

Wake Forest University Senate 2007-2008  
Minutes  
September 19, 2007

The University Senate held its first regularly scheduled meeting of the 2007-2008 academic year in DeTamble Auditorium on the Reynolda campus. The following members were present:

*Administration:* Nathan Hatch, Jill Tiefenthaler, James Bullock, Matthew Cullinan, Nancy Suttentfield, Kenneth Zick, Lorna Moore, Blake Morant, Ron Wellman, Lynn Sutton

*College:* Carole Browne, David Coates, Brad Jones, Natalie Holzwarth, Dilip Kondepudi, James Kuzmanovich, Barry Maine, Kathy Smith

*Graduate School:* Suzy Torti

*School of Medicine:* Edward Haponik, Michelle Naughton

*School of Law:* Tim Davis, Wendy Parker, Simone Rose

*Calloway School of Business and Accountancy:* James Cotter, Dale Martin

*Babcock School of Management:* Derrick Boone, Robert Lamy

*Divinity School:* Neal Walls

*Staff:* Gary Alwine, Julie Groves

*Guests:* Todd Edwards, Nancy Crouch, Kriss Dinkins, Information services; Dana Hutchens, Career Services; Gloria Stickney, Research and Sponsored Programs; Kevin Cox, News Service; Kerry King, Creative Services

*Apologies:* Umit Akinc, Cormac O'Donovan

The meeting was called to order by Senate President David Coates at 4:05 p.m. New senators and members of the administration were welcomed.

*Matters arising from the last meeting*

Matthew Cullinan gave a brief update on the UOC-initiated Staff Advisory Committee. He stated that the first official election for staff advisory council had been completed and that regular meetings would begin shortly. The Senate Fringe Benefits committee requested an update on results of discussions on parental leave policy and child care.

The minutes of the April 11 meeting were approved.

*New business.*

*Introduction and Comments by the new Provost, Dean of the Law School and Dean of the Graduate School*

Provost Jill Tiefenthaler, Dean Blake and Dean Moore addressed the Senate on their plans and vision. Provost Tiefenthaler emphasized that her primary focus is to place the academic mission front and center for the institution. Her goals are to improve excellence at Wake Forest in reality and reputation, and to foster collaboration and connectivity across campuses. Dean Blake stated that a major objective was to broaden education to include teaching students how to be professionals. Establishment of clinics in such areas as community development, entrepreneurship, child advocacy, and immigration were examples he cited. Other goals include capstone courses, metropolitan externships, and a survey law course in the liberal arts. Dr. Moore emphasized the inherently transdisciplinary nature of the graduate program, which draws from multiple WFU schools and is divided between the Reynolda and Bowman Gray campuses. Her objectives include the promotion of connectivity and synergies between graduate education and research through such venues as the Hot Topics community forum. She hopes to foster new international as well as national initiatives.

*Committee reports. Most committees had met once to discuss their charges and plans for the year. These were summarized by the committee chairs.*

University oversight. The Chair stated that his committee will focus on (1) an overview of university resources and the allocation of resources in the university financial structure; (2) a yearly report that reflects the financial position of university that everyone can access; (3) review of parking, childcare, staff representation and tuition reimbursement; (4) more consistent university oversight.

Interuniversity operations committee. The goals of the committee for this year are to improve communication networks; work towards harmonization of governance and practices across the university; encourage academic exchanges and synergies through the university planning council; and facilitate a state of the University address by the President.

Fringe benefits. The Chair stated that Daycare will be the primary focus of this committee for this year. The committee hopes to advise the Vice President for Administration on this topic based on its 20 year record of reports and deliberations on daycare.

Senior University Appointments. The committee plans to increase marketing /awareness of Wake Forest community regarding honorary degrees; use the campus newspaper and emails to encourage input; and revise the website. The committee defined “senior” appointments as academic deans, cabinet level staff and above, and those who come before Board of Trustees search committee. The committee also considered what

constitutes graduate faculty membership. The full minutes of the Sept. 5 2007 meeting of this committee are attached as Appendix I to these minutes.

*Report on COAI, Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics.*

Senator Browne summarized recent proposals adopted by the Coalition at its June 15 2007 meeting. The mission of COAI is to bring a faculty voice to discussions of athletic reform. The report, Framing the Future: Reforming Intercollegiate Athletics, is attached as a separate file to these minutes.

*Overview of the campus master plan.*

Kevin King from Ayers/Saint/Gross Architects gave an overview on the development of a campus master plan. Planners are currently in the process of collecting data and commentary for the plan. The hope is to have the specifics of the plan formulated by Oct. 2008. Information is available at <http://groups/wfu.edu/masterplan/index.html>.

*Report of the Crisis Management Team.*

The Crisis Management Team was formed after 9/11 to design processes that would anticipate, manage and recover from crises. Three levels of crisis were recognized: one-dimensional incident, multi-building incident, and campus wide emergency. This includes such diverse potential crises as water damage, electrical, fire, troubled students, pandemics etc. Currently the team is reviewing communication tools. Use of more than one tool is desirable, including “low tech” options such as a steam whistle. To ensure a timely response, a change from group decision-making to the vesting of responsibility in a highly ranking campus police officer will be implemented. Community education through meeting of police with units and departments are planned.

*First reading of “Reforming the Role of Senate in the Governance Structure of Wake Forest University”*

David Coates highlighted the major points of a paper on the role of senate in governance, which he has authored as a result of discussions with an *ad hoc* working party of Senators in 2006-7. The full document is attached as Appendix II of these minutes. President Hatch and Provost Tiefenthaler expressed their support for the spirit of this document and for continuing discussions of the issues raised therein. A working committee of Senators and the Provost will be constituted for this purpose.

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:56 p.m.

Respectfully submitted.

Suzy Torti,  
Senate Secretary

**Appendix I**  
**Senior University Appointments (SUA) Committee Meeting Minutes**  
**September 5, 2007**

The SUA met on September 5, 2007 to discuss its role in university governance. Brad Jones, James Kuzmanovich, Simone Rose, Derrick Boone, and Jill Tiefenthaler attended the meeting.

Based on tasking from the executive committee, the following charges were discussed:

1. Oversee process for solicitation, nomination, and recommendations for honorary degrees.
2. Participate in the interview process for and make recommendations regarding “senior” university appointments.
3. Define what “senior” university appointment means.
4. Investigate what constitutes graduate faculty membership.
5. Investigate and make recommendations regarding appointments and titles beyond those conferred by the board of trustees.

Honorary degrees

1. Increase marketing /awareness of Wake Forest community regarding honorary degrees.
2. Use campus newspaper and emails to encourage input.
3. Revise website.
4. Emphasize that degree holder will be part of graduating class.

“Senior” appointments

1. Academic deans
2. Cabinet level staff and above
3. Come before Board of Trustees search committee

Graduate faculty membership

1. Must have graduate program (professional degrees are not considered graduate programs).
2. Nominated by department chair for membership, which is voted on by graduate council.
3. Interdisciplinary focus should be encouraged.

Titles

1. Executive professor, professor of the practice, executive in residence, etc. are used by other institutions to recognize contributions of “non-traditional” academics.
2. No uniform system within university for assigning titles.

3. Tabled at request of Provost because Dean's council is also working issue.

Currently there is one medical school and two staff vacancies on the SUA. The next committee meeting is scheduled for October 24, 2007.

**Appendix II**  
**Reforming the Role of Senate in the Governance Structure of Wake Forest University**

**David Coates**  
**September 2007**

*What follows is the result of discussions within an ad hoc working party of Senators in the academic year 2006-7, and of research (on the role of Senates in equivalent institutions elsewhere) undertaken by Ben Verney, a Politics major of the class of 2007, financed by money from the Worrell fund. This paper is intended to be both informative and diagnostic – to be at one and the same time a guide to new Senators on the history and function of the body they are joining, and an argument on how the role and powers of that body might profitably be reset. The paper has been read and commented upon by the members of the ad hoc working party and by a number of current and former university senators; but its final version, and its recommendations, are my responsibility alone.*

**The formal governance structure**

1. Wake Forest University is a private institution, governed by a board of trustees. It has an undergraduate college, an undergraduate school of business and accountancy, graduate schools in the arts and sciences as well as in management, and professional schools in medicine, law and divinity. Since 1967 it has also had a University Senate.
  
2. The University's chief executive officer is the President, who answers to the Board of Trustees. The President's remit stretches across all the units of the University.<sup>1</sup> The President heads a central administration that includes a Provost, a General Counsel, a Senior Vice-President for Finance, and vice-presidents for administration,<sup>2</sup> for university advancement, for investment, for health affairs and for student life. The Provost is the senior academic officer in the University.<sup>3</sup> The Undergraduate College, the Calloway School of Business and Accountancy, the Graduate School and the professional schools are each headed by a dean. The Dean of the Medical School is also the Senior Vice-President, WFU Health Sciences (and currently the Interim President of Health Sciences). The Director of Athletics reports directly to the President, and is a member of the weekly cabinet attended by the Provost, Treasurer and vice-presidents. The Director of the Z. Smith Reynolds Library answers to the Provost (until 2007 the line of responsibility was to the Vice-President for Student Life), and is not a member of the cabinet.

---

<sup>1</sup> If more straightforwardly over the units based on the Reynolda Campus than over the Medical School on the Hawthorne campus. The Medical School is locked into a complex relationship with the Baptist Hospital, a relationship now being reset to operate under a board on which the University President sits as one member.

<sup>2</sup> Under 2006 John Anderson, the vice-president of finance, was also the vice-president for administration. When he stood down, the two roles were split.

<sup>3</sup> Now to be assisted by four Associate Provosts (temporarily seconded to the Provost's Office for that purpose).

3. General university policy is set by the Board of Trustees. The President has the direct grant of authority from the Board to implement those policies. In a formal sense, therefore, all other senior administrators in the University 'serve at the pleasure of the President'. They make policy in their particular areas of responsibility. That policy may be discussed at cabinet, but the cabinet is not a decision-making body. Final decisions lie with the President. Financial policy is the responsibility of the Senior Vice-President for Finance. Investment policy is the responsibility of the Vice-President for Investments, and so on...; but always subject to final approval by the President, and through him, by the Trustees. Academic policy is likewise the responsibility of the Provost, to whom the Deans of the undergraduate and graduate colleges and the professional schools answer. Within the Undergraduate College, the Calloway School, and the graduate and professional schools, policy on academic matters is made by democratically-constituted faculty meetings. In the Undergraduate College, the resulting policy is implemented by departmental chairs. Non-faculty employees answer to a number of administrative heads in lines of responsibility that are complex, (to the outsider, at least) often obscure,<sup>4</sup> and occasionally overlapping.<sup>5</sup>

4. At least two of the units within the university have unique governmental dimensions of their own. The Graduate School has no dedicated faculty. Its faculty is drawn from the Undergraduate College and the professional schools. The Athletics Department has its own Director. Financial and staffing matters of the Athletics Department are the responsibility of the Director. The academic interface between the Undergraduate College and the Athletics Department is overseen by an elected committee of members drawn from the Undergraduate College, to whose faculty that committee then reports.

5. In the Undergraduate College, faculty meetings are chaired by the Dean, and are regularly attended by those administrators who simultaneously hold a faculty position (including the President, the Provost, the Associate Deans and various senior and middle-ranking university administrators) as well as by tenured and untenured faculty. At those meetings all those in attendance (both administrators and faculty) have the right to speak and to vote. The Undergraduate College faculty governs its academic practices through a series of faculty-elected committees that report back to the full faculty meeting. These

---

<sup>4</sup> As far as I can tell, there appears to be no one single point of staff supervision. Staff answer through their departmental heads to various senior administrators. The library staff in the Z Smith Reynolds Library answer through the Director of the Library to the Provost (it used to be to the Vice-President for Student Life), and so to the President. Clerical staff in departmental offices answer through their departmental chairs to the relevant Dean, and then the Provost. Custodial staff answer through their line managers directly to the Vice-President for Administration, as do staff in IS and in Dining Services. Facilities staff answer to the Director of Facilities Management. Staff in HR answer to the Director of Human Resources. Administrative staff in Reynolda Hall answer through their departmental heads directly to the President.

<sup>5</sup> Parking is a good example. The University Police enforce regulations and recommend changes, but the Vice-President for Administration determines whether parking lots should be created and identifies their location (presumably with advice from the Capital Planning committee). Crisis Management is a matrix organization that involves coordination between Police, IS, Facilities Management and Finance.

academic committees exist alongside committees on Student Life, the Judicial Council and the Joint Committee of Admissions, on all of which there is faculty representation.<sup>6</sup>

6. In the *Babcock Graduate School of Business*, faculty meetings are chaired by the Dean or the Associate Dean for Faculty. Senior administrators and staff do not attend the faculty meetings: separate staff meetings are held for them. Tenured, tenure track, and non-tenure track faculty attend faculty meetings, and everyone in attendance has the right to speak and vote (unless restricted due to rank). The faculty governs its academic practices through a series of elected and appointed standing and ad hoc committees and task forces. In the *Law School*, faculty meetings are chaired by the Dean. All Associate Deans, tenured, tenure-track and non-tenured faculty, plus clinical faculty and research librarians, attend the meetings. The Director of the Law Library also attends faculty meetings, but other senior administrators and staff hold their own separate staff meeting. Like the Babcock School of Business, the law faculty governs its academic practices through a series of standing and ad hoc committees, whose members are appointed by the Dean. In the Law School, everyone in attendance can speak and vote, unless restricted due to rank. Governance procedures in the *Divinity School* are very similar to those in the Undergraduate College. The School holds full faculty meetings with open discussion and voting by all those teaching in the Divinity School, including those teaching there only on half-time appointments.

### **The history of Senate within the governance structure<sup>7</sup>**

7. The Senate was created in 1967 when Wake Forest College became Wake Forest University. Prior to 1967, the College had operated as three entirely autonomous units (the undergraduate college, a medical school and a law school), each with a dean who reported directly to the president. Prior to 1967, there was no Provost and no developed university management structure as such. Such a governance system worked well only because the College faculty was small and intimate. Most people knew each other both professionally and socially. Faculty meetings were invariably very fully attended, and faculty views had a large and steady impact on College by-laws, curriculum and other matters. But when the College renamed itself as a University and acquired a new President, it was decided that Wake Forest needed a forum for the discussion of university-wide issues: a body with no authority over the internal operations of any individual unit; one to which the three constituent elements of the new University

---

<sup>6</sup> These three joint committees were established in 1972, to address matters involving undergraduates. The Student Life Committee studies and makes recommendations to the administration on student life policies, hears appeals from student organizations that have been disciplined by the office of Dean of Student Services, and acts to charter student organizations that have been approved by Student Government. The Judicial Council oversees the undergraduate honor system, hears appeals from the Honors and Ethics Council and the judicial office, and works with the administration to reform judicial policy where appropriate. The Joint Committee on Admissions reviews and advises the Admissions Office on special admits.

<sup>7</sup> The source for the information in paragraph 6 was former Provost Ed Wilson, who kindly gave his time for a fascinating interview!

surrendered no decision-making powers; a body whose sole purpose was to work on issues that the three units shared as a university – a Senate.

8. Since 1967 the University has acquired new academic units and a more differentiated central administrative structure; and the composition of the Senate has accordingly widened. As provided in the resolutions of the Board of Trustees, the University Senate is currently composed of ex-officio representatives from the administration<sup>8</sup> and elected representatives from the College and the several schools of the University. The faculty of the Undergraduate College elects twelve representatives to the Senate; three members are chosen annually to serve four-year terms. The School of Medicine has six representatives, while the Calloway School of Business and Accountancy, the Graduate School, the School of Law, and the Babcock Graduate School of Management each have three representatives. Senate also includes one representative from the Divinity School and six staff representatives, three from each campus.<sup>9</sup> All members, both ex officio and elected, are entitled to vote.<sup>10</sup>

9. In the by-laws of the University, the functions of the Senate are as follows. 1. To participate in long-range planning for the University. 2. To consider other matters pertaining to the general welfare of the University.<sup>11</sup> 3. To advise on the appointment of

---

<sup>8</sup> (a) Ex-officio members include the President of the University, the Provost, the Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, the Senior Vice President for Health Affairs, the Vice President and General Counsel, the Vice-Presidents for Student Life, Administration and Planning, Investments and Treasurer, and University Relations, the Deans of the several schools, the Director of Libraries, and the Director of Athletics. The bylaws are clear on how ex-officio appointments to Senate are to be made: “*if additional university-level senior administrative positions are established, and the appointees are approved by the Senate Standing Committee on Senior University Appointments, the elected members of the Senate shall determine whether such officers shall become members of the Senate.*”

<sup>9</sup> Thus far, the staff Senators have been selected by a mixture of appointment and election. The first five Reynolda-campus staff Senators were directly elected by their peers. As their terms ended, a staff advisory council was in the very early stages of formation. The last staff Senator election involved a nomination by peers, interview by the Senate Executive Committee, and then an appointment. In late 2006, the Staff Advisory Council (SAC) was formed, consisting of representatives from across functional units on campus. In August 2007, nominations to fill vacancies on the SAC were taken and election results are pending. It is from this committee that future staff Senators will come, though it is not immediately clear yet exactly how. The three Senate staff seats must include one at least one non-exempt and one exempt staff Senator. Staff representation from the Bowman Gray campus has always been by appointment, without input through either a staff nomination or election process.

<sup>10</sup> Quite how these numbers were originally determined is not immediately clear: but they now constitute a benchmark against which new membership of Senate is determined. The Senate bylaws say: “*if a new graduate or professional school is formed, coordinate in rank to the existing graduate and professional schools, its Dean shall become a member and its faculty shall elect three representatives.*”

<sup>11</sup> While respecting the autonomy of the constituent units. The by-laws say: ‘wherever there is disagreement between the Senate and the faculty of any school about whether a given matter pertains to the general welfare of the University or is a matter internal to that school, any conclusions or recommendations of the Senate on the matter shall be submitted to the faculty of the school for concurrence or dissent before being passed on to other agencies of the University for implementation.’

senior administrative officers.4. To recommend, through the President of the University to the Board of Trustees, persons to receive honorary degrees.5. To do those things “authorized, or permitted” by the Trustees from time to time. The by-laws also recognize and charge four standing committees. The *University Oversight Committee* is charged to monitor, evaluate, and participate in the University's program planning, capital planning and other long-range planning processes, and to make recommendations to the Senate involving initiatives with long-term implications for the University or the faculty. The *Intra-University Operations Committee* is charged to initiate and implement projects and programs that foster cooperation and communication between various components of the University. The *Fringe Benefits Committee* is expected to serve as a conduit of information from the University faculties to the responsible University administrator on benefits issues, and to develop and advocate improvements in benefits and report to the Senate. The job of the *Senior University Appointments Committee* is to recommend persons for honorary degrees and advise on appointments of all senior administrators, including the President of the University, Vice-Presidents and the Deans of all colleges and schools of the University.

### **Dominant characteristics of the governance structure in practice**

10. The specification of formal structures is only the first stage in the understanding of how any institution is actually governed. Their use in practice needs also to be recognized. Prior to the arrival of President Hatch, at least the following features of university governance appear to have prevailed at Wake Forest.

11. *The limited nature of the central administration.* The university was run by a restricted number of full-time senior administrators, with a larger (but still small) number of central support staff. The capacity of the administration to supervise and monitor the implication of policy decisions taken at the top of the university was weakened by the lack of sufficient, and appropriately qualified, staff at the center. The lack of staff available to support the role of Provost was particularly striking. So too, for a brief period in the 1990s, was the absence of any Provost for them to support.

12. *The associated high level of decentralization of decision-making across the entire university,* both between and within its various constituent units. Very little information-sharing or physical interaction occurred between the Medical School and the units on the Reynolda campus, There was slightly more interaction between the units on the Reynolda campus (the Undergraduate College, the Calloway School, the Athletics Department and the various professional schools); but even there, each unit fiercely guarded its own independence and shared information on internal practices only to a limited degree, and only when asked. Within the Undergraduate College and the Medical School, this decentralization of decision-making was replicated in the relationship between departments, and between departments and the relevant dean. Inside the Undergraduate College at least, departments enjoyed very high levels of day-to-day autonomy, even

---

from the Dean.<sup>12</sup> And at the level of the university as a whole, decentralization between units was underpinned by a governing financial philosophy (copied from Harvard – the “tub-on-its-own bottom” philosophy) that left each of the professional schools – and the graduate school of management – solely responsible for its own financial viability: no sinking or swimming together’, rather sinking or swimming apart.<sup>13</sup>

13. *Decentralization between units operated alongside a ‘top down’ model (and practice) of management within them.* Within each academic unit, power was vested in the administrative head (at the first level, the deans: and at a second level within the Undergraduate College and the Medical School, the chairs of departments). Faculty at least had tenure, so deans and chairs lacked the capacity to dismiss the majority of the people they managed. Staff, by contrast, did not. They answered to their immediate supervisor or line manager, and did so without any guaranteed job security. Within parameters set by general university (or Undergraduate College/Medical School faculty) policy, heads of units then enjoyed high levels of autonomy in the distribution of resources and in the making and implementation of decisions – including (from the 1990s) the awarding of salary raises, merit pay, and detailed workloads. Under President Hearn, that centralization of power in the hands of the senior person was replicated at the level of the central administration. Across the university as a whole, lines of authority flowed down and lines of responsibility flowed up: up from the vice-presidents through the President to the Board of Trustees; up from chairs of departments through the dean to (when one was in post) the Provost; up from supervisors to middle management through the Director of Human Resources to ultimately, the Vice-President for Finance and Administration.

14. For the faculty at least, *elements of a more downward direction of responsibility co-existed with this pattern of governance: but were secondary to it.* In the Undergraduate College and the Medical School, the relevant dean pursued academic policies designed by faculty committees and ratified by votes at faculty board. In many departments, chairs consulted widely with departmental colleagues and followed policies agreed and voted on in departmental meetings. But chairs were also expected to act as the dean’s agent in the implementation of faculty-wide policy, and were given considerable latitude to develop their own managerial style. Likewise, the deans were expected to implement decisions taken at the level of the cabinet. Moreover, the line of communication from faculty to the Dean normally ran through the chairs. Direct interaction between deans and faculty on matters of departmental policy were rare, and normally discouraged. And for years, faculty communication with the Board of Trustees was either prohibited entirely, or if allowed, was filtered through the President. Even the horizontal sharing of information – between colleagues about salary for example – was deemed unprofessional and officially

---

<sup>12</sup> Only since 1986 have the chairs met regularly as a group with the Dean of the Undergraduate College

<sup>13</sup> So decentralized are we that we even lack a single administrator servicing the Senate as a whole. Karen Bennet could tell me who were the new Senators from the Undergraduate College: but to find out who they were from the professional schools, I had to e mail each Dean separately! The fact that I had to send multiple e-mails speaks to a point about administrative support for Senate to which this report will come in paragraph 24.

proscribed.<sup>14</sup> There was also no place, within the University governance structure, for trade unions of either faculty or staff; though the AUUP – not technically a trade union but acting remarkably like one – was tolerated: just!

15. The results were at least three-fold.

- (i) *The decision-making process within the University lacked transparency, and become particularly hidden from public view, the higher up the chain of commands the decisions were taken. The space for idiosyncratic, ill-informed and particularistic decision-making was therefore considerable. Certainly a culture was created in which information was not shared downwards, policy decisions were rarely publicly discussed and defended, and requests for information were treated as threatening: in effect, a culture of low trust, both from above and below.*
- (ii) *Policy, practices, rights and rewards also varied significantly between and within administration units. There was no standardization, nor any attempt at standardization between academic units, on terms and conditions of employment, or salary levels and salary increments. Nor was there any systematic central monitoring of variations in administrative practice. There was no systematic bench-marking, no sharing of best practice: no sharing, indeed, of information about administrative practice at all, except on an ad hoc and random basis and in legally mandated areas (like pensions). Wake Forest was (and no doubt remains) a veritable mosaic of practice and rewards, incentives and responsibilities, a mosaic that eats away at the capacity of the University to act and feel itself to be a single deep community.*
- (iii) *Consultation within the University of lower ranks by higher ones was rare, and only occasionally systematized. Staff had no structure of consultation at all. Faculty was left self-governing on academic matters, and allowed access to capital planning through membership on a capital planning committee chaired by the relevant vice-president. But not until Provost Gordon introduced a Budget Advisory Committee was there any faculty (and still no staff) participation in the budgetary process, and even then, those participating were selected by the Provost (in consultation with the officers of the Senate), and met only when invited to do so by the Provost himself. Under President Hearn, no formal University Finance Committee existed; and only very late in his term were channels of direct access established for select faculty to the Board of Trustees.*

### **The place of Senate in the governance structure**

---

<sup>14</sup> As too apparently was the horizontal sharing of budget or financial information among administrators. This ban meant that important information about budgetary decisions was regularly kept from deans, departmental chairs, and senior administrators until those decisions were a *fait accompli*. Requests for information from the Senate or AAUP were tolerated at best.

16. The Senate has a unique place in both the formal and informal patterns of governance within the University. Formally, it is the only body which brings together representatives of faculty, staff and administrators from all the constituent units of the University, including the central administration; and it is the only body charged, however implicitly, with thinking and acting on behalf of the university as a single entity. Informally, of course, the transformation of the university from a small integrated college community into a large and disparate set of academic units – plus the decentralized, hierarchical and closed decision-making process that accompanied that transformation – has often left the Senate struggling for function and impact. Its formal powers were always modest. Its access to information became very limited. (As late as 2004, its attempts to gather systemic financial data met considerable resistance in certain quarters.) Its degree of activism always varied. It varied partly by accident of officers (some Senate presidents have been very active, some rather inert), and partly by accident of wider management philosophy. The original Senate faced Dr. Scales who, like Dr. Hatch, welcomed participation, the expression of views, and genuine discussion. Later Senates faced a more corporate management style which welcomed these things less. But even in that less congenial atmosphere, the Senate continued to play an important role in the appointment of senior university administrators (deans and above); and in the awarding of honorary degrees. And it was always active when a big university-wide issue was at stake (as recently with salaries and health care costs). Even at such moments, however, the level of activism tended to be driven more by College faculty than by faculty in the professional schools – where the degree of identification with a wide university project is perhaps lower, and ease with hierarchical management structures is perhaps greater – and its effectiveness was impaired by difficulties of communicating to the university community as a whole.

17. *Compared to senates in equivalent institutions elsewhere, it is clear that the Senate at Wake Forest is significantly under-powered and under-resourced.* Emory, for example, has both a Senate and a small Faculty Council drawn in part from elected members of the larger body. Its Senate is charged to “consider and make recommendations concerning all matters of general University interest, as distinguished from those affecting a single school” on the understanding that “all changes in existing policies or the establishment of new policies relating to such matters shall be reviewed by the Senate” and that “the decisions of the Senate shall, with the concurrence of the President, be deemed final unless or until the Board of Trustees or its Executive Committee shall take further action”. The role and powers of Emory’s smaller Faculty Council are, if anything, more extensive still. The Emory by-laws are worth considering here, to make the point.

*The Faculty Council is to*

*(a) consider and make recommendations to the President concerning the academic affairs of the University, as distinguished from those affecting a single school or division thereof, or upon any other faculty matters referred to it by the President, the Board of Trustees, or its own members or constituencies;*

*(b) review all changes in existing policies or the establishment of new policies relating to matters of general interest to the University faculty, either at the initiative of its own members or constituencies or*

*when these policies are brought before the Council by the President of the University or the Board of Trustees;*

*(c) monitor and review, in its regular deliberations or by the appointment of special committees, the terms and conditions of faculty employment, the state of facilities and administrative policies that affect scholarship and teaching, the budgetary commitments and general financial condition of the University, and the relationship between faculty and administration;*

*(d) consider any suggestions or problems raised by any recognized faculty group.<sup>15</sup>*

18. The argument of this paper is that we could do with a Senate charged with tasks and powers of that kind. Precisely because the Wake Forest Senate sits, and sits alone, at the crossroads of all the constituent elements of the university, it is uniquely placed to make a powerful contribution to the enhancement of transparency, to the extension of harmonization, and to the deepening of consultation and representation within the university's decision-making processes. It is uniquely well-placed, that is, to make a powerful contribution to the correction of those elements of existing university governance that created and sustained here a culture of low trust. The Senate can – and indeed the Senate should – be a key player in the creation of a much-needed culture of high trust, within the parameters of a governance structure that ultimately answers upwards, as it must, through the President to the Trustees. The by-laws at Rice University seem pertinent as a guide for us here, when they say of their own constitution that it...

*... is rooted in an understanding that the responsibility and authority for the operation of the University are vested in the Office of the President. The effectiveness of the President's leadership rests upon his or her knowledge of the needs and concerns of the University community, his or her ability to make the wisest decisions within the range of feasible options, and his or her ability to elicit the confidence and support of various elements of the University in implementing these decisions. To these ends, this Constitution seeks to establish a pattern of consultation between the President and faculty through a representative structure.*

If Rice (and Duke) are any guide, Wake Forest definitely needs to institutionalize systematic consultation between senior administrators and the faculty and staff, through the full and regular utilization of a proper representative structure – a representative structure that stretches down through the Senate to every level of the university, and a

---

<sup>15</sup> We could just have easily used the documentation on the Academic Council at Duke University to make the same point. Duke has a Council of 90 elected members, with only the President and one/two other administrative officers in attendance ex officio. It follows this rule. *'Except in emergencies, all major decisions and plans of the administration that significantly affect academic affairs should be submitted to the Academic Council for an expression of views prior to implementation or submission to the Board of Trustees. The views expressed by the Academic Council should be transmitted, along with the Administration's proposals, to the Board of Trustees when these plans and decisions are considered by the Board of Trustees.'* As the public documentation of the Council goes on to observe: "that rule succinctly defines the role of faculty governance at Duke University. The Academic Council is only to a very limited extent a legislature. Its primary role is advisory, but it asserts the right of being heard in that advice and having it considered, under a Rule that requires constant and vigilant tending".

structure in which individuals participate, not because they are chosen from above, but because they are elected from below.

19. The proper role of Senate in a private university is to enhance the quality of decisions made at the top by the representation it makes, the expertise it coordinates, and the broad institutional picture it is uniquely charged to focus upon and to develop. But for this Senate to do that, it will need to make significant changes to its own internal practices. It will need to be the recipient of fuller and more systematically presented data; and it will need its own limited but real administrative resources. To that end, the following changes are proposed.

### **Addressing the Weaknesses, Realizing the Potential**

20. The changes proposed here build on others already in train: particularly the creation of a Staff Advisory Council and the establishment of the University Finance Advisory Committee. The Staff Advisory Council – now in the process of creating its own methods of electing representatives from its various constituent groups – was itself the product of earlier Senate initiatives on governance reform; and the new reforms proposed here will include suggestions on how best to strengthen the links between the Staff Advisory Committee and the Senate that spawned it. The University Finance Advisory Committee was created on the initiative of one of the Senate’s own standing committees – the University Oversight Committee – and the reforms proposed below will include ways of strengthening and developing the already positive and valuable relationship between the two committees, co-chaired as both are by the Senior Vice-President for Finance.

21. In the light of inadequacies in the patterns of governance built up prior to the arrival of President Hatch, a reformed Senate needs to be active on at least three vital fronts, and to be active on each in a systematic and integrated way.

(a) For the Senate to make a significant and persisting contribution to the *creation of a culture of high trust and mutual respect*, it has to become the guardian of transparency: and it can do that best by prioritizing its own regular receipt of reports on the state of each of the University’s constituent units, by organizing regular ‘state of the union’ addresses by leading University figures to the university community as a whole; and by developing new ways of reporting back on its own work to the bodies its members were elected to represent.

(b) For the Senate to make a significant and persisting contribution to the *deepening of a sense of genuine community* across the university as a whole, it has to take seriously its already existing responsibility to explore intra-university similarities, differences and relationships. It has to advocate standardization of treatment and reward where appropriate, and it has to push for the implementation of programs that meet the needs of large and significant groups of faculty and staff.

(c) If it is to enhance *structures of consultation and representation* within the university community as a whole, a reformed Senate has to examine (and where appropriate standardize) the procedures by which its elected membership is determined. It has to reinforce the role of the Staff Advisory Council and the University Finance Advisory Committee; and it has to be a pressure for the development of management philosophies and practices within the university that are compatible with the Wake Forest Commitment to *Pro Humanitate*.

22. In relation to 21(a) TRANSPARENCY

***1. It should therefore become the practice for the Senate to hear reports in person on the state of their particular academic unit from the relevant dean, and to hear reports on the state of the university as a whole from the President, Provost and Senior Vice-Presidents. With four scheduled meetings a year, a timetable should be created that would bring to each meeting of Senate one report from a Dean/Athletics Director and one from a senior administrator (sequentially, President, Provost, Vice-President for Finance, Vice-President for Administration)***

***2. It should also become the practice of the President to give a Senate-initiated 'state of the university' address to the entire University community at the start of each spring semester; and for the Vice-President for Finance to give a similar Senate-initiated address, on the financial state of the university, at the end of each budget cycle.***

***3. The Senate should produce a report of each of its meetings for insertion into Old Gold & Black; and should have access to an e mail distribution system that would link it to the entire faculty and staff of the constituent elements represented in its membership. It should be the responsibility of the Inter-University Operations Committee to enhance the flow of information from the Senate to the wider university community by exploring and implementing multiple forms of communication links between the Senate and its constituent bodies***

23. in relation to 21(b) COMMUNITY

***4. The Intra-University Operations Committee should be given a new charge: systematically to gather information, on a rolling basis, of patterns of similarity and difference in codes of practice across the University's constituent units – starting, since it has recently been raised, with an examination of codes of practice in relation to sexual harassment, and with an examination of the selection/election procedures for Senate membership. The Committee should be charged with enhancing harmonization, even standardization, where appropriate.***

***5. The Fringe Benefits Committee should be charged with the responsibility of***

*regularly bringing before Senate proposals for changes that will simultaneously benefit significant groups of faculty and staff – starting, since it has been long on-going, with the much-needed completion of the proposal for university-provided day care for employees with pre-school age children*

*6. More generally, each of the four standing committees should be charged with the establishment of regular scheduled meetings, and with the creation of committee-level priorities for action to be made known to Senate on a regular basis. Membership of these committees should, within the constraints created by term limits, remain as constant as possible, with each committee’s non-elected members being drawn, wherever it can be arranged, from the relevant administrative departments*

24. in relation to 21 c) CONSULTATION AND REPRESENTATION

*7. The Staff Advisory Council should be charged with making at least bi-annual reports of its agenda and progress to the Senate, and with allocating to the staff representatives on the Senate a co-chairing role in the running of the Council.*

*8. The University Oversight Committee should be explicitly charged with staffing and reporting on the working of the University Finance Advisory Committee. It should also be charged with exploring and reporting on the long-term financial health of the university, on capital planning and expenditure, and on the broad flows of resources between and within the Senate’s constituent elements.*

*9. Within parameters established by conventions of privacy at the Board of Trustees’ meetings, the Senate’s representatives to the Board of Trustees should be charged with regularly reporting back to Senate on those meetings; with the Senate going into private session to hear those reports where appropriate.*

25. in relation to all three. ACCESS AND RESOURCES

*10. For the Senate to be able adequately to fulfill its roles of oversight, representation and communication, a half-time clerical appointment should be created to service Senate officers and Senate Committees<sup>16</sup>, with an appropriate budget for staff costs, materials and administrative overheads.<sup>17</sup>*

<sup>16</sup> It is worth noting in this regard that Duke University’s Academic Council is serviced by a full-time administrative assistant. The council is more active than this Senate: but as Senate business grows, so too should its administrative support.

*11. To underscore the University's commitment to transparency in decision-making, from 2008-9 the President of Senate should be made a non-voting member of the cabinet, with access to all cabinet papers, and his/her term of office should be extended to two years, not one.*

*12. To permit reform '11' to be manageable for the Senate President, the Presidency should attract an appropriate reduction in teaching, with the relevant department being compensated with funds for the appointment of a suitable replacement.*

---

<sup>17</sup> The administrative support behind this report, and the preparation for the first Senate meeting, has actually been provided by Elide Vargas, the brilliant and efficient administrator in the Political Science Department – done in her own time, without pay, as an act of friendship to me. At the very least, such 'voluntary' assistance deserves a substantial honorarium.