

Wake Forest University Senate 2007-2008
Minutes

February 13, 2008

The University Senate held its regularly scheduled session in room G28 in the Hanes Building on the Bowman Gray campus of the Medical School. The following members were present:

Administration: Jill Tiefenthaler, Nathan Hatch

College: Carole Browne, David Coates, Andrew Ettin, Natalie Holzwarth, Dilip Kondepudi, James Kuzmanovich, Barry Maine, Kathy Smith

Graduate School: Suzy Torti

School of Medicine: Michelle Naughton, Martha Alexander-Miller, Mark Miller, Cormac O'Donovan, Ron Zagoria

School of Law: Tim Davis, Simone Rose

Calloway School of Business and Accountancy:

Babcock School of Management: Brooke Saladin

Divinity School: Neal Walls

Director of Libraries: Lynn Sutton

Staff:

Apologies: Kathy Smith, Jane Albrecht, Randy Cockerham, Gary Alwine

The meeting was called to order by Senate President David Coates at 4:05 p.m.

Minutes of the meeting of December 5 2007 were approved

Matters arising

Amending the role of the Senate in the Governance of the university: updates and further discussion on motions on senate governance. (Full text of motions and Senate votes on these motions can be found in Senate minutes of December 5 2007. A summary of deliberations on these motions and their outcome was provided by Senate President David Coates and is attached to these minutes as Appendix I. Motions that were further discussed at today's meeting are reproduced here for convenience).

Motion 1 (approved in Dec).

That it should become the regular practice of the Senate to receive annual reports on the state of their particular academic unit from the relevant Dean, and on the state of the University as a whole from the President, Provost and Vice-Presidents for Finance and Administration.

Update: The Provost has agreed to address the next Senate meeting. The Dean of the Graduate School and Sally Shumaker, Associate Dean of Research at the Medical School, have also agreed to address the next Senate.

Motions 2 and 3 (approved in Dec.).

That it should become the regular practice of the Senate to organize an annual and widely publicized “state of the university” address by the President – an address to which all faculty and staff on all campuses are to be invited. That it should also become the regular practice of the Senate to organize an annual presentation to faculty and staff by the Senior Vice-President for Finance on the state of the University’s finances.

Update: The Presidential address has been scheduled for Wednesday April 9 at 4:00 p.m. in Wait Chapel. Nancy Sutenfield, Senior Vice president for Finance, will deliver a presentation in Pugh Auditorium on the Reynolda Campus Tuesday April 22 at 4:00 p.m. Future addresses by the President and Senior Vice-President for Finance are being written into the calendar.

New business:

Discussion then moved to motions on Senate governance that had been tabled in December.

Motion: *That the Senate Executive be empowered to send an email to the entire university at the beginning of each academic year, announcing its membership, meeting schedule and first agenda; that subsequent Senate meetings and agenda items be publicized on the weekly ‘event email’ due to be initiated in the Fall 2008; and that the Senate Executive be empowered to develop its own listserv for regular communication with interested faculty and staff. (Appendix I, Item 7).*

Update and discussion: a listserv is being developed. By “entire university,” faculty and staff of all campuses is meant.

Vote of Senate: Approved.

Motion: *That Senate should establish the following committees, with the following terms of reference. (It should be noted that only Committee (a) constitutes a new Senate committee.) (Appendix I, Item 8).*

- (a) A Planning Committee. It shall be the task of this committee to enhance the academic mission of the University through a regular exchange of information, concerns and views with the Provost. *(It is proposed that, as befits its importance, this Committee should be made up of the entire Senate Executive and the chairs of the Senate’s other standing committees)*
- (b) A Resource Committee. It shall be the task of this committee to consider the manner in which resources are raised, used and allocated in the pursuit of that academic

mission, through a regular exchange of information, concerns and views with the Senior Vice-President for Finance.

- (c) A Benefits Committee. It shall be the task of this committee to assess (and where appropriate, seek to enhance) the adequacy of benefit packages for all categories of faculty and staff, through a regular exchange of information, concerns and views with the Vice-President for Administration
- (d) A University-Integration Committee. It shall be the task of this committee to establish, deepen and widen productive intellectual synergies within and beyond the University community: in the first instance through a regular exchange of information, concerns and views with the appropriate Deans.
- (e) A Senior University Appointments Committee. It shall be the task of this committee to nominate appropriate faculty and staff to all key ad hoc committees created for broad university purposes; to participate in the final stages of the selection of senior university administrators (at the level of deans and above); and to nominate to Senate potential recipients of honorary degrees: all in the first instance through a regular exchange of information, concerns and views with the Provost.

Discussion: Regarding the Senior University Appointments Committee, there was uncertainty as to whether this included the medical school. This issue will be discussed further at next Senate following consultations with Dean Applegate of the medical school.

Vote of Senate: Approved

Motion: That Senate should standardize the procedures for the selection of faculty and staff Senators to ensure that all such senators are elected by the full body of the appropriate faculty/staff group. (Appendix I, Item 10).

Vote of Senate: Approved

Motion: That a budget line be established for Senate expenses, including for administrative support. (Appendix I, Item 11).

Vote of Senate: Approved

The following committee reports were presented and discussed:

The Resource Committee (formerly University Oversight Committee) is preparing a budget report. Data is being collected from Nancy Suttentfield and the Director of Athletics. Input from faculty and staff concerning the form and content of the report is being assembled.

Benefits Committee. Day care was discussed at length. The committee had met with administrative staff to discuss options. Two possibilities are to (1) Contract with local daycare providers to reserve slots for Reynolda faculty and staff (childcare network); or (2) Construct a dedicated on-site facility. The major issue is cost. The childcare network is less costly, provides some choice, but does not address infant care, which is the greatest need. An on-site facility would provide care from infancy through preschool, but would require funds to both build and subsidize the cost of daycare. Estimates are that at the 3rd year and beyond

(at capacity), a \$200,000 annual subsidy would be required to provide salaries and benefits to employees of the daycare facility, since such facilities are generally not self supporting. Other issues revolved around the ability of staff to afford childcare, and potential funding sources for such a facility, including the capital campaign.

Senate Recommendation: The Senate recommended that child care be reviewed by appropriate bodies (faculty/staff) with Senate recommendation for support of a childcare initiative.

Tim Davis provided a report on the Meeting of the Academic Committee, Board of Trustees, and Katy Harringer provided a report on the Trustee Committee on Administration. The latter report is appended to these minutes as Appendix II.

Carole Browne presented a report on the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA), of which Wake Forest is a member. This is an alliance of faculty senates from 56 NCAA division 1A institutions. It is the only national organization of faculty governing bodies. Its purpose is to promote collegiate athletic reform and to assure that athletics support, not interfere with, the academic mission. The full presentation is included as Appendix III of these minutes.

Michelle Naughton led a discussion on the role of the Senate in strengthening relationships between the campuses of Wake Forest. The full presentation is attached as Appendix IV of these minutes. Several recommendations were presented:

1. That the WFU Senate president should be a Reynolda campus faculty member
2. That medical school faculty members should be members of the Senate Executive Committee
3. That medical school faculty should retain membership of the 5 standing Senate committees
4. That Reynolda campus Senators should be represented in medical school committees that perform functions corresponding to existing Senate committees, such as the Dean's Advisory committee, Fringe Benefits committee, Research Advisory Committee, and FEC (ad hoc).

It was also suggested that Deans of the medical school and high level administrators address the Senate at least once a year.

The Senate then moved to closed session to consider honorary degree nominations. The Senate President thanked the Senior University Appointments Committee for assembling a distinguished list of nominees.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:52 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Suzy V. Torti, Senate Secretary

Appendix I

AMENDING THE ROLE OF THE SENATE IN THE GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE OF THE UNIVERSITY

Report and Proposals: February 2008

THE STORY SO FAR

The question of the role of Senate in the governance structure of the University has now been raised and discussed at three successive Senate meetings (i.e. September, November and December 2007). At the September meeting, a paper was tabled and briefly discussed (Reforming the Role of Senate in the Governance Structure of Wake Forest University). That paper was the product of extensive consultations with existing and previous senators (both elected and appointed), and of its own commissioned research study of senates in equivalent institutions elsewhere. Its central argument was two-fold: that the effectiveness and legitimacy of governance in the University would benefit from an enhancement of transparency, a deepening of community, and a widening of consultation; and that the resetting of certain Senate structures and practices could make a significant contribution to improvements under all those headings. The paper made 12 recommendations for change: some designed to strengthen transparency in policy making, some to enhance feelings of shared community, and some to enhance systems of consultation and representation. Those 12 recommendations were referred for review to a committee of senior senators (the Provost, Senior Vice-President for Finance, the Director of the Z Smith Reynolds Library, the President and Vice-President of Senate and the co-chair of the Senate Fringe Benefits Committee). Their resulting report was discussed fully at the November 2007 Senate, and a special Senate called for December 2007 to come to final decisions on the recommendations proposed. The December 2007 meeting was organized around 16 motions, each addressing a particular part of the changes being proposed (the original 16 motions are attached). Even before the meeting, the President indicated he would prefer that the decision-making process be slowed, with some of the motions to be settled only after longer reflection. The list of motions was therefore reset and the Senate commissioned to discuss them all in December, but to come to a formal vote only on some. And during that December discussion, a general view emerged that, even on the motions that could be settled in December, some would be better reset as part of an opening framing statement. Hence, the following...

FRAMING THE PROPOSALS

1. It is our view that the capacity of the entire university community to move forward together in a spirit of genuine commitment to the strengthening of Wake Forest as a major university can only be enhanced by the deepening of dialogue between key stake holders on matters of general policy and direction. We believe that only through such a dialogue will we effectively develop that sense of university citizenship on which alone the full mobilization of Wake Forest's intellectual and administrative resources can be achieved. And if this view is correct, it follows that all of us who care passionately about the future success of this university have a

strong and shared interest in reinforcing the role of each institution in which a sense of university citizenship can be developed and displayed.

2. As the one elected body formally linking all the constituent elements of the university together, the Senate seems to us uniquely positioned in this regard, in two important respects at least. As the one body that brings together senior administrators and elected faculty and staff in a regular manner, it is the ideal site for an informed and continuing *dialogue* on matters pertaining to the University community as a whole. And since its agenda is entirely addressed to the concerns of the university as a whole, the Senate is also the appropriate body to receive reports from the university's various constituent units and from which to sponsor regular *reports* to the entire university from the university's senior administrators.

3. The changes recommended here address both those dimensions of the Senate's unique place in the overall structure of governance at Wake Forest. They provide a mechanism through which senior administrative officers can reach out more effectively to the wider university community; and they promote and enhance regular dialogue between elected and appointed senators. The recommendations are designed to strengthen that important dialogue, by encouraging the regular briefing of the standing committees of Senate by the appropriate senior administrator on changes of policy in their areas of competence, so enabling members of those committees to contribute to the refinement of that policy and/or to report to the full Senate their views upon it. The proposed new structure of committees will also bring the internal organization of the Senate more into line with divisions of responsibility now settled within the senior administration, and are designed on the premise that such a realignment of administrators and committees can only speed the education of all of us in the real parameters within which the university is obliged to operate. Indeed it is our view that the more that Senate is fully briefed on the policy issues of the day, the more that education will be enhanced – and the better placed elected members of Senate will then be to communicate the nature of those realities to their various constituencies.

4. Remarkably, the existing by-laws give the Senate President the power to call into existence/close down both ad hoc and standing committees. We find ourselves therefore with considerable organizational leeway. So although we would want any successful changes to be quickly consolidated into the by-laws, what we propose now is a two stage process: initially, and by way of an experiment, the introduction of a number of minor but significant innovations; followed by their incorporation into the by-laws only after they have been adequately tested. The innovations are of the following kind.

Changes agreed by Senate Members in December

1. It should become the regular practice of the Senate to receive annual reports on the state of their particular academic unit from the relevant dean, and on the state of the University as a whole from the President, Provost and Vice-Presidents for Finance and Administration. *(It was understood that these would normally be oral presentations – supported where appropriate with slides/written material – and focus on general issues)*

2. It should become the regular practice of the Senate to organize an annual and widely publicized “State of the University” address by the President, to which faculty and staff from each of the University’s campuses are invited. *(It was understood that the address would be timed to maximize the proportion of faculty and staff able to attend, that certain offices would still need to be staffed, but that there would be a genuine gain to the university as a community from gathering together as many faculty and staff as possible.)*
3. It should also become the regular practice of the Senate to organize an annual presentation by the Senior Vice-President for Finance on the state of the University’s finances, a presentation to be made to faculty and staff on the Reynolda campus. *(It was understood that financial matters on the Bowman Gray campus fit into a different scheme of things, but the hope was expressed that a similar occasion might eventually be triggered there)*
4. It should become the practice of the Senate to hear regular reports from both the Vice-President for Administration and the Senators representing staff on the Reynolda campus, on the election, agenda and deliberations of the Staff Advisory Council.
5. The number of Senate meetings should be increased from two to three per semester, beginning in the fall semester of 2008
6. It should become an early additional charge on each senate committee to address ways in which, within their specific spheres of activity, they can strengthen linkages between campuses by engaging in cross-campus dialogue with the appropriate administrators and committees

Items remaining to be discussed and settled in the Spring Semester of 2008

7. That the Senate Executive be empowered to send an email to the entire university at the beginning of each academic year, announcing its membership, meeting schedule and first agenda; that subsequent Senate meetings and agenda items be publicized on the weekly ‘event email’ due to be initiated in the Fall 2008; and that the Senate Executive be empowered to develop its own listserv for regular communication with interested faculty and staff.
8. That Senate should establish the following committees, with the following terms of reference. *(It should be noted that only Committee (a) constitutes a new Senate committee.)*
 - (a) A Planning Committee. It shall be the task of this committee to enhance the academic mission of the University through a regular exchange of information, concerns and views with the Provost. *(It is proposed that, as befits its importance, this Committee should be made up of the entire Senate Executive and the chairs of the Senate’s other standing committees)*
 - (b) A Resource Committee. It shall be the task of this committee to consider the manner in which resources are raised, used and allocated in the pursuit of that academic mission, through a regular exchange of information, concerns and views with the Senior Vice-President for Finance.

- (c) A Benefits Committee. It shall be the task of this committee to assess (and where appropriate, seek to enhance) the adequacy of benefit packages for all categories of faculty and staff, through a regular exchange of information, concerns and views with the Vice-President for Administration
- (d) A University-Integration Committee. It shall be the task of this committee to establish, deepen and widen productive intellectual synergies within and beyond the University community: in the first instance through a regular exchange of information, concerns and views with the appropriate Deans.
- (e) A Senior University Appointments Committee. It shall be the task of this committee to nominate appropriate faculty and staff to all key ad hoc committees created for broad university purposes; to participate in the final stages of the selection of senior university administrators (at the level of deans and above); and to nominate to Senate potential recipients of honorary degrees: all in the first instance through a regular exchange of information, concerns and views with the Provost.

10. That Senate should standardize the procedures for the selection of faculty and staff Senators to ensure that all such senators are elected by the full body of the appropriate faculty/staff group.

11. That a budget line be established for Senate expenses, including for administrative support.

Appendix II
Report to Senate
Trustee Committee on Administration Meeting
February 8, 2008
Submitted by Katy Harriger, Faculty Representative

1. **Information Systems:** Dr. Mike Spano, Interim Chief Information Officer, presented a progress report on the alignment of Banner. He detailed the challenges of identifying all the various ways in which Wake Forest has “customized” Banner. The goal of the Banner alignment work is to return as closely as possible to the original native Banner. He provided a timetable for accomplishing the various changes that must be made in order to make it work effectively. Full implementation of the plan will take approximately 2 years.
2. **Campus Master Plan:** A video conference was held with the Ayers/Saint/Gross planning group to discuss the progress of their development of a campus master plan. We looked at maps of possible traffic/parking configurations and of places where new buildings might go. The group is currently in the process of doing “precinct studies” of various parts of the campus. These involve talking with different constituencies that use these spaces and trying to get a sense of needs, culture, etc. that should be considered in design. The plan should be in draft form by May. There will be a preliminary presentation to the Board of Trustees during the summer and a final presentation to the Board in October.
3. **Facilities Renewals:** James Alty, head of Facilities Management, presented a report on repair and renewal needs and costs to campus facilities. He noted that our facilities are aging: 46% of the facilities are over 50 years old and 70% are over 30 years old. There are signs of deterioration in a number of buildings. He provided cost estimates for renewal projects in the academic and residence life and housing buildings. The report did not involve specific plans but instead was an overview of what it would cost to do facility renewal across campus and how such a process should be organized.
4. **Executive Session:** The Committee went into executive session at the end of the meeting and the Faculty representative was excused.

Appendix III: Report on COIA

What is COIA?



- An alliance of faculty senates representing 56 NCAA Division IA institutions
- Founded in 2002
- The only national organization of faculty governing bodies

Conference 2007-08	COIA MEMBER SCHOOLS (56 members as of 1 Feb 2008)								
ACC	Clemson	Duke	Florida State	North Carolina	Wake Forest				
BIG-12	Colorado	Missouri	Nebraska	Oklahoma State	Texas				
BIG EAST	Connecticut	South Florida	Rutgers						
BIG TEN	Illinois	Indiana	Iowa	Michigan	Michigan State	Minnesota	Northwestern	Ohio State	Penn State
C-USA	East Carolina	Houston	Marshall	Southern Methodist	Southern Mississippi	Tulsa			
MAC	Eastern Michigan	Ohio University							
MT. WEST	New Mexico	San Diego State	Texas Christian						
PAC-10	Arizona	Berkeley	Oregon	Oregon State	Stanford	Washington	Washington State		
SEC	Alabama	Arkansas	Auburn	Georgia	Mississippi	Mississippi State	South Carolina	Tennessee	Vanderbilt
SUN BELT	Arkansas State								
WAC	Cal State Fresno	Hawaii	Idaho	Nevada, Reno	New Mexico State	San Jose State			

Structure of COIA

The logo consists of the letters "COIA" in white, bold, sans-serif font, centered within a dark green oval.

- Representatives are faculty senate presidents or their delegates
 - Oversight of the COIA is provided by a 15 member steering committee composed of faculty members from each of the 11 Division IA conferences
-

What is the purpose of COIA?

The logo consists of the letters "COIA" in white, bold, sans-serif font, centered within a dark green oval.

- to promote comprehensive reform of college sports
-

What are the issues?

The logo for COIA (College of the Atlantic Institutional Accreditation) is a green oval with the letters "COIA" in white, bold, sans-serif font.

- Academic integrity
 - Campus governance
 - Student-athlete welfare
 - Fiscal transparency
 - Commercialism
-

How can COIA be effective?

- Work with
 - faculty senate presidents, college presidents, FARs, ADs and other stakeholders
 - other national groups that share our goals
 - NCAA, Association of Governing Boards, Knight Commission, American Association of University Professors, National Athletic Academic Advisors Association (N4A), Division IA Faculty Athletics Representatives, Faculty Athletics Representatives Association (FARA), College Sports Project
-

COIA white papers: recommendations for reform



- 2003: Framework for Intercollegiate Athletics Reform
 - 2004: Campus Athletics Governance, the Faculty Role
 - 2005: Academic Integrity in Intercollegiate Athletics
 - 2005: A Report to the NCAA Presidential Task Force
 - 2006: A Report to the NCAA Working Group to Review Initial Eligibility Trends
 - 2007: Framing the Future: Reforming Intercollegiate Athletics
-

COIA is making progress



- We are recognized as a national faculty voice on the issue of athletics reform
 - Many institutions have taken local action based on our recommendations
 - The COIA has the support of the NCAA and other national organizations focusing on reform
 - Many of our recommendations are under consideration for NCAA legislative or certification changes
-

Why should we support COIA?



- COIA
 - offers a collective faculty voice on issues of athletic reform
 - serves to encourage faculty to review their role in oversight of athletics at their institution
 - provides a mechanism through which faculty can support meaningful NCAA reforms
 - In order for COIA to be credible it must
 - have the widest possible representation among the NCAA Division IA institutions
 - maintain the support of its member institutions
-

Framing the Future: Reforming Intercollegiate Athletics



- 2007 COIA white paper
 - Underlying principles
 - Intercollegiate athletics must be in line with the educational mission of the institution
 - College sports must adhere to the collegiate model
-

Framing the Future

- Academic integrity
 - The primacy of academics
 - Student-athlete welfare
 - Campus governance
 - Fiscal responsibility
-

Academic Integrity



- Student athletes should be admitted based on their potential for academic success and not primarily on their athletic contribution to the institution
 - The academic profiles of freshmen or transfer student-athletes as a group and by sport should be similar to those of the entering freshman class or the non-athlete transfer cohort, as applicable.
 - Data on the academic profiles of entering student-athletes and non-student-athletes should be reviewed at least annually by the Campus Athletics Board or the campus faculty governance body.
 - Special admissions of freshman and transfer student-athletes should reflect the same philosophy as special admissions of non-student-athletes.
 - Faculty should be involved in developing and overseeing campus policies regarding recruiting of student athletes.
-

The Primacy of Academics



- No academic programs or majors should be designed specifically for the students athlete or created for the purpose of allowing student athletes to maintain their eligibility.
 - Qualified student athletes should be allowed and in fact encouraged to pursue the major of their choice
 - The campus governing body or the campus athletics board should
 - gather and evaluate data on student-athletes' choice of major
 - monitor student-athlete enrollment by course.
 - review Academic Progress Rate (APR), Graduation Success Rate (GSR) and other available graduation rate data
 - The NCAA should continue to enforce penalties for teams and institutions that fail to meet NCAA APR and GSR standards.
 - Athletic eligibility shall be dependent on the maintenance of a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.0 on a 4.0 scale.
-

Student-athlete welfare



- Athletics scholarships
 - should be awarded on a year-by-year basis with the presumption that they should be renewed up to four times for a total award of five years, or until graduation, whichever comes first
 - Competition and Practice Scheduling
 - Individual athletic competitions, as distinct from conference, regional and national tournaments and championships, shall not be scheduled during final exam periods unless an exception is granted by the Campus Athletics Board or equivalent.
 - Individual athletic competitions and associated travel should be scheduled to minimize lost class time.
 - Athletically-related activities should be scheduled outside the prime times for academic classes.
-

Student-athlete welfare



- Integration into Campus Life
 - Life skills and personal development programs for student-athletes should have as a goal the integration of the student-athlete into the rest of the student population.
 - Campus Integration of Academic Advising for Student-Athletes
 - Academic advising and academic support for student-athletes should be structured to give student-athletes as valuable and meaningful an educational experience as possible and not just to maintain their athletic eligibility
 - The academic advising facility for student athletes should be integrated into and report through the existing academic and advising structure and not through the Athletics Department
 - The campus academic advising structure or the office of the chief academic officer should have oversight of and regularly review the academic advising of student-athletes.
 - Athletic academic advisors should be appointed by and work for the campus academic advising structure and not solely for the Athletics Department.
-

Campus governance



- Each NCAA member institution should establish a Campus Athletic Board.
 - Major athletic department decisions should be made in consultation with the Campus Athletic Board and leaders of the campus faculty governance body and appropriate faculty committee(s).
 - The Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR) should be appointed by the University President based on recommendation by the campus faculty governance body. The FAR appointment should be made for a specific term and a review of the performance of the FAR should take place prior to reappointment. Such a review should include meaningful participation by the campus faculty governance body, or the Campus Athletic Board.
 - The Athletic Director, Faculty Athletic Representative and the Campus Athletic Board chair should report orally and in writing at least once a year to the campus faculty governance body.
 - Leaders of campus faculty governance body should report annually to the University President
-

Fiscal responsibility



- The Athletic Department's budgets, revenues and expenditures should be transparent and aligned with the mission, goals and values of the institution.
 - The University President should take the lead to ensure that fiscal reports are made available to the campus faculty governance body.
 - The overall annual growth rate in the Athletic Department's operating expenditures should be no greater than the overall annual growth rate in the university's operating expenditures.
 - The athletic department budget should be integrated into the university general budget process where feasible.
 - The University President should take the appropriate steps to fuse athletic fundraising efforts into those of the rest of the university, including eliminating separate, athletic-only 501(c)(3) entities and establishing faculty representation on the board of the institutional
 - Commercialization policies in athletics should include meaningful faculty participation in their oversight.
-

Current Climate

- Changes in leadership:
 - New WFU President, Dr. Nathan Hatch
 - Jill Tiefenthaler, Ph.D. (New WFU Provost)
 - Search for new CEO of WFUHS
 - Lorna Moore, Ph.D. (New WFU Graduate School Dean)
- Institutional Changes:
 - Translational Science Institute (TSI)
 - Decreases in NIH and other sources of funding
 - Strategic plan for Reynolda Campus to form “institutes
 - Re-examination of WFU Graduate Degree Programs
- New Opportunities for building linkages and sharing resources across departments, programs, and campuses

Medical School Senators

- 6 Medical School faculty senators
- 1 Graduate School representative, Dr. Suzy Torti, (Senate Secretary)
- Senate Vice President: Michelle Naughton
- 4 are WFU Graduate Program Directors

Recommendations

- WFU Senate president should always be a Reynolda Campus Faculty member
- Medical School faculty member should be a member of the “cabinet” (e.g., vice-president)
- Medical school faculty should retain membership of the 5 standing senate committees, tailoring the membership to faculty expertise
- Reynolda Campus faculty should participate in Medical School Committees

Senate Subcommittees

- Planning Committee: Assist the Provost in enhancing the academic mission of WFU
- Resource Committee: How resources are raised, utilized and allocated in pursuit of the academic mission
- Fringe Benefits: Assess the adequacy of benefit packages for Reynolda Campus faculty and staff
- University Integration Committee: establish and widen intellectual synergies within and beyond the University Committee
- Senior University Appointments: nominate faculty for key ad hoc committees; participate in selection of senior university administrators; to nominate potential recipients of honorary degrees.

Subcommittee Integration Across Campuses

Senate Subcommittees:

- Planning Committee
- Resource Committee
- Fringe Benefits
- University Integration Committee
- Senior University Appointments

Medical Center Comm:

- WFUSM Dean's Advisory Committee
- WFUSM Fringe Benefits Committee
- WFU Research Advisory Committee
- Ad hoc member of Faculty Executive Council

WFUSM High Level Adminstrators

- WFUSM Deans and high level administrators will also participate in addressing the WFU Senate at least once a year