Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting
February 15, 2017

Submitted by Senate Secretary, Claudia Kairoff, Professor of English
Prepared by Amalia Wagner and Claudia Kairoff, Ph.D.

Caveat: Comments recorded are not necessarily verbatim. In order to facilitate open discussion, the identity of most Senators making comments or questions is not recorded. The identity of comments from Senate Officers and Senate Ad Hoc and Standing Committee Chairs are given, as is the identity of persons commenting in their official administrative capacity (e.g., CFO, Provost and College Dean.)


There were 21 voting-eligible Senators present, a quorum.

Welcome

President Cotter called the meeting to order. He made a motion to accept the minutes of the January 18, 2017 Senate meeting, which was seconded. A show of hands was unanimous in favor of approval.

WFU Faculty Athletics Representative to the NCAA by Peter Brubaker (refer to addendum A for complete presentation)

Pete introduced himself to the group. He is a professor in the department of Health and Exercise Science. He accepted the role of Faculty Athletic Representative this past summer after President Hatch appointed him to serve for a three-year term. The NCAA defines the FAR as “a member of the institution’s faculty or an administrator who holds faculty rank and shall not hold an administrative or coaching position in the athletic department.” The FAR is recognized as the representative of the institution and its faculty in the relationship between NCAA/ACC and the local campus. He reports directly to Dr. Hatch regarding matters relating to athletics and student matters but also works in close consultation with the Director of Athletics. Pete has regular interaction with the Registrar’s Office, the Athletic Department Compliance Office and Student-Athlete Services. The FAR (at WFU) is a voting member and regular contributor to the Faculty Athletic Committee (FAC) and reports to faculty governance groups as requested. A few things are going on currently with the Athletic Committee, which is chaired by Steve Giles. One concern is about the distribution of majors among student athletics. They have done some analysis and are pleased to see that there is a healthy distribution of student athletes across various majors. Another issue regards individual studies and grade changes. There is always a concern that student athletes could be getting preferential treatment. They have done some preliminary analysis on this and don’t see any disproportionate number of individual studies with student athletes or grade changes.

The role of the FAR deals with institutional control, academic integrity and student athlete welfare. In the area of academic integrity/oversight is the certification of eligibility of all student
athletes on this campus (over 400). There’s a process in place where the registrar’s office evaluates all the student athlete’s transcripts. The athletic compliance office and student athletic services reviews all their documents related to eligibility. As the FAR, Pete is at the center of that process. He must review the information generated by those entities and sign off that each student-athlete meets the eligibility requirements of the NCAA and ACC. That happens every semester. Pete described the fun part of his role, that he gets to nominate graduating student athletes for post-graduate scholarships. Four of WFU students were recently selected for ACC post-graduate scholarships. Regarding the well-being of athletes, the best insight into their wellbeing is the monthly meetings with the student athlete advisory committee to discuss their issues and concerns. He also participates in orientation and exit interviews with student athletes. The last area under institutional control and governance of athletics is to participate in audits, and he is currently in the middle of one with the ACC. He also represents WFU at NCAA/ACC legislative meetings. Should there be any NCAA violations, he would be involved with that, but fortunately, none have occurred thus far. If anyone has any questions regarding student athletes, please feel free to email or call Pete. He mentioned that he has a good working relationship with Jane Albrecht, the COIA representative.

Discussion ensued:

Q: How much influence do you have over the process for certification?
A: (Pete Brubaker) We all sit in the same room and review transcripts and other documents provided by compliance. I only sign when the student meets our eligibility standards.

Q: Do you know how many student athletes are graduate students at WFU?
A: (Pete Brubaker) It’s a small number; 5 or 6.

**WFU as a Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) policy by Jose Villalba**

Jose Villalba is a Senior Associate Dean of the College and a professor in Counseling. He gave a brief overview about what the University has done regarding undocumented students. Jose mentioned that the University was alerted to concerns from undocumented students around November 15, 2016, when a petition circulated at Pomona College requesting the University president to support the reauthorization of DACA. Shortly after, other petitions began circulating about sanctuary cities. At that time, WFU heard from about a dozen undocumented students. Not every undocumented student is a DACA student. A group of students met with the Dean’s Office, Campus Life, and the Provost’s Office the Tuesday before Thanksgiving break to discuss their concerns and needs. The university learned about what the worries of these students and their families. If Margaret Taylor of our Law School were here, she would tell you that she and her army of colleagues involved in Immigration law are basically in a holding pattern, not knowing how to write a “know your rights” brief because of the new administration’s constantly changing policies. Since our meeting with the students, WFU has received petitions from students, faculty, and the community. We have received many different ideas about what the university is supposed to do. Our main concern is for WFU DACA students and undocumented students. We are wondering what is going to happen to DACA students and their families. In some ways, we are hopeful that DACA authorization won’t be revoked. But in
the news yesterday, a 23-year-old DACA student in Seattle was detained in a raid. DACA is supposed to protect students from being deported, detained, or arrested. Our students are most likely wondering, “how long before we are picked up in a random raid?” There is not much that we know to do for our students. We are in a bizarre holding pattern.

The other concern is about whether WFU should be a sanctuary campus. Most of you have probably seen the initial response from President Hatch, sent out shortly after the election. We have recently started getting more calls about becoming a sanctuary campus. WFU has decided not to become a sanctuary campus, for two reasons. It’s a policy and / or definition that doesn’t have any teeth. Saying you are a sanctuary campus but it won’t prevent ICE from coming onto campus. By designating ourselves a sanctuary campus, we could be putting a bull’s eye on our campus and drawing unnecessary attention to WFU. Students and faculty, however, have expressed that becoming a sanctuary campus is symbolic and means a lot to them. Jose encouraged everyone to check out the Community in Progress website for further information on WFU undocumented students.

Discussion ensued:

Q: Why is that student being detained, if DACA is the law of the land?
A: (Jose Villalba) According to the Washington Post, he is being detained because he is here illegally, so he is being held until they can figure out which holds more weight, DACA or immigration status. He shouldn’t have been detained to begin with.

Q: I understand why we are not declaring WFU a sanctuary campus, but why not agree to the principles and definition of what a sanctuary campus is?
A: (Jose Villalba) A 5-page document on the Community in Progress website speaks to this. WFU will not volunteer any information about immigration status of students. The International and Scholarship offices by law, if asked, must report to the State Department who is on a J1, H1, H4, etc., visa. WFU will not deputize our police force to serve as immigration enforcement. But this doesn’t prevent ICE or Customs and Border patrol agents coming on campus.

Q: Could the authorities ask for information on visa status, or would they have to ask by name?
A: (Jose Villalba) I don’t know the answer to that. Keila Hubbard, the Director of Int’l Students and Scholars division, would know that.

Comment: Per the Executive Committee’s conversation with Rogan, he informed us that WFU is committed to the three prongs of being a Sanctuary Campus but without the designation.
   1. Not voluntarily reporting people’s status
   2. Not deputizing our campus police force
   3. Not letting ICE on campus without a warrant

Q: As an Institution, what are our legal and ethical obligations to our students?
A: (Jose Villalba) The legal obligations are more black and white. We provide students with a fair and equitable education, and financial aid when necessary or merited. We only provide the information we are asked for per FERPA. Ethically, it is more difficult. You would assume we would honor our motto.
Q: Can we protect the students who live off campus?
A: (Jose Villalba) In the 3 or 4 months that we’ve been having these conversations, we have not told the students not to live off campus. We have recommended that they not travel abroad, and if they were going home, to return by January 19, 2017.

Q: I’m still concerned about reporting people’s visa status. Rogan indicated that there is just a handful of students who we know are undocumented students on campus and we are committed to not giving them up. If we know that they don’t qualify under any of these visa statuses, then we aren’t required to report them, is that correct?
A: (Jose Villalba) Yes, that is how I would interpret that. We are not sure how many undocumented non-DACA students we have; we think we have 3 or 4. We assume those are the students on Golden Door scholarships, which are reserved for undocumented students.

Q: What happens if I see immigration officials on campus?
A: (Jose Villalba) If that happens, I would encourage you to call the Provost’s office. I would imagine that the campus police would be involved, along with CER. This hasn’t happened on any University campus yet.

Q: Should WFU send out a message about what to do if ICE shows up on campus?
A: (Jose Villalba) I’ll touch base with Margaret Taylor, and that’s a good question to talk to Rogan about as well. Maybe a 5-point action plan for if this occurs. This needs to be a campus-wide effort.

Q: If someone showed up at either the registrar’s office or housing looking for a student without a signed warrant, what would they do?
A: (Jose Villalba) I don’t see Harold divulging this information. If anyone knows FERPA, it would be the Registrar’s office.

Comment: The ACLU produced a “know your rights, or what happens if ICE shows up on your doorstep” document. You can google “ACLU, know your immigration rights” and get a list of 9 or ten items in English and Spanish. We shared that resource with our undocumented students. It is not a DACA-approved document; it is an overall immigration “know your rights.” Margaret Taylor and her immigration colleagues are working on a DACA “know your rights” postcard.

Q: What about undocumented faculty?
A: To our knowledge we do not have any. In NC, you must have proper documentation to work for WFU and are subject to e-verification.

Q: I’ve heard concerns about faculty with visas. Have you reached out to them?
A: Yes, we have. University-wide, with the exclusion of the Medical School, we have 6 or 7 on visas.

Jose closed by reminding everyone that this doesn’t just impact our students, but their families as well.
**Medical School’s promotion and tenure policies by Dan Bourland:**

Dan Bourland is the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee at the Medical School. His committee was tasked with reviewing the current policy. A small task force of seven individuals held a town hall and met with a variety of groups. The (FEC) Faculty Executive Council approved it last week; the (FRC) Faculty Representative Council will vote tomorrow on the changes. After the FRC’s approval, the policy will go before the BOT’s. The task force found that the Medical School had too many academic tracks (7). They looked at peer institutions and most of them had 4 or 5 tracks. After their review, the committee decided to reduce their options to 5 tracks. This applies to all academic programs on the Bowman Gray campus, including the Graduate School. Below are the revised tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tracks (5)</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Research Scholar</th>
<th>Educator Scholar</th>
<th>Clinician Scholar</th>
<th>Clinician Expert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenure Eligible</td>
<td>Non-Tenure</td>
<td>Non-Tenure</td>
<td>Non-Tenure</td>
<td>Non-Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Focus</td>
<td>Scientific Discovery and Innovation</td>
<td>Research Implementation and Innovation</td>
<td>Clinical Education and/or Basic Science Education</td>
<td>Clinical Practice Innovation Education and/or Research</td>
<td>Clinical Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Elements of Scholarship</td>
<td>Research Education + Clinical Practice Service (Int/Ext)</td>
<td>Research Innovation + Education Service (Int/Ext)</td>
<td>Pedagogy Education Practice / Education Research + Service (Int/Ext)</td>
<td>Clinical Practice / Innovation Research / Education + Leadership Service (Int/Ext)</td>
<td>Clinical Practice + Education Leadership Advocacy Service (Int/Ext)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The committee combined the Educator track into one. Previously there were two, one in Basic Science and one in Clinical. Not many people are in that track. The chairs wanted the Clinician Expert track defined appropriately. They wanted a track that had 90% clinical service and 10% of something else. They put innovation into the Clinician Scholar definition because they want to see more innovation. They had some debate about using modifiers, but decided against it. They are working on a guidance document and asking faculty and chairs to help them include examples. They do have a tenure clock; it is 9 years. There was a fair amount of input from stakeholders and most of the current policy carried over.
Discussion ensued:

Q: In the chart under Clinician Expert, I don’t see the words research or scholarship.
A: (Dan Bourland) It doesn’t mean they couldn’t or shouldn’t perform research or scholarship, but it is not key to that track.

Q: Will existing faculty be reclassified?
A: (Dan Bourland) Yes, we will have a map to make this clear.

Q: What kinds of contracts do the non-tenure tracks have?
A: (Dan Bourland) There is an initial appointment category that we added for clarification. The usual terms are three years on the initial appointment. After the initial term, they are for one year.

Q: Of all the people who work at the Medical School, what percentage are likely to end up under the Tenure-Track category?
A: (Dan Bourland) In the past two years, 50% have been in the Clinical Service track, 20% have been in the tenure track, and 10% in the Clinician Scientist and Educator tracks. We do allow track changes to a tenure-track position.

Q: What is the breakdown between the percentage of faculty on tenure-track versus the overall outside?
A: Currently about 20% are on tenure-track. That percentage will probably go down in the future, but that is just a guess.

Ad Hoc Committee Reports:

Faculty Senate bylaws as part of the Faculty Handbook by Sarah Raynor:
Sarah asked for volunteers other than from the College to look at the potential entry of the Senate bylaws as a chapter in the Faculty Handbook.

Poverty-Free Wake Forest by Simone Caron:
The committee is meeting on Friday for the first time. The only other volunteer from the Senate is Steve Robinson. The task force consists of: David Coates, Steve Virgil, Sarah Wojcik, Norma-May Isakow, Angela Culler, Virginia Christman, Adam Hall and Simone Caron.

Committee on Climate Survey of Faculty Evaluations by James Cotter:
James reported that they have finalized the document and are preparing to administer the survey.

Standing Committee Reports:

No report from the University Integration Committee.

No report from the Compensation Committee.
Fringe Benefits Committee by Peter Siavelis:

Peter Siavelis, the Chair of the Fringe Benefits Committee, responded to four questions posed at the last Senate meeting.

1. Regarding coverage on applied behavior analysis for Autism: the response to this was that it is not covered under our medical plan, in line with our peer schools.
2. Whether coverage would continue for children under 26: the response from HR was that they do not have any information that suggests they should reduce this coverage.
3. About health savings accounts: HR indicated that this is usually part of a high deductible health plan, which would require a shift in our current medical plan options.
4. The healthy outcome program was eliminated due to lack of participation.

If anyone has any concerns, please let Pete know and he will take them to the Fringe Benefits committee meeting.

Medical School Subcommittee by Jeff Weiner:

Jeff Weiner, the Chair of the Medical School Subcommittee, announced the new CEO of the Medical School: Julie Freischlag. They have heard some great things about her and are cautiously optimistic.

Committee for Academic Freedom and Responsibility by Mark Knudsen:

Mark Knudsen reported on the Committee for Academic Freedom and Responsibility. He reported that they will have a formal report in March. They are meeting with Jim Otteson tomorrow. If anyone has any questions, please let Mark know.

No report from the Staff Advisory Council Subcommittee

No report from the Athletic Committee

No report from the Collegiate Senators Committee

The meeting adjourned at 5:27p.m.