

Minutes of the University Senate Meeting (November 17, 2009)

Senators present: Carole Browne (President), Paul Anderson, Doug Beets, Derrick Boone, Anne Boyle, James Cotter, Paul Escott, Jacque Feltrow, Ed Haponik, Sara Jones, Judy Kem, Greg Kucera, Ken Middaugh, Mark Miller, Lorna Moore, Steve Reinemund, Mike Robbins, Lynn Sutton, Nancy Suttentfield, Jill Tiefenthaler (Provost), Neal Walls, Bill Ward.

Visitors present: Gary Alwine, Andy Chan, Angela Culler, Charles Morrow, Susan Smith, Mike Tesh, Alan Townsend, Michael Tytell.

I. Approval of the minutes of the October 21 meeting. The minutes were approved as amended.

II. Announcements:

A. Paul Anderson has agreed to be our liaison to the Staff Advisory Council.

B. University Senate Holiday Reception - Saturday, Dec 5, from 6 to 8 pm.

C. Our next Senate meeting will be February 3. The Provost will be giving a presentation to the entire faculty and staff on Feb 22. The site of this presentation may be changed.

D. Carole Browne announced that Mary Dalton could not be here today to give a report of her attendance as the representative of the College Faculty Athletics Committee at the Board of Trustees Athletics Committee meeting. She submitted a written report to the Senate. But since the Athletic Director Ron Wellman will give a presentation today that will probably include information in her report, the report will not be read at this time.

III. Business: Standing Committee reports

A. Report on the Staff Advisory Council – President of the SAC, Gary Alwine: This last summer, the Council rewrote the SAC bylaws. President Hatch approved them. The first meeting of the newly configured SAC was held two weeks ago. By the end of the third year, all committee officials will be elected. The Council needs to make itself known to the staff and to define its role and determine how to communicate staff concerns to the administration. It is also important that the Senate and the SAC leadership establish a mechanism by which they can work together, perhaps through joint meetings of their executive committees, to make staff concerns known to the administration. At the present time the Fringe Benefits Committee currently both the Senate and the SAC, and is co-chaired by Anne Boyle of the Senate, and Pat Morton of the Senate and the SAC.

B. Report on the Staff Climate Survey, Mike Tesh: Mike Tesh thanked the Senate and began his report. The Staff Climate Survey was started in the spring of 2009. It had been done ten years earlier in 1999. A committee was formed that included members of the Senate as well as of the Staff Advisory Council. It was co-chaired by individuals from the Provost's Office and Human Resources. The goals: of the survey were to 1) assess attitudes and perceptions about the University and the work environment; 2) establish a baseline measure of current staff attitudes and work climate that can be used to measure progress in future years; and 3) formulate an institution-level action plan that aligns with the Strategic Plan and enhances work environment and staff engagement. The Committee reviewed proposals and selected a third-party vendor (Sibson Consulting) to create a customized WFU survey, administer the staff

survey and ensure confidentiality for all participants. A primary focus of the process was anonymity. No one at Wake Forest will be able to view individual responses. 863 staff members participated.

Overview. The favorability score for WFU's Work Climate was 60% (70% represents a "healthy work climate" – 60% is a positive indication; 64% is a benchmark for higher education). Wake Forest has an opportunity to improve in several areas. Satisfaction with compensation is low, which is fairly common. We're 4% off the benchmark in that area. There was much greater satisfaction with benefits.

Survey Process – Next Steps: We found three areas to focus on: 1) improving staff communication; 2) improving performance management, appraisals and job descriptions; and 3) reviewing and understanding compensation processes and practices. The institutional information has been available on WIN since September 24. Frequently asked questions will also be posted on WIN and will continue to be updated as we receive questions and feedback. A feedback form will be available on WIN to submit anonymous feedback. Future surveys will be scheduled every 2-3 years to monitor University progress and departmental feedback. Senior leadership will continue to review progress of institutional initiatives and departmental plans and accomplishments.

Key findings: 1) A large number of respondents chose not to identify themselves; 2) Trust is an important factor and opportunity for improvement; and 3) Both positive and negative results were not significant as regards to race, gender, and age.

Mike Tesh also gave the Senate a timeline for the survey and an action plan. The University will move to a "job family approach."

Dean Feltrow asked if there were steps taken to ensure that staff members who do not have access to computers were informed of the results of the survey. Answer: There were forums held and results are made available to those who do not have computers.

Anne Boyle asked Mike Test to characterize written comments. Response: The content of the work is interesting and challenging. The university has a family feel to it. Areas of greatest satisfaction included working at a nationally recognized university, with good student interaction, in an attractive campus environment and in a "progressive" institution. Areas that needed improvement were indicated by comments such as: pay does not keep up with workload, input from the staff is ignored, there is a "yes" culture on campus, workloads continue to increase, no clear career path exists, and long-time employees do not receive enough respect.

C. At the last two meetings of the Senate, considerable discussion was devoted to the issues of salary reductions and tenure probations at the School of Medicine. A committee, chaired by Neal Walls of the Divinity School, was formed to recommend an appropriate Senate response. The committee offered the following resolution as a motion:

Resolution 1, sponsored by the University Senate, with the support of the Wake Forest Chapter of the American Association of University Professors:

The Wake Forest University Senate is deeply concerned with recent administrative decisions to institute salary reductions and tenure probation for some tenured members of the Medical School faculty. In particular, the lack of transparency in the evaluation process and the lack of clear, written criteria by

which faculty performance is to be judged are of concern. The Senate calls for greater openness, clarity, and participation (by both faculty and department chairs in the evaluation process).

Although the Senate recognizes the unique administrative structure of the School of Medicine, we urge the School of Medicine's administration to adhere to AAUP guidelines on faculty governance and the privileges of tenure. The Senate affirms that the School of Medicine should be held to the same high standards of fairness, equity, and respect in its treatment of faculty and staff as the other Schools of Wake Forest University. The Senate invites the senior administration of the School of Medicine to enter into dialogue with the Senate on the appropriate procedures for ensuring cross-University consistency on these vital issues.

Neal Walls read the resolution and asked for questions and comments. The committee met with the AAUP and the Dean of the Medical School. Some progress has already been made, in that the Dean has received feedback from both committees (AAUP and the Senate Committee). In addition, two committees at the School of Medicine have been formed to study these same issues, and will be giving additional feedback to the dean. The motion to approve this resolution was made and seconded. The motion passed in a show of hands.

D. In the last two Senate meetings there has been discussion on whether the Senate should consider conversion from a University Senate to a Faculty Senate. A committee comprised of former University Senate presidents was formed, and chaired by Doug Beets of the Schools of Business, to make a recommendation to the Senate. The committee offered the following resolution as a motion:

Resolution 2

That the name of the University Senate be changed to that of Faculty Senate. That there shall be two classes of members: (1) ex-officio and (2) elected. All elected members are entitled to vote. Ex-officio members shall consist of the President of the University, the Provost, and the Deans of the academic units. The elected members shall consist of faculty from each of the academic units.

Additional senior university administrators, upon approval by the Senate Standing Committee on Senior University Appointments and election by members of the Senate, shall become ex-officio members of the Senate.

Doug Beets read the above resolution and asked for questions and discussion. A friendly amendment was offered and was accepted –that the word “only” be inserted before “elected members are entitled to vote”. A questions was asked as to when this motion will take effect. Answer: First the by-laws need to re-written and approved by the Senate. In the spring, the by-laws changes will be submitted to the Board of Trustees for approval, so that this would take effect in the next academic year. Comment: “University Senate” sounds more important and influential than “Faculty Senate.” Answer from Doug Beets: Much of our concern was that there is not a significant voice of the faculty; it is an attempt to give faculty that voice. The University Senate is an “amalgam” of the faculty, staff, and administration. Most of the issues we have faced in the University Senate have been faculty issues. Paul Escott proposed an amendment that the CFO be added to the ex-officio members. Response: Isn’t that covered by the last paragraph in the motion above? This amendment will be voted on separately. In response to questions: The current faculty members of the University Senate will continue as members of the Faculty Senate. Who besides staff will

no longer be members of the Senate? Mainly Vice-Presidents will no longer be members. The Escott amendment to include the CFO under ex-officio members in paragraph 1 was passed by a voice vote.

Paper ballots were distributed for the vote on the amended motion. The final vote was 25 to 2 in favor of the motion. The motion passed.

IV. Presentation by Ron Wellman, Director of Athletics:

“This is the first time I’ve presented to the Senate.” Academic Overview: 2008-09 was one of the best academic years for student-athletes. 6 teams for spring 2009 had semester GPAs over a 3.0 (the most in 10 years). Semester GPA 2.804 and cumulative GPA 2.734 for all teams (the highest in 4 years). Our coaches support us in the endeavor to keep up academic standards. Question: How many teams are there? Answer: 18

WFU Student-Athlete Graduation Rates Summary. Wake Forest continues to be one of the highest in the ACC and NCAA in all graduation measures:

GSR (Graduation Success Rate): 93%.

Federal Graduation Rate: 77%.

APR (Academic Performance Rate): 963-1000.

Minority Graduation Rates: Men (2nd in ACC) and Women (1st in ACC).

Student-athletes transfer for various reasons (sometimes because they are not given enough play time); that is one of the major reasons that our Federal Graduation Rates are lower.

Graduation Rates Definitions: Federal Graduation Rate. Freshman cohort is 6 years prior to when rate is released. Transfer students and students leaving early to play professionally count negatively against the school even if the student-athlete departs while eligible.

NCAA Academic Performance Rate (APR). The NCAA developed this rate to show a more accurate picture of academic success of student-athletes (real-time measure of academic success). Data is collected each year for all student-athletes on scholarship. A cut score of 925 was developed and schools falling below 925 incur penalties. A point-based system – students earn a total of 4 possible points each year. Points are not lost if student-athletes leave to play professionally.

Wake Forest University Football:

WFU Academic Progress Rate: 966.

Division I Football APR Average : 941.

WFU APR: Fourth in ACC.

WFU Federal Graduation Rate: Third in ACC.

WFU Graduation Success Rate (GSR): 83.

Division I Football GSR Average: 67.

WFU GSR: Third in ACC.

Wake Forest University Men's Basketball:

WFU Academic Progress Rate: 963.

Division I Basketball APR Average : 933.

WFU APR: Fifth in ACC.

WFU Federal Graduation Rate: First in ACC.

WFU Graduation Success Rate (GSR): 100.

Division I Men's Basketball GSR Average: 62.

WFU GSR: Third in ACC.

Wake Forest University Women's Basketball:

WFU Academic Progress Rate: 986.

Division I Women's Basketball APR Average : 962.

WFU APR: Third in ACC.

WFU Federal Graduation Rate: First in ACC.

WFU Graduation Success Rate (GSR): 100.

Division I Women's Basketball GSR Average: 82.

WFU GSR: First in ACC.

Ron Wellman compared men's and women's WFU APR standings by team. Men's tennis was tied for first. Men's Track Indoor/Outdoor teams were second. Women's golf and women's tennis were tied for first.

He also provided the graduation rates of black males and black females. We are doing better than anyone in the country in graduation rates for black females. He also provided the six-year graduation rates for both black males (second: 77%) and black females (first: 100%). "Our faculty hold our student-athletes accountable."

Director's Cup: Began in 1993-1994 for Division I by NACDA and *USA Today*. This is a program that awards institutions maintaining a broad-based program, achieving success in many sports, both men's and women's. Each institution is awarded points in a pre-determined number of sports of men and women (10 men's and 10 women's sports). Our final standing last year was 37th. It was a good year but not a great year.

There were a number of individual award winners last year. The Hermann Trophy was given to Marcus Tracy, one of our student athletes. Sam Cronin was runner-up.

2008-2009 End of Year Conference Ranking and NCAA Ranking: Half of our teams ended up in the top half of the rankings.

Question: For some time there has been concern that the curriculum taken by many athletes does not match that of the typical student at the same institution. In particular, athletes are found to be clustered in certain academic majors, or to be disproportionately represented in classes offered by certain professors. To what extent is that an issue at WFU? How is this issue being addressed? Answer: If a student is interested in a particular major, why shouldn't the student major in that particular curriculum? As long as we are not forcing our students to major in a particular area, it is not a concern.

Question: Wake Forest College has dropped the requirement for the SAT for admissions decisions. In the past, the number of students (overwhelmingly athletes) brought in as "special admissions", students with SAT scores below 900, was limited. What has been the impact of dropping the SAT been on the admission of student athletes? Answer: We expect all our prospects to take the SAT. Question: Have the SATs been going up? Answer: They're stable.

\$8 million were transferred to Athletics this past year. At other division I schools that have 50,000 students and more, the cost of the athletic program is spread over many more students. What are the benefits of the NCAA athletics programs to the WFU student body as a whole that makes it worth the cost? Answer: Quite frankly, the allocation allows us to be in Division I. We are at the bottom of the ACC in operating budget, and our scholarships are included in the budget. We compare our budgets to other schools in the ACC. What direct and indirect benefits does the university receive from our participation in the ACC? – the exposure on TV is well worth it. Follow-up question – is the dollar amount determined on the basis of a head count. Answer: No, it increases depending upon tuition.

Question: How much money can we earn in athletics merchandise? Answer: It is increasing. It turned around when Skip Prosser came up with the tie-dyed T-shirt.

Question: What is your stand on Congressional intervention in intercollegiate athletics, i.e., the movement to drop tax-exempt status for intercollegiate athletics? Answer: I'm not aware of it. The congress is very upset that there is not a football play-off. A revenue-sharing formula would hurt us, because a championship would fall under the auspices of the NCAA, and revenues would be shared among all NCAA schools, not just among schools in the conference that have members participating on the bowls.

The meeting was adjourned.