

Minutes of the Senate meeting
Wednesday, October 21, 2009-10-19

Present: Carole Browne (President), Martha Alexander-Miller, Paul Anderson, Peter Antinozzi, Doug Beets, Steve Block, Derrick Boone, Anne Boyle, James Cotter, Randy H. Cockerham, Jim Dunn, Paul Escott, Mary Friedman, Ed Haponik, Brad Jones, Judy Kem, Greg Kucera, Bill Leonard, Ken Middaugh, Ellen Miller, Mark Miller, Patrick Morton, Susan Smith, Lynn Sutton, Ahmed Taha, Jill Tiefenthaler, Lynne Wagenknecht, Neal Walls, Ron Zagoria.

Al Claiborne, Larry Daniel, Roy Hantgan, Linda McPhail, Charlie Morrow, Guangchao Sui, Alan Townsend, Mike Tytell, and Yuh-Hwa Wang were visitors.

I. Approval of minutes

The minutes were approved with one correction: Mark Miller is a senator, not a visitor.

II. Announcements:

President Hatch's State of the University presentation will be at 4:00 pm, October 28, in Wait Chapel.

The Z. Smith Reynolds Library elected its first Senate representative, Susan Smith. She will begin a four-year term with the understanding that the first year is without vote until the Senate bylaws have been updated to include library faculty.

III. Report from Senate Representatives to the Board of Trustees

President: For a number of years now, members of the Senate have been invited to sit on committees of the Board of Trustees. This arrangement originated out of a desire of the Board to have more contact with faculty. The Board works through its committees, so this gives us an opportunity to observe and on occasion have input to the Board's operation. Senate representatives sit on the Resources, Advancement, Academic, and Finance Committees. The Board met on October 8, and we have brief reports from the Senate representatives to those committees.

Ellen Miller – Administration Committee. There were 4 major areas to report on: 1) Sustainability – there is a set of principles that will be adhered to and that will aid in integrating sustainability in all areas; 2) Staff climate survey – staff reported mostly positive responses, areas of improvement were outlined, and the top three priorities were identified; 3) Environment – A required EPA audit was performed, 36 areas were corrected; 4) Capital projects – update on two new buildings, two have been approved for design, and three projects are in the design stage.

Paul Escott – Advancement Committee. This committee is concerned with money. The bad news is that the economy has affected giving. The number of large gifts is way down. The number of small gifts has increased; it is better this year than last year. Planning is underway for

the next Capital Campaign. No target has yet been established. Staff members were very professional and the trustees were very much engaged.

Carole Browne – Academic Committee. The Academic Committee approved the MA and MFA degrees in Documentary Film and looked at the Divinity reaccreditation report without discussion.

There was considerable discussion of a report by the Provost on the financial aid situation at the College. Wake Forest is a needs-blind admissions school. That means that we admit students independent of their financial needs and agree to provide them with the financial support necessary to attend if they are admitted. Due to the economic downturn and the changing demographics of the student body, providing financial aid to all admitted students this year was very difficult.

At the present time about 60% of the student body are full paying students, 40% receive some form of aid. This is up from 37% students on aid last year. Family income must exceed \$175,000 to be a full-paying student.

The financial aid package consists of grants, government loans, and when necessary, private loans. The use of private loans as part of financial aid packages is unusual. The university pays the interest on the loans while the students are in school. The problem this year was compounded by the fact that many students were turned down for private loans due to financial difficulties in their homes. This year they basically ran out of money and had to reach deep into pockets to provide the extra money needed to support students, and relied on gifts from donors to make up the difference. It is expected that this problem will get worse in the future, not only because of the weak economy, but because of the changing demographics of the student body. The college is seeking to increase diversity, which brings in more students with need. This year the college also targeted first generation college students, many of whom have greater need. And the demographics of the pool of students are changing. In the near future, the majority of students graduating from US high schools will be students of color, and many will come from less prosperous homes.

Another problem is the size of the loan packages that students are taking on. There are 99 students who took on more than \$12,000 in loans this year. This could be an issue for retention and graduation rates, and it has implications for student selection of Wake Forest, since many needs-blind schools are holding down the size of loan packages.

The Provost clarified that Citibank denied loans this year; over half of students denied loans were continuing students. There is a concern that this may be a long-term problem. Students graduating from high school in the future may have greater needs.

Other announcements: Wake Forest graduates taking the state bar exam for the first time had the highest pass rate in the state: 92%. The new Admissions Building will break ground soon. The new dorm will be ready for occupancy by the fall.

James Cotter – Finance Committee. The financial state of the university, while challenged, is strong (6/30/09). There was no management comment letter. Revenues were \$325 million. Expenses were \$313.2 million. Net tuition was \$145 million. Endowment totals \$485

million, down 20.6% in 2009. The university's rating was Aa3 (the lowest Aa rating). 26,000 gifts raised \$35 million, down from \$47 million. There was an increase of 59 students over last year. There was \$38.9 million in capital improvements in 2009: 1) Deacon Tower, 2) Baseball Park purchase, 3) Library study and coffee lounge, 4) Faculty apartments, and 5) Benson renovations. The university borrowed \$110 million – nearly all the debt is fixed rate. \$203 million in total debt.

Student Life Committee Report. When the committee met, they discussed H1N1. The university is planning to vaccinate students in their dorms. The university is planning a Pro Humanitate honor roll. The shuttle service has been expanded. "Amethyst Limited" – there is some discussion of reconsidering the drinking age and lowering it to 18.

Athletic Committee Report – The faculty representative to the Athletic Committee is Mary Dalton, chair of the College Committee on Athletics. Mary will be asked to share her report at the next meeting of the Senate.

The Integration Committee Report is forthcoming after November 3. The other major task force is to rewrite the Senate Bylaws.

IV. Report from the Committee on Fringe Benefits: Anne Boyle. The committee met with Mike Tesh to discuss putting a cap on the number of semester credit hours transferred in. The committee will make a formal report on what the university has accomplished. Patrick Morton is co-chair of the committee.

V. Report from the University Integration Committee:

- 1) Safety Response Team: Ken Middaugh has a November 3 meeting with Dr. Cecil Price to discuss historical activities and usage of the Safety Response Team. Once this information is obtained, the committee will deliberate and present their ideas to the Senate for consideration.
- 2) The Senate by-laws have been distributed to the committee members. They plan to begin their work editing/correcting the by-laws soon. Since there are several sections that are affected by the results of the discussion about moving to a new senate structure (faculty senate), the committee will hold off on working on the affected sections until the senate votes on the new structure.

VI. Updates:

- 1) The Staff Advisory Council is up and running. The SAC by-laws have been approved, and the Council has met and elected officers. The President is Gary Alwine of the Biology Department. The Council discussed what role the SAC would have relative to the Senate. The Senate Executive Committee proposed that the SAC and the Senate exchange liaisons, and that there would be a joint fringe benefits committee whose members are drawn from both bodies. The SAC by-laws also call for a SAC presence in the Senate.

Gary has asked Pat Morton, who is a member of both the Senate and the SAC, to serve as the SAC liaison to the Senate this year. Pat has also agreed to co-chair the Fringe Benefits Committee. If the Senate agrees that a joint committee is a good idea, then additional staff members will be added to the committee, and appropriate by-laws changes will have to be made.

- 2) Reynolda Campus Faculty Handbook. Carole Browne spoke to the Dean's Council about the process that had been used for revision of the Faculty Handbook, which was completed by the Senate Executive Committee last summer. The purpose of the revision was to eliminate redundancies and conflicts, and to make the handbook shorter and more user friendly. To this end, many policies that are found elsewhere were removed from the handbook and links provided to the original source of the policy. The Deans will take the appropriate handbook chapters back to their units, where the faculty will review and edit the chapters. It is hoped that the Handbook revisions will be back in the hands of the Senate by December 1 and will be distributed next fall.
- 3) The Associate Provost Mark Welker reported that the Deans were interested in whether the Executive Committee had considered including a chapter on post-tenure review in the handbook. This was not done since there was no such policy in the handbook, and the committee did not propose policy changes; they just edited the handbook. The Associate Provost suggested that we might want to look in to a post-tenure review that would occur on a five-year cycle where faculty members would meet with their immediate supervisors and discuss their goals for the next five years, and he suggested peer and aspirational schools that we might look at as we investigate such a review process. The Provost said that this is not spelled out in any consistent way throughout the university and that this would be a mentoring process.

Medical School salary cut and tenure probation committee: The committee is chaired by Neal Walls of the Divinity School. Also on the committee are Bill Conner of the College, Ed Haponik of the Medical School and Senate Vice President, and Larry Daniels and Judy Brunso-Bechtold, both of the Medical School and both former Senate Presidents. The committee has not yet met.

VI. Report from Committee studying the concept of a Faculty Senate.

Carole Browne: A Senate committee has been put together to investigate the possibility of converting the University Senate to a Faculty Senate. The committee is chaired by former Senate President Doug Beets. Members of the Committee include Gloria Muday of the College and Derrick Boone of the Medical School, both past Senate Presidents, and Brad Jones, Chair of the Senate SUA Committee. The committee has met, and Doug Beets will give you a report of their activities.

Doug Beets distributed a handout with the "Status Quo" of the present University Senate, with underlined segments subject to change, and the proposal for a Faculty Senate. In the proposal, there will be two classes of members: 1) ex-officio and 2) elected. All elected members

are entitled to vote. The ex-officio members would include the President of the University, the Provost, and the Deans of the several schools and the libraries. The elected faculty members would include the senators from the college, library, School of Business, and professional schools, but the number of senators might be revised. Finally, “Additions to the above Senate membership may occur as follows. If a new graduate or professional school is formed, coordinate in rank to the existing graduate and professional schools, its Dean shall become an ex-officio member and its faculty shall elect. . . (the number of senators from new schools [may] be considered and possibly revised during this academic year in a separate proposal).”

There was some discussion about the exclusion of staff and about why deans had been included as ex-officio members. All questions and comments are to be addressed to Doug Beets (beets@wfu.edu).

VII. Presentation by Steve Block, Associate Dean of the School of Medicine

Overview of the Medical School:

“It is an exciting time.” The Medical School has recently conducted a major recruitment effort. The Chief Medical Officer of the Medical School was only one of those recruits. Three core missions of the Medical School: 1) research, 2) clinical, and 3) education. Steve Block listed and described other recent recruits: a new Chief Financial Officer, the Head of Public Relations and Marketing, the Chair of Physiology, and others. They have also put up the new website.

“In change, there comes a need for strategic planning.” Was it a good time for this, considering the economic crisis? They nonetheless went ahead. He said that the Medical School’s mission statement refers to a “pre-eminent” institution of the highest quality. To serve as a premiere health system was also a high priority. Education and the health missions have become integrated. Excellence, compassion, service, integrity, diversity, collegiality, and innovation are all goals of the strategic planning process. “That’s where we are in the planning process.” It is hoped that this process will generate revenue.

The Medical School collaborates closely with the Graduate School. They have 120 students per year. That’s an increase from four years ago – they are at capacity. They have an innovative curriculum, constantly in evolution. The students learn applications and work with patients. The “benchmark” has improved. Problem-based learning is in stage two. “Our students are competitive.”

The NIH budgets have been flat recently due to the economy. “Our faculty struggle.” However, “this quarter we had some significant success.” The Medical School will receive some stimulus funding as well. In the regular funding cycle – “we have had a good year.” He described several grants and projects at the Medical School.

“We’re strong clinically.” We have opportunities to become stronger and better and create centers of excellence. These centers have financial challenges. There are people who are not getting health care because they can’t afford it. We have to be prepared to deal with these

problems. We have to take a long look at health care. “Stay tuned to see what happens. We have to be nimble. . . We’ll see what we can afford next year.

Responses to Concerns Expressed in the Minutes of the Last Meeting:

It is true that some faculty members’ salaries have been reduced by 10%. Some have not been successful in funding their salaries. There was a grand total of 19. Although the process was not very transparent, it was fair. “I will not get personal.” 75% of one’s research time (60% of overall work) is supposed to be funded. This was not easy – but it was done even-handedly. It was not based on a single year, but on a three-year cumulative basis.

There are 1,010 faculty at the Medical School. 228 are basic science faculty, and 782 are clinical faculty. Only 186 faculty members are tenured. There is no “tenure-track.” Tenure can only be given at the associate professor or full professor rank.

Question: Why have only 186 been tenured? Answer: Most of them are eligible. There is a difference between the way members are tenured. Clinical chairs are concerned that they have to keep faculty members accountable. Basic science chairs regard tenure as much more important. We would have a great problem recruiting if there were not greater opportunities for tenure in that field (basic science).

Question: Of the 19 who received salary cuts, how many were tenured? Answer: About a little more than half.

Question: What are the precise rights and privileges of faculty? Answer: I will answer that question later.

Question: Was this done for budgetary reasons? Why was this done? To change behavior? Answer: “First of all, I did not say ‘change behavior.’” While the dollar amount was small, the motivation was indeed financial. That is why this is going on – to cut expenses.

Steve Block: On March 30, 2007, the Wake Forest University Trustees passed a new tenure policy for the Medical School. In that document, it says that tenure is granted to reward and recognize the faculty member. The five year contract was changed – it is a continuous process. Tenure probation can be initiated at the five year point. Tenure probation before the five-year point is initiated by the chairs. The Dean of the Medical School has the right to initiate tenure probation before the end of the five-year period.

Comment: You are in effect eliminating tenure at the Medical School. This will harm the Medical School. Answer: “I will say the following. We have a generally productive faculty. There have been people who have struggled to get funding. The dean and many dept. chairs

agreed to do what was done this year. We were all troubled by the lack of transparency. Two committees were put together to create greater transparency.”

Comment: Some are trying to rebuild. Answer: Policy deals with the process overall. You (a Senator), as an individual, have some issues. I’m happy for you to come and see me.

Provost: Any tenure revocation has to go to the Board of Trustees. The Dean of the Medical School does not have the right to revoke tenure.

Question: Is there an appeals process? Answer: Yes. Provost: The University Grievance Policy *does* apply to all faculty.

Question: Are grants the only criteria for salary cuts and tenure probation? Answer: Budgets need to be met. The Medical School makes these decisions with the input of department chairs. The department chairs have not been kept out of the loop. There may be a disagreement – but the department chairs have been included in the discussion. Models are being developed that will set a timeline and expectations. There is never going to be a perfect process.

Question: How will the tenure situation affect recruitment at the medical school? Answer: We sometimes give people tenure upon recruitment. We’re very concerned about that. We’re hurting less than many. Departments can be eliminated and tenure can be legitimately terminated.

Question: Can the five-year contract be circumvented? Answer: There are two two-year probations. The person can then be put back on the five-year contract. It has never happened that someone did NOT go back on the five-year contract, but things change.

Question: How many people are on tenure probation? There is one faculty member on the second year of tenure probation. There are three more on the first year of tenure probation.

Question: At what point is the salary cut instituted? Answer: That’s one of the challenges we were faced with – we need to be more transparent. This year some people were informed within only a month.

The meeting was adjourned.

Corrections to the minutes have been submitted by Dr. Mark Miller, School of Medicine

Dr. Block stated that the School of Medicine appointments are 75% research effort, and 60% of that salary needs to be recovered through grant funding. Salary reductions started if one did not recover 60% of the 75% research effort (hence 45% of salary) averaged over a 3 year period, and

that there would be a one year grace period before that kicked in. This metric does not include the 25% non-research effort (teaching and administration).

Of the 19 individuals receiving pay cuts, 17 were basic researchers. 15 of the 19 received 10% pay cuts, the other 4 received 5%.

When asked about the tenure probationary period of two years, Dr. Block indicated that a second probationary period would be instituted before the School of Medicine moved to revoke tenure if the faculty member had not yet corrected his funding situation.

When asked about grievances, Dr. Block initially indicated that faculty could only file grievances for tenure revocation. However, the Provost indicated that medical school faculty had the right to file grievances over salary issues through the University Grievance Committee.

Dr. Block was asked about the Dean placing individuals on tenure outside the 5 year summative review when not requested by the chairs, and Block indicated that tenure probation within the 5 year summative review had to be initiated by the Chair of the department.