

Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting

November 16, 2016

*Submitted by Senate Secretary, Claudia Karloff, Professor of English
Prepared by Amalia Wagner and Claudia Karloff, 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, Susan Borwick, Stewart Carter, Arjun Chatterjee, James Cotter, Larry Daniel, Will Fleeson, James Ford, Michele Gillespie, AC Howlett for Dwayne Godwin, Amy Hildreth, Charles Iacovou, Claudia Kairoff, Molly Keener, Bill Leonard, Nina Lucas, Hof Milam, John Parks, John Pickel, Tim Pyatt, Sarah Raynor, Pete Siavelis, Kathy Smith, Beverly Snively, Darlene Starnes, Michelle Steward, Rosalind Tedford, Lisa Washburn, Julie Wayne, Mark Welker, Page West, Ulrike Wiethaus.

There were 23 voting eligible Senators present, a quorum.

Welcome

President Cotter called the meeting to order. He began with committee reports.

Committee Reports – Vision and current activities:

Jay Ford, the chair of the Resources committee, gave an overview of the committee's responsibilities. The Resources Committee will monitor, evaluate, and participate in the University's program planning, capital planning, and other long-range planning processes. The Committee will also make recommendations to the Senate involving initiatives with long-term implications for the University and the faculty. As in the past, the committee will meet with Hof Milam, Jim Dunn, Mark Peterson, and Ron Wellman because of the significance of their areas and allocation of resources. The committee would like to have a clearer understanding of broader, long-term strategic plans of the university. Jay has reached out to the Provost to see if he's willing to meet with the committee to discuss long-range strategic plans. Additionally, the committee would like to inquire about the allocation of capital resources; in particular, the amount of capital resources allocated to large construction projects on campus. If anyone has any questions please contact Jay or any of the following committee members, Chris Knott, Nina Lucas, John Pickel, Michelle Steward, Roz Tedford and Page West.

Mark Welker, the chair of the University Integration committee, informed the senate of the MOA that was signed in the Spring by the Provost and the Dean of the Medical School. This impacts Medical School faculty who want to teach on the Reynolda campus. Mark contacted Jeff Wiener from the Medical School and is going to attend the Faculty Representative Council meeting in December to get input from Medical School faculty interested in teaching on Reynolda campus. Mark's goal is to get folks well-informed on this topic.

Wilson Parker, the chair of the Compensation committee, was not present. President Cotter mentioned that he felt the committee's objectives are focused on what kinds of significant compensation issues should be addressed by the Senate and any initiatives that the Senate should weigh in on.

Peter Siavelis, the chair of the Fringe Benefits committee, said they are going along with their usual process of evaluating fringe benefits before they decide what their initiatives will be. They will hit the ground running in April, when they know what the fringe benefits landscape will look like. They will know more when they meet with HR on December 9th. He mentioned one issue that may arise as a result of the election, the shape of the Affordable Care Act and what it might mean relative to our health insurance coverage. He received a suggestion from a member of the Fringe Benefits committee to ask the senate about the possibility of the Fringe Benefits committee seeking a promise from the administration that our children can remain on the WFU health plan until the age of 26, regardless of the outcome of the ACA. This provides the University the opportunity to do the right thing, despite the federal changes that might occur. He opened the topic up for input from the Senate floor.

Discussion ensued:

Comment: Anyone that has kids would say "yes."

Q: Maybe we should have Hof weigh in and ask him if the administration has budgeted and incorporated this expense into the long-term budget?

A: (Hof Milam) That's a loaded question. The reason I say that, is that there are a lot of things going on in health care: the national trends are not good. Unfortunately, the recent numbers on our own health care plan this past year are not good. Hopefully, with a few more months of claims, we will see better numbers.

Comment: I think if my children were younger I would be more concerned about the pre-existing condition aspect of the ACA.

Comment: Our current plan doesn't have a pre-existing clause.

Comment: (Hof Milam) We didn't have that exclusion before ACA.

Comment: President Cotter thinks that the Senate should craft a proposal expressing our opinion and vote on it.

Q: What was the policy before?

A: They were covered while in school until graduation. I don't remember the age prior to ACA.

Comment: Will Fleeson reported some good news regarding a recent change that affected staff. Some employees were changed from exempt to non-exempt status, which meant they would lose a week of PTO, but the university decided to increase their PTO to five weeks so they wouldn't suffer a loss in PTO.

Peter said the committee would craft a proposal, following President Cotter's suggestion, and bring it to the Senate. Those with additional concerns should contact Peter or the other members of the committee, Simone Caron and Ralph Kennedy.

Mark Welker asked Peter to ask his committee for input regarding automatically enrolling current staff/faculty who are not contributing to the retirement plan at a 5% contribution rate. Mark mentioned that his impression is that doing so will not be controversial as long as it is easy to opt out.

Jeff Weiner, Chair of the Medical School subcommittee, was not present.

Ulrike Wiethaus, Chair of the Committee for Academic Freedom and Responsibility, reported that there is no outstanding business. She asked that Jarrod Whitaker be removed as a member of the committee on the website. He is not a full professor and is therefore not eligible to serve. She indicated that her committee will be involved in creating a report and looking into the petition regarding the Eudaimonia Institute. Additionally, they are looking at recommendations for a more uniform set of guidelines in place for all institutes, present and future.

Darlene Starnes, Staff Advisor Council Subcommittee member, announced the holiday giving campaign. One is for a school supply drive for Mineral Springs elementary school, along with a food drive, through December 16th. The drop-off is in the Benson Center and those items will be donated to campus kitchen.

Jane Albrecht, Chair of the Athletics Committee, reported first that her committee is small and consists of Julie Wang and Cathy Smith. The committee has met virtually and discussed three issues. She has been busy organizing the COIA meeting which will be on Wake's campus on February 19th. The first action they will take is to invite the new Faculty Athletic Representative to the Senate in January or February. In February, they will update the data that they started collecting last year on the gender and ethnicity of student athletes on our campus. Third, they will meet before the COIA meeting regarding a national issue, the possibility of developing learning outcomes for students who participate in intercollegiate athletics.

Sarah Raynor, Chair of the Committee of the Collegiate Senators, said her committee has met three times. The main thing they are working on is the Faculty Handbook chapter on the College, such as its descriptions of College committee bylaws. Other topics are diversity and inclusion issues and follow-up on the Innovation Quarter, with its new undergraduate engineering program. They are working on communicating with the college about retirement benefits and with the Senate about the college petition regarding the Eudaimonia Institute, trying to get information going in both directions.

President Cotter mentioned that the Executive Committee has discussed including the Faculty Senate by-laws in the Faculty Handbook. If you have any input on this, please reach out to James.

James Cotter chairs of the Ad Hoc Committee on Climate Survey of Faculty Evaluations, which met a few days ago. The committee feels that there hasn't been a significant solicitation of opinions about which teaching evaluations are best and how they should be used. They hope to disseminate a survey that will invite responses from all University faculty. There is an expansive, annual survey of faculty administered nationally, HERI, but the word "evaluation" in its most recent 120-page report appears only 9 times. James believes there is currently no sense about how faculty members view the teaching evaluation process. If you have any opinions about this, please feel free to email James your concerns.

Discussion ensued:

Q: What evaluation process are you talking about?

A: Evaluation of faculty by having students weigh in: course evaluations.

"Poverty Free" Initiative: David Coates (For Full Summary refer to Addendum A)

President Cotter introduced David Coates, who distributed copies of the Executive Summary for a "Poverty-Free" Space. David explained that this group "Wake Forward" has been working on this initiative for about one year. They have engaged in conversations with HR and the Provost and met with a very positive response. The University is already working with the campaign to redress poverty-level wages among direct employees, but it still needs to address the poverty-level wages paid by contractors. This need is being discussed at the College, Law and Divinity School faculty meetings and has been met with terrific support. In addition, the Wake Forward group is taking this to the Staff Advisory meeting in February. With increasing support from faculty, the next step is to set up a working group of the Senate with members of the administration and members of Wake Forward to explore ways in which they can move on this initiative. David is asking for the support of the Senate today. David mentioned that they are well aware that a rise in wages will have a serious immediate cost and employment consequences. They feel that other initiatives could be put in place that can improve working conditions without major cost to the University. These include policies on child-care provision, transportation, and banking services to lower the cost of work and to increase take-home pay.

James suggested coming up with a resolution that can be voted on at the next Senate meeting.

Discussion ensued:

Comment: David clarified that the details in the report are not set in stone; it is their first draft. They need to have more conversations with Finance and HR. The Aramark wages are very low, and here we are telling our students to go and do good in the world and lead anti-poverty programs. There's a growing sense across universities that a university shares some responsibility for its low-wage service workers. David feels that he has shared enough paperwork that the Senate could support this initiative and put its approval behind it.

Q: This is the first time I have heard about this. It seems that as a University what we do best is not necessarily raising wages but educating, increasing financial literacy, budgeting, and helping plan for retirement. Absent any of those, an increase in wages could be money down the toilet. Is any of this included in the full report?

A: Yes, there are many things we can do. We can provide training, courses etc.

Q: Charles Iacovou expressed his gratitude for the work that has been done. Is this a volunteer effort? How inclusive is the scope of the definition of an employee? What about adjunct faculty and PhD students?

A: Yes, it is a volunteer effort. We went for the core [the lowest-paid service workers] and are well aware that there are many other groups. What happened initially is that we heard stories from the Chaplain's office about people who could not afford to go home during inclement weather. We began to talk to HR, and they checked the MIT data regarding a living wage. HR found that 6% of direct employees were below that, and as a result, they increased those employees' pay immediately. David hopes to get the ball rolling and do a little bit of good each year; the process will take time and cannot be accomplished overnight.

Comment: It appears that #5 on the summary is the charge for the Senate. The action point is the last line: the creation of a University-wide working party charged with the design and implementation of needed changes. That could be the Senate support of the ad-hoc committee, and I don't think we need to wait for that action. I would recommend that we vote on that.

A motion was made and seconded to establish an ad-hoc committee charged with the design and implementation of needed changes based on the "Poverty-Free Space" Executive Summary.

Q: Hof, if this already on Carmen's radar?

A: (Hof Milam) Yes, not only on Carmen's but also on John Wise's. He is working with Aramark and John Shenette is working with Budd Services. We have a good estimate of the implications, at least from a cost standpoint.

Comment: I appreciate basing this on moral and pedagogical reasons, but it is also good business sense. Walmart is raising wages, resulting in improved customer service and decreased employee turnover. If employees are paid better, they will be better employees.

Comment: Hof clarified that it has been two years since WFU has had the practice of looking at our employee base and anyone below a living wage is adjusted to a living wage.

Q: Does this apply to the hospital?

A: Not at this time.

Comment: The faculty in the Business School would love to have you come to our meeting and present this initiative.

A vote by a show of hands was taken. Motion passed unanimously.

Faculty Handbook update by Sarah Raynor

Sarah requested that an ad-hoc committee be formed to update the Faculty Handbook. President Cotter agreed and will solicit volunteers for this ad-hoc committee.

Fancy Gap Lodge and Cottage by James Cotter

James Cotter informed the senate that he has spoken with Hof Milam regarding the sale of the Fancy Gap Lodge. James feels that this is an “allocation of resources” issue. After reviewing the income that the property was generating compared with its maintenance costs, the university determined it should be sold.

Hof Milam explained that this came up during the SRI process. Fancy Gap was discussed because it was losing money, but the university decided to give it another year or two, to see if they could generate more income from the property. They continue to lose between \$20,000 - \$25,000 per year. Even though that it isn't a large amount of money, it doesn't benefit that many people in the organization, nor is it critical to the mission. Only two academic departments used it last year; 16 faculty used it as individuals, and 29 staff. It doesn't get a lot of use. The ongoing expenses exceed the revenue. Both properties need a significant amount of work. At this time, we don't know how much the university is asking for the property. The last time it was appraised in 2012, it was valued at about \$650,000. If that money was in the endowment and earning roughly 5%, that's roughly \$30,000 the university could make rather than losing \$25,000.

Discussion ensued:

Q: How many acres is it?

A: It is between 60-70 acres.

Q: My understanding is that this was a gift to faculty and staff for their use. Is that true?

A: Hof Milam: I heard that came up in the Staff Advisory meeting, but we have not been able to find any evidence of that. The only stipulation was it could be used to benefit the University, however the administration deemed fit.

Q: Was that in the deed of trust? I have heard that as well. Even though what you've said are all positive things that make sense financially, I want to take another stand on this because this has been a way for folks to have a low-cost family weekend stay. We are talking about poverty free zones, and at one time you could go for about \$25.00 per night. That was a reasonable perk that we are losing. I think there's more than just the financial piece of this. It's not a huge amount of money the university is losing.

A: (Hof Milam) Yes, it is in the deed of trust. The maintenance is going to get more expensive and it is difficult to maintain a property that is an hour away from campus. Let me say this, already today the faculty has discussed many things that have serious budget consequences.

Don't worry about the \$20,000; it's a drop in the bucket to the things we've discussed today that represent new budget expenses for the university. We are taking something that benefits a few and trying to do other things that benefit more people.

Q: How many weekends were not used?

A: (Hof Milam) I don't know the answer to that.

Q: Do you have an idea what the renovations would cost?

A: No.

Comment: I guess I'm not ready to voice an opinion, unless I know the cost.

Comment: (Hof Milam) We are not really looking for opinions, but just letting you know the direction we are taking on this. I have already spoken to the son of the couple who donated the property, and he's fine with the university selling it.

Q: So the decision has been made to sell, and you're just sharing the information?

A: Yes, that's correct.

Forming a committee to review the Eudaimonia Institute (EI) (For petition refer to Addendum B):

President Cotter asked for input on the formation of the Eudaimonia Institute and what the Faculty Senate should do regarding this project.

Sarah Raynor informed the senate about a petition that's been signed by over 180 faculty members. This is roughly 45% of the college faculty. The petition is requesting that the Senate, in collaboration with CAFR, study the situation. Sarah feels that it behooves us to listen to the faculty and study the issue.

Discussion ensued:

Q: I may be the only person in this room who doesn't know what issue we're talking about or what the petition says. Can you be more specific about what the petition says?

A: Sarah Raynor: The petition is related to the formation of the EI, which is a University institute formed to study human flourishing. The way I see it, it is a general concern with the way institutes are formed and whether an institute is supposed to be a university-wide thing that speaks to the mission of the university in a cross-campus way. The question is, how are institutes formed, and how do faculty have input on whether such an institute has appropriate scope or mission? There is no such policy in existence. If you ask Rogan, he'll say there's about 10 million types of traditions about how centers and institutes get formed.

Q: Just to clarify, is this petition to examine the Provost's office process or EI?

A: Both.

Comment: I think it was formed in response to the EI issue. In the process of looking into this issue, the procedures used to set up any institute or center at the University became a concern. The faculty who signed the petition are saying they want those procedures reevaluated. It wasn't about going back and determining whether we should be taking Koch money or not.

Q: To clarify, is this about centers and institutes?

A: Just institutes.

Comment: I've seen a version of the document that has been shared. Is it possible to read out what the statement is so we know what our colleagues are supporting?

Q: Has this petition been shared with all of the faculty of the university?

A: No, just the College faculty.

Q: Why not the rest?

A: Because it was circulated to the College faculty in order to ask for support to submit a request to the Senate to form an ad hoc committee to review the policy. Since these institutes are university-wide, it seemed to make sense for the faculty senate to spearhead the process of looking at how they are approved and evaluated over time.

Comment: It wasn't a formal initiative. Several faculty members from the College started and circulated the petition.

Q: As a subcommittee working on the Faculty Handbook, shouldn't the oversight of institutes be outlined in the Handbook, or is this an administrative issue that faculty don't have any say in? I think it should be in the handbook.

A: (James Cotter) Somebody who knows about the governance process guiding creation of centers and institutes would have to answer that question.

Comment: I would like to hear exactly what the petition states.

Sarah Raynor read from the petition as stated below.

We, the undersigned faculty of Wake Forest University, are calling on the Faculty Senate and the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility to investigate the research and teaching independence, the extent of appropriate faculty governance, and the intellectual integrity of the newly formed Eudaimonia Institute. The petition is based on our concerns about the Eudaimonia Institute (EI), and its principal funding source, The Charles Koch Foundation (CKF).

Specifically, we are calling for an ad hoc Faculty Senate committee to be charged with the review and investigation, and for this committee to submit its report to the full senate at the senate's 2017 March meeting and to issue a response to the report to the entire university.

Additionally, we respectfully request that the Memorandum of Understanding and/or Donor Agreement with the CKF be made available to the Faculty Senate and the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility for their immediate review.

Comment: It seems very EI specific.

Comment: I would suggest, since several of us haven't seen the petition, that it be circulated.

Comment: (Sarah Raynor) It hasn't been circulated outside of the College and it's not being circulated by any particular body. The Collegiate Senators were asked to help circulate it, but it didn't feel appropriate, since it's a petition to the Senate.

Comment: As a senator, I feel that we should look at it.

Comment: I feel that this is going to sound like I did when I screamed about the HB2 petition that came up in the Senate without any advance documentation but was suddenly presented to the Senate to be voted upon. I have my own opinion about EI, about the Provost's process with institutes, and about HB2, but I'm here to represent my faculty.

A motion was made to share the petition with every member of the faculty and staff. Motion was seconded.

Discussion ensued:

Q: Who are you petitioning, Sarah?

A: We don't have access to a University-wide listserv to circulate it. The people who distributed this just distributed to their contacts.

Comment: My motion isn't to ask for a list of who signed it. I just want to see what it says and be able to share it with faculty.

Q: How is it going to get distributed to the faculty at the university? Are we going to request that the administration provide us access to a distribution list to email everyone?

A: That's why everyone hasn't seen it, because there's no list.

Comment: I'm on the advisory board of the Eudaimonia Institute at the request of my dean in the Divinity School. I am in agreement with this motion, but would add that all faculty who receive the petition should also receive the explanation from the director of the Institute as to what it is. Many people don't know what it is, so some basic information on how the Institute articulates itself would be helpful. I will add my opinion to this. I think there are 3 key issues.

- 1. The Koch money is an implicit issue. That is what raised this petition, and not acknowledging that is a big mistake. That is the elephant in the room.*
- 2. I really don't think that the advisory board and the director have been able to articulate what this institute is. There's a great deal of ignorance as to what is going on with this*

institute. At the forum held by the Provost and Jim Otteson, even though some of us advised them to talk about the mission and plan of the program, they did not. Even people who were at the forum didn't gain an understanding as to how this benefits this University or what it will do for students, faculty, and research.

- 3. The third issue that arose out of concern about this particular institute was the process whereby this institute was approved and developed: whether or not the procedures that were said to be followed were actually followed. I think there's a lot going on that warrants this conversation, but full information is necessary.*

Comment: (James Cotter) I initially invited Jim Otteson to this meeting, but the Executive Committee strongly recommended that I un-invite him. They felt it wasn't the right next step.

Comment: I signed the petition and am happy to forward it to anyone who wants it. I think your points are absolutely right. I have read the Eudaimonia Institute's mission statement, and I have some issues with it. It puts art, athletics, and good nutrition in the same sentence. I also have issues with the Koch brothers' money. Lastly, I think the Provost should have known that this was going to get peoples hackles up. It's inflammatory because of the Koch brothers' history on politics and fracking. May I share the petition with the President of the Senate?

Comment: (James Cotter) Yes, Amalia has everyone's email and can disseminate the document.

Comment: As a point of order, I don't think we have a quorum.

[A count was taken, and a quorum was present.]

Comment: I think it would be instructive to have the agreement with the Koch brothers to hand out with the petition. The Koch brothers don't hand out money without strings attached. Without a copy of that, I'm very hesitant to approve anything.

Comment: Are you talking about the Memorandum of Understanding? We've been informed that it's confidential and cannot legally be circulated.

Comment: I would like to make a point here. I think it is a great idea to circulate this so all faculty can review this. The question being asked is not the merit of this or evaluating this but simply to form a committee within the Senate to evaluate the information that this group of colleagues have assembled (which is very extensive), then report back to the Senate about their assessment, including information that might come from the Eudaimonia Institute itself. A group of 180 faculty members feel this is a worthwhile thing to do in the Senate. I think it's fine to put it off until the next meeting, however, so people have a chance to review the information.

Comment: I agree with you. I think it is important to get all the information possible, but it hasn't been possible to get a full set of documentation from EI about what they are doing. This is something the concerned faculty who signed the petition have been trying to obtain. That information would be helpful. My interpretation of the Executive Committee didn't want to bring Jim to the meeting is because the full Senate is not prepared to discuss this. That is why the Executive Committee was leaning towards creating a committee to look into this matter. As far as the donor agreement, Rogan is optimistic that it might be possible to get approval for a small group to view the agreement. I think it is appropriate to create a committee to investigate and report back to the Senate. Once the Senate has the report, then they can make appropriate recommendations.

Comment: We have a motion on the floor. Would you accept a friendly amendment that along with distribution of the petition to everyone that there be a Senate committee?

Comment: The petition asks for a committee that has representatives from the Senate and CAFR. It is not a Senate committee.

Comment: With all due respect, I have a tough time voting on a subcommittee without first being able to read what the committee is supposed to be investigating. There's information that is in a petition that we should probably ask Jim Otteson and his administrative group to provide as much transparency as they can.

Comment: I was hoping this would be like the Benefits subcommittee, a small group that is sworn to secrecy. A group of us could see the documentation and assure me as a colleague that there's no funny business going on. I would be very happy with that and I support your motion.

Q: This might not be in order, but do we have an existing committee that could examine this?

A: CAFR and the Committee on Academic Resources are possibilities. I've heard Rogan say the stumbling block arises from reviewing confidential documents, which opens us up to reviewing all confidential documents from every donor that has ever given to WFU. I think that represents a judgement call about whether we want to set a precedent where people can review the appropriateness of contributions to the University.

Comment: That's an issue for this proposed committee to deal with. It's not relevant to whether you do this or not.

Comment: So, each Senator commits to forwarding the petition to their entire faculty.

Comment: Yes, that's what was done with the HB2 proposal.

Comment: I think that there is a desire or expectation that the Faculty Senate votes on important issues. In the case of the “Poverty-Free” initiative, the executive summary was sent in advance. I came into this meeting with zero understanding of anything having to do with concerns around the Eudaimonia Institute. It’s very difficult procedurally to vote on something without the information. It’s clearly an important issue, and if it’s that important, it should be communicated to senators in advance of a meeting in which we are expected to vote, so we can be deliberate and thoughtful. I think we need to do a better job within the Senate of providing senators information in advance, particularly those not in the College, so they can be good senators and act on behalf of their constituents.

Comment: I would like to call the question.

A vote was taken to call the question. Passed by a show of hands.

The motion is to share the petition with every member of the faculty and staff in the University. How the Senate accomplishes that is not part of the motion.

A vote was taken by a show of hands. The motion was rejected.

A decision was made to circulate the petition only to senators at this time. It was also agreed upon that the senate would vote on whether to create a committee to review the EI at the next meeting after the senators had a chance to review the petition.

A motion was made and seconded to accept the minutes of the October 19, 2016 Senate meeting. Approval by a show of hands was unanimous in favor of approval.

President Cotter adjourned the meeting at 5:36pm.