale Sigal and Hank Kennedy, were sent forward to Dr. Hatch for consideration. We have not heard who the new FAR will be. This person will be the successor to Richard Carmichael.

Kathy Smith mentioned some of the issues that the committee looked into.

- Looked into the nature of the student athlete career development and how to help athletes who are not going to become professional athletes find jobs.
- Looked into the financial commitment to each student athlete, called the cost of attendance. What WFU adds to an athlete's stipend compared to other universities (WFU is in the middle).
- Hank Kennedy is looking into our athletic success rate, the win/loss records of our teams relative to our financial commitment to athletics.
- Asked Jane Albrecht to take some suggestions to the COIA meeting, and then discussed her report about the meeting upon her return. The committee asked some broader questions that they wanted to leave them with the Senate:
    - How does athletic participation help academic performance? Not from the university's perspective, but from the individual athlete's perspective; how does being part of a team influence academic performance?
    - What business model is used to evaluate the athletic program as a whole?

Report from Senate Compensation Committee, Hank Kennedy

Hank Kennedy continued the discussion about athletics. He raised the issue of performance; how well WFU competes in the ACC. The two main flagships, men's basketball and men's football in the report (*refer to Addendum B for full report*) indicates that in the past six years, WFU hasn't done well at all. During the past six years, our teams have been worse than any other ACC teams in history. Hank noted that it would seem this losing record would influence how much WFU makes in game revenue and licensing. He pointed out that WFU has the smallest number of students in the ACC, which leads to the largest contribution to athletics per student. The expense per student for athletics is $12, 200. The other issue Hank mentioned was gender inequity, including the disparity in pay for female coaches vs male coaches.

Turning to faculty compensation, Gale Sigal reported that she and Hank had difficulty getting together as a committee but are going to try to meet over the summer. Hank presented a preliminary report on salaries (*refer to Addendum C for full report*). He looked at how WFU is doing only in terms of the Reynolda Campus. Hank mentioned that that there have been significant strides in raising faculty salaries in recent years and his should be recognized. On the other hand, he noted that in regard to faculty salary comparisons with the Colonial group for 2015-16, WFU is 12 out of 14 in the Professor rank, 12 out of 14 in the Associate Professor rank and next to last in Assistant Professor rank.

Report from Senate Fringe Benefits Committee, Peter Siavelis

Peter Siavelis spoke about the benefit changes that have taken place or will go into effect on July 1, 2016.

- 403 B retirement plan process transition to TIAAA Cref has been accomplished. More flexibility with brokerage and Roth IRA options for faculty and staff.
- Effective 7/1/2016, all new hires will automatically be enrolled in the retirement plan for faculty/staff contribution at 5% of their base salary, but they can opt out if they do not want to participate.
- Wake Forest University successfully completed an audit, which reviewed the eligibility for coverage on WFU benefits plans of more than 2,400 dependents, representing approximately 1,100 faculty and staff members. Because of the audit findings, 38 ineligible dependents were removed. This translates into approximately $335,000 in savings over a 3-year period, as compared to the audit cost of $30,000. All new hires will be required to present qualifying documents during the onboarding process.
- The names of the medical plans will change effective 7/1/16 from Value/Core to High/Low.
- Premium increase of 5% to the medical plan.
- Premium increase of 7.9% to dental plan.

- Effective 7/1/16, because of changes to the affordable care act, monies paid toward prescription drugs will count towards employees' overall deductible.
- Effective 7/1/16, there will be an additional $5.00 copay for those who go out of network for prescriptions. Target, CVS, and Harris Teeter are not in network and will be subject to the additional $5.00 copay. At the meeting, Human Resources pointed out that this change was put in place to take into account increasing drug costs.

Report from Senate Integration Committee; Larry Daniels reported for Mark Welker

Larry reported that the committee met at Biotech Place and discussed the new programs that will be downtown: Medicinal Chemistry and Drug Discovery, Biochemistry, and Molecular Biology Engineering. After their meeting, they took a hardhat tour of building 60, which overlooks Bailey Park. It is a beautiful facility; classes are slated to begin there in January 2017. Mark Welker said that one of the recurring questions has been, how can medical school faculty become involved? If they would like to teach, they need to contact the chairs of biology and chemistry. The other question has been; what is the compensation going to be for medical school faculty? This has not been determined. IQ is going to be a great opportunity for collaboration between the medical school faculty and Reynolda campus faculty. However, concerns about parking have surfaced; there will be less parking downtown as more buildings are developed.

Comment: Provost Kersh said that the developer plans to build a 900-car parking deck.

Report from Senate Resources Committee, James Cotter

James Cotter reported that the committee met with CFO Hof Milam, Jim Dunn, Mark Peterson, and Ron Wellman, looking at various areas from a resources perspective. James will produce a report that the Senators can share with their constituents. He reported that in each area, the committee came away with a different impression than they had before. Regarding the resources of the university and the decisions that have led to changes in the resources, he thinks there is a balance between conservation and confidence. He feels that Hof is a very able manager of the financial resources and decision-making process. In many ways, resource management is about timing of cash flow. The university has made investment decisions that have led to significant income today. The other news, however, is that our debt has increased from one hundred million several years ago to more than 300 million today.

On the endowment side, the committee had numerous conversations with Jim Dunn about his approach and strategy. Jim also discussed the university's spending rate, about 5.3 %, which is considered high.

According to the committee's discussion with Mark Petersen, the Wake Will campaign has gone very well and has achieved its objective ahead of schedule.

On the athletic side, Ron Wellman provided some very specific information about the various demands of women's sports. The committee's objective was to get current information so that they could replicate it on an annual basis.

Report from Collegiate Senators Committee, Will Fleeson (refer to addendum D for full report)

Will reported on the various issues that this committee has been working on.

- Background Checks
- Teaching Professionals
- Communication
- Revising the College Faculty handbook over the summer

Will gave a more in-depth report on the Subcommittee on Communications. Communication has been an ongoing issue that keeps coming up: how do we communicate with our constituents, when and how and what form should we use to communicate. The Faculty Senate is struggling with these issues. This committee is working on how to be efficient with communication. One thing that has been discussed is what the mechanism should be regarding how we should communicate. We have considered a redesign of the Faculty Senate webpage, adding various features. The committee wants to ask the University Faculty Senate to draw up some guidelines regarding the issue of communication, such as when, how and about which issues to communicate. The committee would also like input from the college faculty about which matters are of most concern to them.

Q & A

Comment: Claudia, as Chair of the Collegiate Senators' Communication Committee, mentioned that the committee welcomes help from all faculty senators.

Comment: Regarding the request that the Collegiate Senators work on the Faculty Handbook over the summer, I want to note for the minutes that Faculty is not on twelve-month contracts, and it seems that the administration forgets that.

Comment: If anyone has a particular interest in this topic, even if you are not a collegiate senator, feel free to participate and provide feedback.

Q: When is the revision of the handbook going to be completed?
A: Probably not until the fall.

Comment: This committee will make recommendations for the handbook, but ultimately the college faculty must vote on the changes.

Report from Representative to Staff Advisory Council, Roz Tedford

Roz explained that the Staff Advisory Council is a body similar to the University Faculty Senate. SAC has representatives from all units. She reported that SAC had many of the same presentations that the Faculty Senate did this year. Roz volunteered to serve another year.

President Wilson moved to accept Roz's kind offer by affirmation.

Report from Medical School Faculty Focus Survey and Update on the Medical Administration's Response (for faculty focus survey presentation, refer to Addendum E and for faculty compensation survey, refer to Addendum F)

President Wilson asked all Senators to please wait through the Medical School presentation and share the presentation with their colleagues He thanked the Medical School presenters for their patience.

Jeff Weiner reported that the Medical School senators have struggled to define their role, but have been meeting this year and feels that it will be clarified next year.

He introduced Michael Cartwright, the chair of their Faculty Forward Task Force. The Dean of the Medical School recommended a Faculty Focus survey. The survey was completed prior to a recent LCME accreditation visit. The survey was conducted in June, and was online and anonymous. The task force received the data in September 2015. They had two town hall meetings to discuss the results. The first one included both faculty and administrators, but the faculty asked for a second meeting without the administration present. After the town hall meetings, they identified 5 areas of focus. The task force met with medical school and medical center leadership and with each department. The five areas identified were: loss of retirement match, lack of faculty input into decision making, strict 75% salary support requirement, need for more focus on teaching and research, and lack of support for clinical operations. Changes since the survey:

- Loss of retirement match:
    - 2% match was fully reinstated in February 2016.
- Lack of faculty input into decision making:
    - Additional department representatives added to Faculty Rep. Council (FRC).
    - Advisory subcommittees added to FRC.
    - Faculty Compensation Committee activated.
- Strict 75% salary support requirement:
    - FCAC looking into ways to better support faculty affected by this requirement.
- Need for more focus on teaching and research:
    - Faculty Development courses added.
    - Support for research faculty.
- Lack of support for clinical operation:
    - Clinical Operations has hired about 200 FTE since June 2015.

Some of the outcome is concrete; some is more nebulous. The task force is following up by holding a town-hall meeting May 17, conducting a pulse survey (5-10 critical questions) in June, blending Faculty Forward task force work into FRC, and repeating full AAMC Faculty Forward survey in two years.

Q & A

Q: How is morale?
A: The survey indicated 53% responded with a positive response, which is 11% below that at other medical centers.

Q: How is retention at the medical school?
A: The survey posed the question: In the next two years are you considering retiring or leaving the medical school? 33% answered yes, which was higher than the response of the comparison group, which is 29%.

Q: Did the survey differentiate based on gender identification?
A: Yes, it was split up by gender. One of the challenges is that the data from the survey goes to the AAMC, so we have to go back to them and pay for additional information.

Comment: It would be very interesting to know the results of dissatisfaction by gender.

Q: How many medical school faculty are there?

A: Approximately 1,000. Two hundred are basic scientists; the majority are on the clinical side.

Evelyn Anthony explained the undergirding principles related to Medical Faculty compensation. WFBMC board sets the medical center compensation policy. The current policy was approved in 2012 and reaffirmed by the full board in March 2016. It is broad so that it can be applied in clinical and basic science departments; the details differ slightly in each arena. Policy mandates both fixed and variable/incentive elements to individual compensation. The goal is to encourage recruitment and retention of high-quality faculty and to promote all parts of the academic mission. The Faculty Compensation Advisory Committee (FCAC) has been in place for several years but hasn't had strong faculty representation. Last spring it was reconstituted, and Jeff Weiner and Evelyn currently serve on the committee. Dr. McConnell sets membership appointments and the committee is co-chaired by Dr. Edward Abraham and Dr. Kevin High. The policy on faculty compensation seeks to ensure that faculty compensation plans meet guidelines established by the Board and align competitive compensation with over-all institutional goals/objectives. The FCAC serves as the appeal body. It will also review all of the compensation plans annually. Two faculty member from FRC serve on FCAC. Evelyn gave an overview of how clinical faculty are compensated. The vast majority are not tenure-track and less than 50% of their compensation is based on research grant funding; their compensation is largely based on clinical revenues. It is assigned using AAMC databases that determine the median by rank and specialty. The fixed portion of compensation reflects clinical work. The variable portion may vary slightly by department and has to do with each individual's teaching, research, or administrative roles and rank. There are incentives if the medical center and given department exceeds budget expectations in a given fiscal year.

Jeff explained the faculty compensation for the science side. The vast majority of basic science faculty devote 75% of their effort to research. There is an expectation that these faculty members cover 75% of their research expenses from grant sources. The administration provides 3:1 matching funds to cover the remainder. Failure to achieve this level of funding will result in a salary reduction, which is what created much of the consternation Reynolda Campus faculty members heard about. There were protective

mechanisms in place if a faculty member's funding dropped for one year, but this was viewed very negatively and was very humiliating to faculty. They now have a Research Excellence Award designed to incentivize faculty members to cover 80% of their salary. In the current structure, any contribution above 75% is not matched; funds are held centrally by the administration. Thanks to the FCAC, there have been substantive changes in compensation policy. The research-intensive faculty members are still expected to cover 75% of their research efforts from grants, but failure to achieve this level of funding **may** result in a salary reduction. Such issues are now discussed within departments, and the decision is made at the departmental level. Regarding the tenure issue, the Medical School separated compensation from tenure (Jeff hopes the Faculty Senate will look into this issue next year). The 3:1 match will be calculated based on each faculty member's full salary. Excess funds will be distributed at the departmental level and not retained centrally. A revised incentive plan will be created, with substantive input from the faculty, to more effectively encourage faculty to support their salary through research grants. All didactic teaching will be viewed (and compensated) equally across the Medical School, PA program, and Graduate School. Things are better now than two years ago and are moving in the right direction.

The Senators thanked Wilson for his dedicated and conscientious service.

Additional written reports submitted to the University Faculty Senate

Addendum G – Athletics Committee of the Board of Trustees
Addendum H – Student Life Committee Meeting of the Board of Trustees
Addendum I – Academic Committee Meeting of the Board of Trustees
Addendum J – Report from the Collegiate Senators to the Dean of Wake Forest College Regarding Teaching Professionals

President Wilson asked if there was any new business. There was not. He adjourned the meeting at 6:35 p.m.