

Wake Forest University Senate 2005-2006
Minutes
February 15, 2006

The University Senate held its third regularly scheduled meeting of the 2005-2006 academic year in Lecture Hall G28 at the Bowman Gray Campus.

Administration: Nathan O. Hatch, William Gordon, Louis Morrell, Gordon Melson, Robert Walsh

College: Robert Browne, Bob Evans, David Coates, Natalie Holzwarth, Harry Titus, Andrew Ettin, Barry Maine, Jill McMillan

Graduate School: Greg Shelness

School of Medicine: Michelle Naughton, Michael Olympio, Ronald Zagoria

School of Law: Tom Roberts, Simone Rose,

Calloway School of Business and Accountancy: Yvonne Hinson

Babcock School of Management: Jeff Smith, Robert Lamey, Michelle Roem

Divinity School: Neal Walls

Library: Lynn Sutton

Staff: Gary Alwine, Gloria Stickney

Visitors: Gloria Muday (Biology), Carole Browne (Biology), Charles Kimball (Religion)

President Harry Titus called the meeting to order at 4:07 PM

The minutes of the November 16, 2005 meeting were approved.

REPORTS

Endowment Review – Louis Morrell

Copies of the WFU Financial Report 2004-2005 were distributed and a brief presentation was made on the structure of the endowment and its role in funding the operating budget of Wake Forest University. The operating budget of WFU still relies predominately on tuition, fees and revenues from ancillary sources (e.g., real estate

rental income). Revenue from the endowment makes up only 4% of the operating budget of the University.

The investment performance of the endowment was summarized. The expectation for the endowment is for a 10.6% annual rate of return, 5.3% of which is annually distributed for operating expenses. The investment performance of the WFU endowment for 2005 was 12.35%, which exceeded the average investment performance for similarly sized endowments (\$500 million – \$1 Billion) of 11.3 %. However, very large endowments (>\$1 billion) had an average return of 13.8%. For the previous 10-year period the annual return was 10.7%, again outperforming the average of 10.3% for endowments in the \$500 million – \$1 billion category but underperforming the 12% annualized 10-year return of large endowments. The current value of the combined endowment is \$1,027,000,000.

Budget Advisory Council – Bill Gordon

Provost Gordon provided an update on the activities of the Budget Advisory Council. Meetings began in the fall of 2005 for the 2006-2007 budget year and the following issues were addressed: 1) Overall trends in budget allocation patterns were analyzed; 2) In depth analyses of the budget initiative of two years ago were reviewed. The goals of the initiative included reducing reliance on the endowment for operating income (to prevent loss of endowment principal), reducing the size of the operating budget, and increasing revenue. Although the goals of the plan have been achieved, the newly realized savings and revenue are committed to meet past liabilities; 3) The Council heard presentations by John Anderson and Maureen Carpenter on the Long-term Budget Plan. This plan looks five year ahead in terms of income and budgetary priorities and is updated and revised annually, as circumstances warrant. The structure of the budget plan affects salaries and other components of the operating budget; 4) The Council was presented a report prepared by an outside consulting firm detailing how relative levels of tuition increases affect the marketability of the University, including enrollment and student quality. Based on these and other data, tuition increases were discussed. The Council recommended a higher tuition increase than initially provided for in the 5-year budget plan with the proviso that additional revenue be committed to a Provost's Discretionary Fund for salary and other needs. The Board of Trustees approved these increases allowing for larger faculty and staff salary increases than in recent budget years.

Provost Gordon noted that the Council had gotten a late start, meeting for the first time in the fall of 2005 for the 2006-2007 fiscal year. The goal is to meet this spring to begin planning for the 2007-2008 fiscal year.

A question was raised about the membership of the Budget Advisory Council. Harry Titus indicated that the members are listed in the Senate minutes, which are publicly available on the Senate website (<http://www.wfu.edu/senate/>).

Reports from Faculty Representatives to the WFU Board of Trustees

1. Business Operations Committee - Yvonne Hinson

This committee received several reports and updates regarding ongoing and planned projects. These included completion of a computer systems replacement project, an effort to decrease student course registration time by 50%, a mobile communications project, and renovations and improvements at Groves Stadium, Reynolds Gym, Hearn Plaza and Magnolia Quad. A written report provided by Yvonne Hinson is appended to the minutes (Appendix A).

2. Athletics Committee - Charles Kimball

The Athletics Committee focused on the academic performance of WFU athletes, the competitive status of teams for the 2005-2006 fall and winter seasons, and a review of the Strategic Plan for the Department of Athletics. Of note is that the NCAA has instituted new guidelines for measuring graduation rates and academic performance among athletes. A positive development is that among ACC schools WFU ranks highly in terms of graduation rate. It was ranked 1st or tied for 1st in 9 of its 14 sports and ranked in the top 30 nationally.

A question was raised regarding the perceived gap in academic performance between athletes and non-athletes. Dr. Kimball indicated that as a whole the athletes do not substantially under perform the general student body; however, on a team-by-team basis there are discrepancies. A written report provided by Charles Kimball is appended to the minutes (Appendix B).

3. Committee for the College - Barry Maine

Barry Indicated he has been warmly received by the trustees and that he has heard numerous reports dealing primarily with student residence and life issues. A report provided by Barry Maine is appended to the minutes (Appendix C)

4. Advancement and Communications Committee - Jill McMillan

Agenda items were received ahead of time and the Faculty Representative has been warmly received. However, to date there has been insufficient time to provide substantive input. Among the numerous reports received was that gift donations to WFU have been healthy and well ahead of 2004 levels. This applies to all schools and campuses. A thematic focus of recent fundraising on the Reynolda campus is on recruitment and retention of superior faculty. A report provided by Jill McMillan is appended to the minutes (Appendix D)

5. Graduate and Professional Committee - Alan Palmiter (as reported by Harry Titus)

Alan was unable to attend the Senate meeting. Harry provided a brief introduction to Alan's written report. Consistent with the experience of other representatives, Alan noted that the Committee was welcoming but did not seek input. The Committee has continued its practice of visiting the various schools to hear presentations by selected faculty. This year visits were made to the Babcock School of Management and the Graduate School of Arts and Science. A report provided by Alan Palmiter is appended to the minutes (Appendix E).

Report by WFU Representative to The Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) – Carole Browne

Carole provided an overview of the history and structure of the COIA and some of its recent activities and reports. The COIA was founded by University/Faculty Senates of several Division IA schools. There are now 52 members including representatives from most of the major athletic conferences. The COIA mission is to provide a faculty voice in the ongoing debates surrounding the role of college athletics in the academic life of Division IA schools. The activities of the COIA are summarized by at the organizations web site:

<http://www.neuro.uoregon.edu/~tublitz/COIA/index.html>

Carole noted the importance of continued membership and participation in the COIA and pointed out the need for the Senate to develop a plan for selection of future representatives. A report provided by Carole Browne is appended to the minutes (Appendix F).

Staff Issues Committee - Gloria Stickney

The most pertinent issue for the SI committee is the ongoing effort to create a permanent Staff Advisory Council. Draft bylaws were formulated and submitted to Drs. Bill Gordon and John Anderson on December 1, 2005. The bylaws have since been revised and forwarded to Harry Titus for presentation to President Hatch and final approval. A report provided by Gloria Stickney is appended to the minutes (Appendix G)

Senate Oversight Committee – David Coates

No activities were reported

Fringe Benefits Committee – Robert Browne

The Fringe Benefits Committee (FRB) continues work on a number of health care-related issues. Among these is the Salary Based Health Care Premium Plan. The Ad

Hoc Benefits Planning Committee has received a report from the outside consulting firm, Gallagher Associates. However, the Committee is waiting input from the Presidents Office on this and a number of other related issues before moving forward. A report provided by Robert Browne is appended to the minutes (Appendix H).

Intra-Operations Committee – Barry Maine

The history of the planning and implementation of an evaluation system for Departmental Chairs and Deans was summarized. The system is now fully functional in the College and faculty and staff invited to evaluate their Chairs on a regular basis. The Dean of the College meets with each chair to discuss the results. Provost Gordon indicated that the evaluation process is also being implemented for all Deans on the Reynolda Campus. Under new business, a new faculty-to-faculty lecture series is being implemented. The first speaker will be Jacquelyn Fetrow of the Department of Physics. The lecture series will be hosted by President Hatch at his home. A report provided by Barry Maine is appended to the minutes (Appendix I).

Senior University Appointments – Jeff Smith

Harry Titus requested that Joe Tobin provide a written account of efforts by the Senior University Appointments Committee during the past presidential search. This report was placed into the record by Jeff Smith as Appendix J. Jeff noted one correction to the report: in the second to last paragraph the sentence, "The report was filed with the Board of Trustees" should instead read, "The report was filed with the Search Committee."

Motions regarding honorary degrees were discussed and voted on in closed session

New Business

Harry Titus indicated that he had asked the Fringe Benefits Committee to initiate discussions on childcare for the Reynolda Campus.

Meeting was Adjourned at 5:35 PM

APPENDIX A

University Board of Trustees Business Operations Committee Update

The 2/2/06 meeting was primarily an update from the 10/21/05 meeting. The following is a summary of presentations:

Jay Dominick - Information Systems Update

Administration Computing System Replacement Project – The 2 year project which began in July 2003 was completed in October 2005. All deadlines were met. Registration time was cut by 50% in August and they are trying to reduce this by another 25%

MobileU Project – This is a cell phone/PDA project for the students. A program involving over 100 students was conducted during the Fall 2005 semester. The assessment focused on academic value, student life value and administrative utility. They anticipate a voluntary program next year targeted towards upperclassmen.

Security Analysis – The IS department has contracted for an IT Security Assessment which will be performed this spring. This will gauge our existing and potential IT security risks.

ACC Security Conference – this was hosted by WFU on February 8th and 9th.

ThinkPad for 2006/2007 – Along with the new dual core technology the laptops will feature tablet PCs for those who opt for this.

Bill Sides – Capital Projects Update

Completed projects include building automation system control upgrades, exterior upgrades in Reynolda Village, new UPS service store and a state of the art fire alarm system in the Welcome Center.

Active Projects include various upgrades around campus, renovations and cosmetic upgrades at the President's House, a long-term renovation plan at Groves Stadium, renovations in Reynolds Gymnasium and various deferred maintenance projects.

Pending projects were also reported. They included projects at Reynolda House, Reynolds Library improvements and storage, improvements at the University Corporate Center, upgrades to Hearn Plaza (Main Quad) and Manchester Plaza (Magnolia Quad) and various other projects around campus.

John Anderson further discussed the deferred maintenance.

Brenda Balzer – Human Resources Benefit Update

Medical Insurance – as previously discussed at the Senate meeting. The university is looking into various initiatives related to medical insurance including options for health insurance premiums, usage of health insurance, surveys of cross-admits and a wellness disease management program.

Retiree Medical Insurance – a new program was implemented 1/1/06 that provides significant premium savings to retirees.

Retirement Plan – As of 2/1/06 the automatic default investment with TIAA-CREF changed to a Life Cycle Fund which will be much more beneficial to employees who do not select investment option.

APPENDIX B

Report on the WFU Trustees Athletics Committee

The meetings of the WFU Trustees Athletics Committee focused primarily on three reports: academic performance of WFU athletes, the competitive status of teams for 2005-6 fall and winter sports, and a review of the Strategic Plan for the Department of Athletics.

The NCAA has new guidelines and criteria for measuring the graduation success rate and academic progress rate for its institutions. These criteria provide a more accurate picture than previous formula (e.g., schools are no longer penalized for student-athletes who transfer to another school while in good academic standing). Wake Forest ranks exceptionally well among ACC schools in graduation success rate for the past four years (1st or tied for 1st in 9 of the 14 sports in which we compete). Wake Forest ranks second in the ACC (after Duke) in the top 30 nationally (out of more than 300 institutions) in the newly established system that measures academic progress.

The report on the competitive status of the fall and winter sport teams revealed both that WFU teams fell below expectations in several sports and that the overall ranking in the Sears Cup remains very high—both in the nation (top 30) and among ACC schools (4th). Data on particular teams was examined in conjunction with both academic progress and measurable goals identified in the strategic planning process. Other goals for the Athletic Department (attendance, marketing and promotion of various sports) were also presented and discussed.

The meetings concluded with executive sessions during which personnel and fiscal matters were discussed between the trustees and the Director of Athletics.

Prepared by:

Charles Kimball
Professor of Religion
Chair, Faculty Athletics Committee

APPENDIX C

Board of Trustees Committee for the College (2005/2006)

The agenda for the Committee for the College is set by the Trustees, in consultation with Dean Best and Vice-President Zick. The October and February meetings for the 2005/2006 academic year have been largely devoted to student residence and life issues. At the October meeting Chaplain Auman presented a study of best practices in college ministry, informing the committee of the very active and diverse religious life among students on campus, and reported on some areas we need to improve on, such as worship space for non-Christian religious groups. The committee also heard reports on retaining university police, the NCAA self-study, and judicial protocols for marijuana offences.

At the February meeting of the committee Vice-President Zick reported on new initiatives in sexual awareness education on campus, and Director of Residence Life and Housing Connie Carson and her staff presented a summary of the results of Wake Forest's continuing participation in student satisfaction surveys (conducted under the auspices of Educational Benchmarking) covering such categories as quality of housing, dining facilities, residence advising, etc., and offering both comparisons with other schools (Wake Forest ranks highly in all areas) and longitudinal data (we continue to make progress in virtually all areas).

Academic issues brought to the committee's attention by Dean Best in October included the hiring of new faculty, accommodating increases in student enrollment, arrangements for visiting Gulf Coast students displaced by Hurricane Katrina, academic planning initiatives (including a CAP recommendation for a reduction in requirements, a recently completed evaluation of first-year and writing seminars, and the appointment of a College Strategic Planning Committee, with funding from the Lily Foundation, to examine Wake Forest's "identity, future challenges, and goals"), and the SACS Accreditation process. At the February meeting Dean Best reported that Wake Forest is in a position to satisfy the SACS Accreditation requirements, which includes an enhanced program for international education (including but not limited to study abroad). She also reported on the success of summer study abroad at Wake Forest overseas houses (a new program), registration for Spring classes, and the forthcoming participation of Wake Forest undergraduates in the first ACC Research Conference highlighting undergraduate student research, which will be held at Clemson in April of this year.

The Trustees on the Committee for the College have been most welcoming and very receptive to faculty perspectives.

Submitted by Barry Maine, Professor of English
Faculty Representative

APPENDIX D

Advancement and Communications Committee
Wake Forest Board of Trustees
February 2, 2006

Report by Jill J. McMillan, Faculty Representative from the University Senate

Selected highlights of the committee report:

Sandra C. Boyette, Vice President for University Advancement

- The Campaign for Wake Forest has exceeded its goal of \$600 million by \$54 million as of December 31, 2005. The Reynolda Campus portion has generated approximately \$380.6 million toward its goal of \$400 million.
- A campaign focus continues to be to recruit and retain superior faculty members, and to shore up library support for their work. Dr. Hatch will be reporting on a specific initiative to this end.
- End-of-calendar year giving showed a seven per cent increase in Reynolda Campus receipts. The College and all Reynolda Campus professional schools are ahead of December, 2004 gift levels and well ahead of annual fund goals.

Robert Baker, Assistant Vice President of Development, Reynolda Professional schools

- The professional schools have approximately 17,000 living alumni and 25% make annual gifts.
- The professional schools have raised approximately \$85 million in the capital campaign as of December 2005. There have been endowment gifts for 89 new scholarships.
- With the completion of Kirby Hall, the four professional schools will focus on unrestricted support and gifts to the endowment.

Barry Faircloth, Associate Athletic Director

- The Athletic Annual Fund has grown by \$2 million over the last three years, fueled by an increase in all giving levels and the creation of a new giving level, the Moricle society (\$50,000/year gift).
- A new revenue stream for capital projects has been created by converting from permanent seat rights to termed leased seat opportunities in LJVM.
- Capital projects this year included a renovation of Reynolds Gym, a brick facade on the field wall of Groves Stadium; a graphical upgrade (pictures) of Budd Gym in the Miller Center.

- The Athletic Department is on pace to meet its Strategic Plan goal of funding 77% of the 2009-2010 scholarship cost from the annual fund and endowment payout. 73% was funded in 04-05 as compared to 59% in 01-02.

Norman Potter, Development Officer, School of Medicine

- In the Campaign for Wake Forest, the medical school has exceeded its goal by 37%.
- The Development Office at the medical school is operating from a coherent plan of fund-raising based on needs assessments of major constituents, especially the clinical faculty and the students.
- Like the Reynolda campus, the Hawthorne campus sees its major goal as recruiting, supporting, and retaining excellent faculty and students.
- Current major initiatives include building Research Park and developing burgeoning programs in regenerative medicine.

Communication of upcoming events:

- Founder's Day Convocation on February 21, 2006, will feature Senator Richard Burr '78, and there will be a special evening convocation on March 14, 2006, with Bill Moyers as the keynote speaker.
- A lifelong learning class will be piloted on campus on June 15-16, 2006, in an effort to connect with alumni, parents, and friends of the University. The topic will be "Signs of the Times: Contemporary American Religion in Historical Perspective."
- Following Hurricane Katrina, Creative Services established an emergency University website (<http://emergency.wfu.edu>) which is hosted on an out-of-state server to ensure continuous communication with constituents in the event of a disaster affecting campus.

APPENDIX E

Report of Faculty Representative to Graduate and Professional Committee of University Board of Trustees February 15, 2006

Over the past two years, the board committee on Graduate and Professional Schools has toured the University's graduate/professional schools on the Reynolda campus. Breaking from past practice of receiving reports from each school's dean, the committee itself initiated this new format to get a better sense for the programs and activities of the various graduate/professional schools.

In 2004-2005, the Committee visited the Law School and the Calloway School. This academic year, the Committee visited the Babcock School of Management and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. There were several constants in the visits:

- (1) in each case, the Committee heard presentations for two hours from faculty members selected by each school's dean
- (2) all the presenters felt obliged to use Powerpoint
- (3) present throughout were the school's dean and the provost
- (4) the Committee members were uniformly well-behaved, and asked polite questions after the presentations
- (5) the Committee members were uniformly surprised to learn about many of the professional/graduate school's activities and programs
- (6) after the presentations, which all brimmed with enthusiasm and optimism, the Committee went into executive session

But there have also been some differences from school to school:

- (1) powerpoint skills vary markedly among the faculties - the best PPT presentation was by
- (2) the focus of each school's presentation was different -
 - (a) the Calloway School focused on the community service and practicum projects available to its students
 - (b) the Law School described its various international programs, including a Masters program for international students
 - (c) the Babcock School gave an overview of all its academic programs (day, evening, weekend, here and in Charlotte) and its student competitions
 - (d) the Graduate School focused on its most prominent degree programs - in Physics, Communications, Biochemistry
- (3) over the past two years, Committee members have become increasingly engaged, asking such questions as
 - (a) "how do you teach business managers to be ethical?"
 - (b) "where are the graduate school's programs headed and what do they need?"

As Graduate/Professional Committee rep, I received an agenda for each meeting, as well as invitations to the Trustees' breakfast, lunch and dinner events. I also received copies of any handouts

at the meetings, though not the Trustees' info package. I did not receive a list of the Committee members or their bios, which I pieced together from the University's website and Google. I have not been asked about my views on the Committee's work, except by the University Senate.

Alan Palmiter
Law School

APPENDIX F

COIA website

<http://www.neuro.uoregon.edu/~tublitz/COIA/index.html>

The COIA (Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics) was formed in 2002 as a coalition of faculty senates at the Big 10 schools that were concerned about the commercialization of division IA college athletics. Subsequently other faculty senates joined, and now there are 57 division IA member senates. The purpose of the organization is to provide a faculty voice in the national debate over the future of college sports. The long range goal of the COIA is to preserve and enhance the contributions athletics can make to academic life by addressing longstanding problems in college sports that undermine those contributions.

In early 2004, COIA leaders, in consultation with the leadership of the national Faculty Athletics Representatives Association, drafted Campus Athletics Governance the Faculty Role: Principles, Proposed Rules, and Guidelines. After a process of discussion and amendment, the Governance paper was adopted in April 2004 as a Coalition policy recommendation for all Division IA institutions.

In January 2005 the COIA prepared a policy paper, Academic Integrity in Intercollegiate Athletics: Principles, Proposed Rules, and Guidelines, which was adopted by vote of the COIA membership in April 2005. Initial drafts of this document were developed in consultation with members of the leaderships of the National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletes and the Drake Group.

COIA members gathered again in December 2005 at Washington State University. The meeting agenda, a discussion of fiscal responsibility in college athletics, was set aside when just before the meeting the COIA received a request from the NCAA Presidential Task Force on the Future of Division IA Athletics to discuss and provide feedback on their on-going work.

Twenty-eight representatives from 24 of the member senates were present. Those present formulated and endorsed eight draft reports, including recommendations, which were sent out for comments and review by representatives of all COIA faculty senates. Because of the brief time frame, the reports could not be reviewed by entire participating faculty senates. After comments were received from COIA representatives, final versions of eight reports were produced and approved by the COIA Steering Committee.

Topics covered included fiscal responsibility, presidential leadership, over-commercialization, the nature of the collegiate model, integration of athletics into campus life, and admissions and diversity. The initial drafts of the reports were endorsed by the conference participants. The final version, A Report to the NCAA Presidential Task Force, was approved by the COIA Steering Committee and submitted to the NCAA in December.

Major points in the report:

The nature and core values of the collegiate model of athletics is based on the priority of academics; The goals usually associated with athletic competition (e.g., winning and excellence in athletic performance) should complement but not supersede the goals of educational accomplishments and personal growth.

In order to reach this objective, athletics needs to be more integrated within the academic structure of the campus. This includes

Integration of the Athletics Department into campus budget decision making, into general governance structures, including faculty governance; and in salary structure;

Integration of the Athletics Department staff, at all levels, in the cultural and academic life of the whole campus;

Integration of athletes into the student body in terms of the admissions process and campus experience; and integration of the academic advising for athletes into the campus academic advising and support structure.

Commercialism and over-commercialization present a threat to the integrity of intercollegiate sports. We must seek mechanisms to manage the demands of television networks and corporate sponsors. Universities are non-profit, educational institutions; many are governmental agencies with public restrictions; they traditionally cherish academic freedom, freedom of thought, and freedom of information, and are devoted to the public good. Commercial interests that devalue the commitment and mission of the institution must be carefully examined.

APPENDIX G

Senate Staff Issues (SI) Report February 15, 2006

The Staff Issues committee continues to meeting on a monthly basis.

Bylaws for a Staff Advisory Council were drafted and sent to Drs. Bill Gordon and John Anderson on December 1, 2005. The bylaws have since been reviewed and revised. They were sent to Harry Titus to forward to Dr. Hatch for approval.

Tim Auman, University Chaplain, was the guest speaker for January. He shared about ways he and his staff can help members of the Wake Forest community. Two brochures, "Religious Life at Wake Forest University" and "Wake Forest Campus Ministry" (which talks about the religious organizations on campus) were distributed. He indicated that in order for a religious group to be recognized on campus, it must meet specific guidelines set up by the Chaplain's office. Tim indicated that a huge part of his time is spent assisting students in different organizations, but that he also provides pastoral care to all areas of WFU – students, faculty, and staff, and assists with crisis and financial management.

Claire Hammond and Terry Pratt of the Winston-Salem Arts Council were guests speakers for the February meeting. The Winston-Salem Arts Council, which is the oldest council in the United States, will launch its fund drive in March, using the theme "Grow Art." Information will be distributed to WFU employees at that time. Last year they granted over \$1,000,000 in grants, while supporting 13 organizations.

The committee is scheduled to meet again March 14.

Submitted by: Gloria Stickney, Co-Chair

APPENDIX H

Report of the Fringe Benefits Committee February 15, 2006

The FRB continues to work on a number of issues, primarily related to health care. The majority of the health care fringe benefits are currently being considered by an Ad Hoc Benefits Planning Committee, composed of representatives from Human Resources (Reynolda Campus), Senate members and additional faculty members with relevant expertise. The committee has also received input from Gallagher Associates, a consulting firm. The Ad Hoc Benefits Planning Committee is waiting for a report from the President's Office, where a committee has been formed at the cabinet level to examine a range of health care issues, including salary dependent health care premiums. The recent communication from the President's Office is that the cabinet committee has found these issues to be complex and that the committee's plan is to have a proposal(s) available by the end of the spring semester.

The FRB plans to take up the issue of day care on the Reynolda campus, from the short- and long-term perspectives. President Hatch has expressed interest in moving forward on this topic.

APPENDIX I

Senate Intra-Operations Committee (IOC) Report:

The Implementation of the Senate Recommendation regarding the Evaluation of Academic Administrators February 15, 2006

History

In response to concerns raised by the College faculty about what appeared to be insufficient opportunity for faculty to participate in formal evaluations of deans and department chairs, at the April 2002 meeting of the University Senate, the IOC was formally charged with finding out what peer institutions were doing with regard to the evaluation of academic administrators, and to report back to the Senate at its first meeting of the following year. At the October 2002 meeting the IOC presented its report, with copies distributed to all senators present and entered in the senate files. (The report can be accessed from the minutes of the meeting.) At this time there were no regular procedures in place for evaluating deans in the College or professional schools, and some departments in the College had no formal procedures for evaluating department chairs. All respondents (in the report) reported that their universities had procedures in place for evaluating deans and department chairs. Although the procedures themselves varied, all combined the efforts of supervisor and supervised to evaluate the performance of academic administrators. It was suggested at this meeting that the Senate consider a recommendation for “a uniform system of evaluation.”

At subsequent meetings of the Senate that year and the next, the IOC reported that it was at work on the issue, and at the April 2003 meeting the IOC presented a draft of an evaluation form (a survey) which was approved by the Senate and appended to the minutes. At the October meeting of that year the IOC reported it was fine-tuning the instrument and procedures. At the November 2003 meeting of the Senate the following motion was made by IOC chair Paul Ribisl:

The Wake Forest University Senate recommends that all Department Chairs and Deans be regularly evaluated and provided developmental feedback by their superior administrator. The attached questionnaire will be the model of the questionnaire to be used to gain input from the relevant faculty and staff. The Office of the Provost will coordinate the administration of the evaluation.

The evaluation will be administered to the faculty and staff under the appropriate administrator and the information will be shared with that administrator by their immediate superior; i.e., all department chairs will meet with their respective deans to discuss the results of the evaluation. It is emphasized that the evaluation process will be developmental and confidential. The schedule for conducting the evaluations is to be decided by the respective superior administrator of that unit and should be at least biennial (i.e., once every two years).

A two page model questionnaire for the evaluation process was included in the motion, and the motion was passed..

The Dean of the College (Paul Escott) had already begun to implement the Senate recommendation, but due to President Hearn's illness, surgery, and recovery time, Provost Gordon was appointed Acting President, and no action was taken in the Provost's Office on this recommendation. Upon further inquiry from the IOC about implementation, Provost Gordon assured the Senate that there was no opposition in the administration to the recommendation, and that full implementation would begin the following Spring. At the April 2005 meeting of the Senate Provost Gordon announced that the evaluation of deans would begin the following day, beginning with the dean of the Calloway School, and continuing that Spring with the deans of the Law and Divinity Schools. (These deans had served longest.) He reported that he would use a survey consistent with the one approved by the Senate.

Implementation

Dean of the College Debbie Best reports that procedures are in place for the regular evaluation of all department chairs in the College. Although practices are not uniform among all departments, faculty and staff in each department are invited to participate in the evaluation. The Dean meets with each chair to discuss the results. The evaluations are developmental and confidential, and are consistent with the principles set down in the Senate motion.

Provost Bill Gordon reports that procedures are in place for the evaluation of all deans on the Reynolda Campus. Deans (of the College, Calloway School, Babcock School, Law School, Graduate School, and Divinity School) are evaluated by the Provost every 3-4 years using the model and survey proposed by the Senate. Faculties are asked to fill out detailed evaluative questionnaires and the Provost and Deans discuss the results. The Provost also provides his own assessment of each Dean's performance. Provost Gordon would like some latitude in determining when an evaluation will occur (based on how many are scheduled in a given year) and some latitude as well on procedures, depending on the nature of the School (e.g. the College is so large that department chairs may be the better group to survey). He may continue to seek the Senate's advice on procedures. He reports that so far the evaluations have proved to be very useful and valuable for all concerned.

The Medical School has not adopted the Senate recommendation, but Richard Dean (President, WFU Health Sciences) has expressed some interest.

APPENDIX J

Report to the Wake Forest University Senate on the Presidential Search of 2004-2005.

The Senate leadership approached Michele Gillespie and Judy Brunso-Bechtold, faculty representatives to the Search Committee, at the conclusion of the search, with a request for an overview of the search process. Their report follows.

Presidential Search Process

2004-2005	Board of Trustees began preliminary formation of search committee
May 2004	10 members of Search Committee Named <i>7 Trustees, including student trustee 2 Senior Administrators Reynolda Campus and Med School 1 Alumni Council Rep)</i>
June 2004	Faculty Advisory Board to the Presidential Search Named 2 Faculty members from Board of 10 Selected by Search Committee
July 2004	Shelley Storbeck of A.T. Kearney secured as Consultant to the Search Leadership Retreat: Meetings with Alumni and Parents Council, Board of Trustees inviting comments, feedback, discussion Advertisement for President in Chronicle of Higher Education
August 2004	Presidential Profile Completed Organizational Meetings of Search Committee: Securing Nominations
Sept- Dec. 2004	Search Committee Meetings with: Campus Constituencies 3 Reynolds Campus Open Forums 1 Medical School Open Forum Parents' Councils, Alumni Councils, Board, etc. Multiple Faculty Advisory Committee Meetings held; Wrote Document: PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE CHARACTERISTICS: PRIORITIES OF THE FACULTY, shared with Search Committee, Candidates and WFU Community

Sept.-Oct.
2004

Search Committee Reviewed Nominations

Initial Review by One of Four Subcommittees

Each Subcommittee with an Academic on it

Each Nominee subject to subcommittee and committee discussion

Oct.-Nov.
2004

Search Committee Representatives, including a faculty member,
Visited highly qualified candidates to persuade to apply (3 trips)

Short List of Top 20: October 21

Short List of Top 12: October 31

Interview List of Top 8: November 8

In Person Intense Interviews of 8 Top Candidates: November 20

At conclusion of interviews, decided on Top 3 Candidates to bring to
Campus

Dec. 2004-
Jan. 2005

Top 3 Candidates Came to Campus; Interviewed by Search Committee
and Senate University Appointments Committee

SUA Reports Submitted to Search Committee

Search Committee Discusses SUA Report and Candidates;

Selects Nathan Hatch

**Senior University Appointments Committee of the Wake Forest University Senate
Synopsis of activity involved in the presidential search process, 2004-2005.**

In November 2004, the SUA was contacted by Mr. Murray Greason, Chairman of the Board of Trustees in regards to the SUA's participation in the presidential search process. The Board required members of the committee to sign a Confidentiality Agreement prior to distribution of the names and supporting materials for the list of candidates to be interviewed. The Board appointed presidential search committee (Search Committee) had already reviewed the multitude of proposed candidates and had conducted interviews of the semi-finalists. The Board then agreed to the list of finalists to be invited to Winston-Salem for interviews. The SUA met with the two faculty members (Dr. Judy Brunso-Bechtold and Dr. Michele Gillespie) of the Search Committee to review the process and expectations of the SUA report. The SUA was to devise an interviewing strategy for each candidate and plan to spend approximately 2.5 hours with each candidate.

The SUA committee convened and decided to break into 2 teams of 5 members each, in order to decrease the size of each interview, and each team would have approximately 1 hour with the candidate. This allowed for some scheduling flexibility for the members of the SUA. The candidates were to be interviewed over the 2 month interval of December 2004-January 2005. All candidates were notified of the interest of the SUA in interviewing them, and each agreed to meet with the SUA committee.

Dr. Jeff Smith, Chair of the SUA at that time utilized the password protection option available in Microsoft Word for e-mail communications between members of the committee. This password was distributed to the committee members via hardcopy. Materials in support of each candidate, and template evaluations were distributed by Dr. Smith to each committee member in person. SUA members reviewed the questions that had been provided as starting points by the Search Committee and external consultant. The committee was also provided with the document 'Presidential Candidate Characteristics: Priorities of the Faculty' from the Faculty Advisory Committee. SUA members then developed their own questions to evaluate each candidate in several dimensions. Each team utilized half of the selected questions to avoid duplication, and evaluate each dimension of the candidate as fully possible within this time frame.

Interviews were scheduled at an off-campus location. Following each interview, the entire SUA met for a debriefing session within 24-48 hours. Draft notes were transcribed. Then, in marathon sessions, group editing of the proposed SUA report occurred. The report evaluated each candidate in several dimensions. An executive summary was prepared on each candidate by the SUA along with a multipage report discussing each of the dimensions evaluated and the insights of the SUA members regarding the candidate's strengths and weaknesses.

The SUA report concluded with a summary evaluation of each candidate and the level of enthusiasm or endorsement for each candidate. Final wording of the completed report was proofed by each committee member (one SUA member was out of the country and did not participate in the final report). The report was filed with the Board of Trustees. A follow up

meeting with Dr. Brunso-Bechtold and Dr. Gillespie and the SUA occurred to provide feedback to the group's work.

This summary is respectfully submitted, January 9, 2006

Joseph R. Tobin
Chairman SUA Committee 2005-2006