

Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting

January 18, 2017

*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: Jane Albrecht, Doug Beets, Caron Simone, Stewart Carter, Arjun Chatterjee, James Cotter, Larry Daniel, Will Fleeson, James Ford, Michele Gillespie, AC Howlett for Dwayne Godwin, Claudia Kairoff, Ralph Kennedy, Mark Knudson, Nina Lucas, Hof Milam, Wilson Parker, John Parks, Sarah Raynor, Stephen Robinson, Pete Siavelis, Beverly Snively, Darlene Starnes, Rosalind Tedford, Allen Tsang, Lisa Washburn, Page West, Ulrike Wiethaus.

There were 23 voting-eligible Senators present, a quorum.

Welcome

President Cotter called the meeting to order. He made a motion to accept the minutes of the November 18, 2016 Senate meeting which was seconded. Approval by a show of hands was unanimous in favor of approval.

Eudaimonia Institute report by Jay Ford

Jay Ford reminded the Senate about the conversation from the last meeting in regards to the Eudaimonia Institute. The petition had not been circulated prior to the meeting and per the minutes it was decided that the committee would be formed at this meeting. However, the Senate President decided to create the ad-hoc committee immediately after the last meeting, as is the President's prerogative. According to Senate by-laws, such a committee should be ratified by the senate in the following meeting. The ad-hoc committee consists of the following members: Claudia Kairoff, Simone Caron, Kathy Smith, Doug Beets and Jay Ford (chair). This committee has been working diligently during the entire break. The committee has met twice and has four more meetings scheduled along with a meeting with the Provost. They have spoken with concerned faculty who were behind the petition and will meet with Jim Otteson. Below are the areas the committee will review.

1. The Charles Koch foundation, its history, agenda, and Wake Forest connection.
2. The timeline of the Eudaimonia Institute, history, and approval process.
3. University Institutes in general. What is the review process and proposal guidelines? Is this something the Faculty Senate can make new policy recommendations for?
4. AAUP guidelines for Academic Industry engagement. That is how Academic Institutions engage with Foundations like the Koch Foundation. There are some things in their recommendations that WFU is not doing.

Jay presented the following motion for a vote to the Faculty Senate.

“In response to the Faculty Petition submitted November 17, 2016, this is a motion to ratify the President’s creation of an Ad Hoc committee to review the Eudaimonia Institute and report recommendations for future directions to the Faculty Senate in the March (2017) meeting.”

Motion passed unanimously by a voice vote.

Faculty Senate bylaws as part of the Faculty Handbook by Sara Raynor

Sara informed the Senate that there is a group of Collegiate Senators working on the College chapter of the Faculty Handbook. However, she mentioned, they may want to review other parts of the handbook outside of the college chapter and would like representation from Senators outside of the College. Please contact Sara or James Cotter if you are interested.

Poverty-Free Wake Forest Discussion by James Cotter

President Cotter talked about the efforts being made by a group of people to make a Poverty-Free Zone at Wake Forest. He mentioned that there is a gap between the Poverty-Free Zone document and Wake Forest Policy. Wake Forest uses an MIT website to determine a living wage for Winston Salem. He said that the Provost shared with him that WF complies with the MIT standard for all employees on Reynolda Campus. The document goes further, however, and wants subcontractors to conform to the living wage standard.

Sara Raynor reported that the group that created the “Poverty-Free” Space documents requested that the Senate take on the idea of implementation of policies that would lead in that direction. In the Senate’s November meeting, it was decided by vote to create a committee. Only one person volunteered to serve on that committee. The group would still like the Senate to create a committee to serve as a clearing house for ideas. It is not just the hourly wage they are concerned about, but improving the lives of people who are making a lower wage. For example, addressing the current problem that has occurred when the City of WS changed the bus routes. Sara indicated that this group would like some leadership from the Senate to help with deciding what needs to be and can be done.

President Cotter will follow up with an email asking for volunteers who would like to work with David Coates on this matter and report back to the Senate.

Discussion ensued:

Q: Hof, do you have any information on what the financial consequences would be to increase WF employees to \$15.00 an hour?

A: (Hof Milam) We have some ballpark numbers on that. To take WF employees to \$15.00 an hour would cost about 2 million dollars. That would be very difficult to accomplish. In terms of a living wage, for the last two, maybe three years, any WF employee below the living wage was automatically brought up. What we are doing now is working with Aramark and other organizations that we contract with, like Budd Services. I think we have worked out the details with Aramark; their employees will be brought up to a living wage. With Budd Services, it is a little more complicated and it will take some more time to work it out. We haven’t gone to the

point of speaking with Construction Manager; to delve into that world is very complicated. I'm not sure we can take it that far.

Q: What about the landscaping companies?

A: (Hof Milam) Most of the landscaping on Reynolda campus is handled by our employees.

Q: Would it be a good idea to have representation from the Staff Advisory Council?

A: (Sara Raynor) Yes, I forgot to bring that up. We discussed that at our meeting to have a joint committee with SAC and the Faculty Senate.

Comment: I would like to make a pitch for people to volunteer for this committee. The Senate has never been seen on campus as a place where members of the community would bring their concerns. The result may be that groups who have a single issue may sprout up and they will go to the administration on their own. The Senate, to the extent that it is representing the community, may not even know everything that is going on. If there comes a point, as there often does, that the Senate wants to comment on resource allocation, there may already have been side deals struck by the administration and the Senate knows nothing about it, although everybody is acting in good faith. The Provost said to the Executive Committee last week that in his view, they have met the major concerns of this committee. It seems to me that if we can encourage members of the community to bring issues to the Senate, then the Senate has some idea of the scope of the issues affecting the broader community. My plea would be to have people volunteer for this committee, and for you to tell your colleagues if they have any concerns to funnel them to the senate.

President Cotter will send out an email and solicit participation.

Committee Reports – Current Activities:

Ulrike Wiethaus, the chair of CAFR, informed the Senate that her group is working closely with Jay Ford's committee regarding the review of the Eudaimonia Institute. The committee has met once and will meet again next week. They will meet with Jim Otteson and Jay's committee in February. One major concern they have is that a lot hinges on a review of the donor's agreement. At a public institution, you have the legal right to access this information. Private Universities do not have to disclose such agreements.

Discussion ensued:

Q: Have you consulted with Mark Peterson regarding the donor agreement?

A: (Jay Ford) We have submitted our request to the Provost requesting this information. Rogan is going to have a conversation with the Koch foundation and try to work this out.

Jay Ford, the Chair of the Resources Committee, reported that his committee met twice. They had a meeting with the Provost to discuss overarching strategic plans for the university. The Committee plans to meet with Ron Wellman, Jim Dunn, and Mark Peterson to discuss issues,

challenges, and opportunities related to resources. They should have a complete report at the April meeting.

No report from the University Integration Committee.

Wilson Parker, the Chair of the Compensation Committee, reported that historically this committee reports at the April meeting based on AAUP reporting in cooperation with the Provost's Office. This year, Provost Kersh said he is going to instruct the office of institutional research to cooperate with the committee in order to get a fuller view of what is occurring at WFU. Additionally, we will try and gather the information from AAUP. If you're interested in compensation issues, please join this committee.

Peter Siavelis, the Chair of the Fringe Benefits Committee, provided a written report (cited below) from their meeting on December 9 with Carmen Canales and Angela Culler. As the summary indicates, the medical plan will exceed the medical plan budget this year. In order to bring costs in line with expenses, they are considering the bulleted items below.

Fringe Benefits Committee Report
Faculty Senate
January 18, 2017

While Wake Forest has been able to keep medical premium increases to a minimum due to negotiations and plan design enhancements, we have experienced very high claims over the past two years. Based on claims data to date, we project the medical plan will exceed the medical plan budget for this plan year. In planning for the medical plan for the FY18 (July 1, 2017 – June 30, 2018) year, we will evaluate the following plan design features in order to keep employee premiums and plan costs increases to a minimum:

Medical

- a narrow network with WFBH and Novant as preferred providers
- medical plan deductible/OOP/coinsurance
- additional prescription drug tiers for generic drugs
- improved participation in case management and disease management
- wellbeing and telemedicine options

Dental

- changing dental networks to one that has more local dental providers
- review employee contribution share of premiums

WFU has eliminated \$1.6M from health and welfare plans in the last two years with minimal plan design changes (spousal surcharge, dependent eligibility audit, life and disability marketing, pharmacy marketing, BCBS negotiations, and OptumRx preferred network).

Human Resources routinely seeks feedback from the Fringe Benefits Committee, Faculty Senate, and Staff Advisory Council to ensure we have benefits plans in place that continue to recruit, retain, and engage our faculty and staff colleagues.

Discussion ensued:

Comment: I understand that our medical insurance does not cover dependents with autism. I received an inquiry from a faculty member regarding this. I meant to send this to you.

Q: Hof, do you know anything about this?

A: No. could you please forward the inquiry to me.

Peter asked the Senators to share this menu of options with the people they represent to find out if they have a preference of which options are most or least desirable to cut.

Q: Could you please explain those options in a little more detail?

A: (Peter Siavelis) Currently, you have wide choices where you can go. The narrow network would have a series of preferred providers; you could still seek out other providers but would have an additional charge. The medical plan deductible, out of pocket insurance, and co-insurance is self-explanatory. They are going to go up; we don't know the exact amount yet. For the drug tiers, there are certain generic drugs that are getting more expensive. Having different tiers could represent a cost savings. Also, some of the cost associated with the medical plan had to do with actual case and disease management. With improvement, the plan could eliminate or reduce some of the expenses associated with certain conditions. This would involve not just person-to-person but also tele-case management via electronic means, telephone, and on-call people who can respond to certain conditions.

Q: Down below, it states WFU eliminated \$1.6 million. Are these figures taken into account in the overages?

A: (Hof Milam) Yes, the overages would have been higher. According to the last number I heard, if we didn't make any changes to the health care plan, we would have to increase the premiums by 14%. I'm waiting on some new numbers, hoping that with a more complete run of claims, the numbers will look better.

Q: Could you explain how a narrower network of providers saves costs?

A: (Petre Siavelis) I think that specific agreements can be signed with specific providers regarding cost of procedures and treatment.

Q: So we would only be limited to providers doing things at a cheaper rate?

A: (Hof Milam) There's two reasons you want to deal with Physicians that treat diseases or

conditions most cost-effectively. This isn't always about the fee they're charging, but how many services they provide you. Some physicians will run you through a whole battery of tests because they make more money on each test. The trick is to find someone that has a reasonable fee schedule and practices good medicine. I worked at QualChoice years ago and spent about six years of losing a lot of money. We had really good information on Physicians, and the practice patterns from one set of Physicians to another varied dramatically. The trick is finding people that provide good quality care and not an over-abundance of care. You want people not thinking of piece-rate: the more they do, the more they make. The narrow network we are talking about would most likely be with Baptist Hospital. I'm not sure it's as you described it, that you could opt out of the network and pay a higher fee on a case-by-case basis. I think it would have to be that we offered two plans, one that is more expensive and allows you to go wherever you want to go and a cheaper one that restricts you to a certain network.

Q: What's the metric to determine if they're doing enough care?

A: You have to have a long history so you measure outcomes, not just claims.

Comment: Some years ago our former Business School Dean Steve Reinemund had the CEO of Safeway come to visit at WFU. Safeway had approximately 25,000 employees and operated in half of the US at the time. He spoke about the health insurance they provided their employees. They broadened the network, and the organization provided better information to the employees about what their choices and pricing options were. They managed to maintain the quality of care and not increase health care premiums for employees over a period of years when premiums were increasing across the US. Currently, you look at Novant or Baptist and who knows how much it costs?

Q: Can the University look into an alternative to the narrow network but a broader network with more information for all of us that are part of the program?

A: (Hof Milam) We would have to find someone to track all of that information. Safeway was large enough to do it. We are dependent on Blue Cross/ Blue Shield for the administration of our plan. It is hard to get that information for a plan our size. The cost of getting it might not be worth the benefit we get out of it. I don't know the Safeway plan but would love to know how it's working for them now.

Peter emphasized that his committee wants input from Faculty on which range of options are most important to them. He believes that during the last election, many people blamed the ACA for limiting their choices. In his past experience, people seem to have been more willing to stomach premium increases over changes to the plan.

Q: I am concerned about the narrow network and wonder how an employee would be able to access another center of excellence out of the network?

A: (Hof Milam) I would be shocked if you see a narrow network in the next offering. It requires a lot of planning.

Comment: I am a Medical School Senator and can comment on what the Medical Center has done. They just went to a narrow network. We have three options: Baptist Hospital just bought the Cornerstone practice. They created this new insurance plan that combines Baptist and Cornerstone. You can pay a lower premium and lower copays if you agree to get your healthcare primarily through Baptist and Cornerstone. However, if you are out of town you can still get coverage on an 80/20 plan. The next plan is MedCost. They are a network partially owned by Baptist Hospital and others. This network spreads out to Charlotte and Statesville but you pay a slightly higher premium. I think there's another option that allows you to go outside of the MedCost arena. A lot of staff went with the Baptist/Cornerstone combo because of the lower cost.

Comment: (Hof Milam) I want to clarify that we do not use MedCost on Reynolda Campus, we use Blue Cross/Blue Shield.

Q: Where are we with keeping children under the age of 26 on our insurance plans?

A: That was discussed at our meeting with Carmen, but there is currently too much uncertainty with the ACA to do any planning. If we wanted to put a proposal together from the Senate to address this possible change, we could do that or just wait and see what happens with the ACA.

Comment: Hof recommended that if coverage for children under the age of 26 is of high value, then indicate that under preferences.

No report from the Medical Subcommittee.

Nothing to report from Staff Advisor Council Subcommittee.

Jane Albrecht, Chair of the Athletics Subcommittee, reported that she had a very productive meeting with the new Faculty Athletic Representative, Peter Brubaker. He will attend the Senate meeting on February 15 to discuss the FAR position. As COIA representative, she has been busy planning the national meeting to be held here on February 17.

No report from the Committee of the Collegiate Senators.

James Cotter, Chair of the Climate Survey of Faculty Evaluations Ad Hoc Committee, reported that this group is working on developing an instrument to poll faculty. They have created a drop-box document and are working on creating a website in order to make it easy for people to participate in the survey. The survey will focus on faculty opinion about student evaluation of teaching and how those evaluations are used.

Discussion ensued:

Q: The instrument you're talking about is the survey itself?

A: Yes, that is correct.

Q: Given that there are different forms of evaluations used throughout campus, how will you know which process the faculty member is complaining about?

A: (James Cotter) I don't know enough about the process everywhere, but I know what it's like in my area. We are going to try to understand who is filling out the survey and try to understand their attitudes about the value and use of the instrument that we call student evaluations. My hope is that we will get to the bottom of it and find whether faculty are encouraged by the use of the evaluation process or oppose the instrument used for student evaluations.

Q: One problem I see is that each department devises their own evaluation scheme and I'm not sure how you are going to be able to compare the data across the university?

A: (James Cotter) I think that is a valid concern. We need to produce an instrument that takes that into consideration.

Comment: There seems to be an assumption that underlies what you are trying to examine. The assumption is that students themselves actually find substantive value in filling out these surveys. I wonder if getting information about whether students find this process valuable might inform the Senate and the Administration about the use of the forms. Students might feel that there's another method to measure what they think about courses.

James said that the committee hasn't discussed what the students' feelings are about the evaluation process. They have focused more on the faculty side of this process. He will bring this to his committee for input.

Comment: I think it would be insightful for all of us to know how teaching is evaluated across schools, even within our university. I'm getting the impression that it is pretty different from the College to the School of Business to the Law School, and also how it affects annual evaluations and raises.

President Cotter asked if there was any new business; there was none.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00p.m.