

## **Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting March 25, 2015**

*Submitted by Senate Secretary, Catherine Seta, Professor of Psychology  
Prepared by Amalia Wagner and Catherine Seta, Ph.D.*

*Caveat: Comments recorded are not verbatim. In order to facilitate open discussion, the identity of most Senators making comments or questions are 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.)*

There were 27 voting Senators present, a quorum. In attendance: Umit Akinc, Martha Alexander-Miller, Edward Allen, Sarah Bodin, Susan Borwick, Dan Bourland, James Cotter, Kevin Cox, Larry Daniel, Will Fleeson, Samuel Gladding, Derrik Hiatt, Tim Janke, Kevin Jung, Leslie Kammire, Rogan Kersh, Nina Lucas, Hof Milam, Emmanuel Opara, Wilson Parker, John Parks, Sarah Raynor, Cathy Seta, Peter Siavelis, Gale Sigal, Omari Simmons, Kathy Smith, Michelle Steward, Lynn Sutton, Julie Wayne, Jeff Weiner, Mark Welker.

President Sigal called the Senate meeting to order. A motion was made and seconded to accept the minutes of the January 21, 2015 Senate meeting. Approval by a show of hands was unanimous in favor of approval.

### **Resolutions put before the Senate:**

The following resolutions come from the Executive Committee to the Senate body as seconded motions. President Sigal presented the first motion to endorse the revised CAFR report below.

#### ***Item A: The report from the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility***

**To: Senate Executive Committee**

**From: Paul Escott, Chair, Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility**

**In response to your request, the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility met today to discuss the Vision 2020 report. Ten members of the committee successfully arranged their schedules to attend a meeting in this period between semesters; two additional members of the committee sent comments that were shared with those present; a third additional member sent comments which were largely consistent with today's discussion but arrived late.**

**The Committee recognized that the Vision 2020 report aimed to generate enthusiasm and encourage progress and synergies on campus. As a starting point, its intent may be to spur useful discussion of issues relating to information technology and teaching. But the report has a specific viewpoint and lacks breadth. The Committee saw a number of problems or reasons to be concerned:**

- **The Committee supports encouragement of the use of technology in teaching. But it believes that Wake Forest's goal should be good teaching, however a faculty member achieves that result. The Committee was in favor of rewarding**

those who use new technology successfully, but not in favor of requiring, forcing, or penalizing those who do not.

- **The tone of the document is overly enthusiastic and generally uncritical in regard to the use of technology. Phrases such as “remarkable potential” and “transformative” effects are common, but the report does not cite convincing research to support such claims. Where empirical research is needed, the report often substitutes the claims of individuals who have a commercial interest in promoting their product. Members of the Committee have not seen in their students the large benefits that are supposedly accruing in secondary education due to the use of new technology.**
- **The Committee felt that before plunging ahead, research is needed on the positive and possibly negative educational impacts of today’s modern information technology. Committee members felt that it would be good for the faculty to have access to sound research and expertise bearing on both desirable and undesirable impacts of the new technology. Collection and dissemination of this research are appropriate before adoption. A committee or several existing groups on campus could provide this service to the faculty. Wake Forest also should ask, how are we going to measure the benefits of new learning methods or technologies?**
- **The Committee was troubled by a tone that seemed designed to herd faculty members in one direction; some feared what was called “coercion creep.” As specific examples, the Committee saw reasons to be concerned with Recommendation 11 on page 19, which concerned tenure and promotion, and also criticized the last sentence of Recommendation 10. In the view of several members of the committee, these potentially raise issues of academic freedom. Members of the Committee also disagreed with the idea (page 18) that the faculty should be a “cohesive whole” and suggested that the strength of a university derives from its individual, diverse faculty members.**
- **The Vision 2020 report failed to take into account important differences among disciplines. This is especially notable in regard to open access, which seems desirable in theory but for various disciplines is currently impractical as a way to publish one’s research and gain professional acceptance for one’s work. The Committee also noted, as does the Vision 2020 report, that funds for open access publishing are not adequate for potential future needs at this point. If open access is to become common, faculty and administrators will have to move carefully through a transition period, and open-access publishing cannot be required or demanded of all faculty during such a transition. There was general**

**agreement that, if peer-reviewed, open-access publications are legitimate and deserving of respect.**

- **The Teaching and Learning Center was established in 1995 by the undergraduate faculty as a resource for the faculty, run by the faculty. At that time it was made very clear to the administration that its role was merely to provide funding; the programs and direction of the TLC were to be left in the hands of the faculty. The recommendations of the Vision 2020 report continue a movement toward control by the administration of the TLC.**

Discussion ensue:

- Several people reiterated what Provost Kersh said about the Vision 2020 report ....that it will serve as a first draft of a brainstorming exercise and there will be more input before implementation.
- Assistant Provost Sutton, the co-chair of Vision 2020, informed the Senate that the group is taking all comments received into a revised version that will be available at the end of the academic year. These comments will be taken into account for the next version.
- Assistant Provost Sutton expressed concern about the content of the last bullet point regarding The Teaching and Learning Center. She offered an alternate view about the TLC and the positive impact of its present administrative structure - as headed by a professional versus faculty. A comment from a Senator supported this view.
- A Senator expressed his feelings about the CAFR report and requested that it should be noted that reading the CAFR report seemed to him as if the committee read a different document than he read.

President Sigal presented all voting members with a ballot to vote on endorsement of the CAFR's report. Results of the voting were 15 in favor, 5 against, and 2 abstentions. The motion carried.

***Item B: Resolution regarding the Wake Forest School of Medicine***

**The Wake Forest University Faculty Senate condemns the continuing proliferation and implementation of policies and practices regarding tenure, terms of employment and tenured faculty compensation adopted by the Wake Forest School of Medicine since March 2007.**

- 1) **Significant and systematic reduction of the salaries of tenured faculty members constitutes de facto tenure revocation. Consequently, the implementation of such policies effectively bypasses long-established existing university and medical school policies regarding tenure revocation.**

- 2) **Policy changes introduced by the “Tenure Policy Revisions” (2007) and the “Policy on Faculty Compensation” (2012) constitute wholesale revisions of the terms and conditions of employment for tenure-track and tenured employees hired before 2007 as well as those hired between 2007 and 2011, thus breaching the contracts of the respective employees.**

Discussion ensued and the following comments were noted.

- Provost Kersh offered to convey to the Dean of the Medical School the results of the vote on this resolution.
- A Senator noted that there have been other letters expressing similar views that were shared with the medical school administration. The present resolution has the advantage of putting the content of the concerns in a compact form. The discussion that has taken place has been with officers of the Senate and within the Senate, but not communication from the Senate directly.

Ballots were distributed and votes tallied. Results of the vote were 24 in favor. The motion carried. Senate President Sigal stated that the Executive Committee will set up a meeting with the Medical School Administrators.

***Item C: Resolution proposed by the Fringe Benefits Committee of the University Senate Resolved:***

**In light of the reality that Wake Forest University faculty and staff have been subject to four consecutive years of benefit cuts and/or price increases in their benefits packages, and that additional increases are slated for FY 2016, the Wake Forest University Senate formally expresses its profound concerns regarding the impacts that these continuing cuts and increases will have on faculty and staff morale, employee health and wellness, the ability to recruit and retain high quality faculty and staff, and in the end, the potentially negative effect on the quality of the student experience that can result from the deteriorating benefits package offered to university to faculty and staff.**

Discussion ensued:

- A friendly amendment was made to offer a possible solution to the proposed problem. At the end of the resolution, add *that we urge the administration to consider increasing the size of the insured pool and by exploring integration options with other institutions such as the medical school.*
- President Sigal noted that the intention of the ExCom was not to propose specific or particular solutions. Rather, the ExCom felt that stating the resolution generally would

be more effective than proposing specific policies (e.g., co-pay amounts). Given this explanation, the friendly amendment was withdrawn.

- A Senator asked if Hof Milam could give a report about the budget to the Senate
- Hof Milam responded that he is giving his financial address to the University in April.
- Senator Siavelis, Chair of the Fringe Benefits Committee informed the Senate that the committee was told by CFO Milam that there will not be any changes to benefits. But there will be a premium increase to the university's cost (6.5% for core plan and 7.4% value plan) that is currently under negotiation, and an increase to the fringe rate (from 27.4% to 28.4%).
- A Senator addressed CFO Milam – noting that we were told last year the university was over the budget for medical expenses, which resulted in increased medical plan costs to faculty and staff. Is this something that happens every year; did it happen again this year; should more money be committed to the budget for medical expenses?
- CFO Milam responded that fortunately it does not happen every year but it did occur last year and again this year. Despite the changes we made last year in the benefits we are still spending well above what was budgeted. He commented that this is not atypical in the inflationary medical environment.
- A Senator asked Mr. Milam whether it was possible that he share the benefit data used in comparing WFU with other institutions. CFO Milam responded that he would share that information with the Fringe Benefits committee.

Ballots were distributed and tallied. Results of the vote were 25 in favor, 1 no. The motion carried.

*Item D: Resolution regarding the Faculty Athletic Representative to the NCAA*

**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. (COIA 2004 Campus Athletics Governance – the Faculty Role section 1B; local and national [NCAA certification]).**

Discussion and friendly amendments arose from the floor:

- This is a positional resolution, unrelated to past or present representations.
- The resolution is a response to a national movement on the part of COIA to adopt this as a best practice.

- A motion was made to add (*i.e., University Faculty Senate*) to the resolution, at the end of the following sentence: *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.* Approval by a show of hands was unanimous in favor of approval. The amendment was adopted as an aspect of this resolution.
- A friendly amendment was made changing the first sentence of the resolution to read as follows. *Based on the COIA framing the future report, 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.*

Approval by a show of hands was unanimous in favor of approval.

The amended resolution follows:

**Based on the COIA framing the future report, 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 (i.e., University Faculty Senate). 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. (COIA 2004 Campus Athletics Governance – the Faculty Role section 1B; local and national [NCAA certification]).**

### **Integration Committee Report**

**Item 1.** John Parks, Chair of the Integration Committee introduced William Turkett, who spoke about the new Biomedical Informatics MS program. Below are some of the highlights of the program.

- Cross-campus program focuses on providing training, in an interdisciplinary environment, on the quantitative and analytical methods necessary to work with and transform medical data.
- Primary departments and units involved in leadership and implementation
  - Biomedical Sciences Campus: Public Health Sciences-Biostatistical Sciences, Biomedical Engineering
  - Reynolda Campus: Computer Science, Mathematics
- Faculty leadership:
  - Ralph D’Agostino (Public Health Sciences-Biostatistical Sciences) – Director

- Sean Simpson (Public Health Sciences-Biostatistical Sciences)
- William Turkett (Computer Science)
- Traditional 2-year MS with thesis, project and coursework completion options, plus a 4+1 option for undergraduates with aligned interests
- Three planned concentrations:
  - Bioinformatics (“Omics”, Computational Systems Biology)
  - Public health/Clinical informatics
  - Imaging informatics
- Implementation details:
  - Anticipated start date AY 2016-2017
  - Cohort size: 20 students
  - Location: Biomedical Sciences Campus, Innovation Quarter (under consideration)
  - Tuition: \$20,000 a year (review generating)
  - The program offers a professional degree intended to qualify students for employment.
- There are related, but not identical programs at Duke, UNC, ECE, NCSU, and UNCC

**Item 2.** John Parks introduced Carol Milligan, who reported on the implementation of a new 5 year MS degree in neuroscience.

- In order to be eligible for this program, at the end of the student’s sophomore year, the student will declare that they want to be a Neuroscience minor.
- At that time they will apply for the 4+1 program by submitting an application to the graduate school.
  - Minimum GPA of 3.25
  - Need two recommendation letters, one from the director of neurobiology course and one from a faculty member of the students major.
- Students will start their research fall semester of their junior year or spring semester

- The curriculum does not double count credits for the neuroscience undergraduate degree minor and graduate Masters degree.
- The thesis and graduate course work will take place in the 5<sup>th</sup> year of the program
- Currently, there are 35 neuroscience minors and 13 applications for this new program
- Pending board approval, program will begin in Fall 2015
- Program is only available to WFU and Winston Salem State ON TRACK program students.

**Reports from Senate representatives on their reports about the Board of Trustees meeting:**

President Sigal noted that the individual reports were attached to the agenda and opened the floor for questions. For complete report, please refer to the respective addendum.

- Athletic Committee meeting, Nina Lucas (For complete report, refer to Addendum A)
- Academic Committee meeting of the Board of Trustees, Cathy Seta, Jay Ford (For complete report, refer to Addendum B)
- Advancement and Communications Committee, Michele Gillespie (For complete report, refer to Addendum C)
- Finance Committee meeting of the Board of Trustees, John Stewart (For complete report, refer to Addendum D)
- Administration Committee meeting, Mike Green (For complete report, refer to Addendum E)

**New Business:**

President Sigal asked if there was any new business. There was not. She adjourned the Senate at 5:20pm