

Washington University in St. Louis
Minutes of the Fall Meeting of the Faculty Senate
December 16, 2013

1. Call to Order and Introductions

Chancellor Wrighton called the meeting to order at 4:02pm.

2. Approval of the minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting, May 6, 2013

The minutes were approved.

3. Chancellor's Report—Mark S. Wrighton

Capital campaign: The kickoff was in early October, with half of the goal of \$2.2 billion already met. \$1.417 billion has been raised as of the end of November. MW is getting very good response as he travels to regional campaign kickoffs in Los Angeles and San Francisco; then New York; Chicago; Washington, DC, in the fall; Dallas in February. Attendance has been the best of any event ever in each of these cities. Much follow-up is needed to secure donations. There are new degree programs, such as Master of Public Health, Master of Landscape Architecture. Physical expansion projects: Olin School of Business with 2 new buildings—occupancy is projected for March 1, 2014; Brown School expansion; a major research building for the School of Medicine is underway.

Undergraduate applications: Early decision is complete. In terms of qualifications of admitted students WU is doing as well as or better than last year. Slightly over 1/3 of the next class is lined up. January 15 is the final admissions deadline.

The ongoing challenge of attracting students from low-income backgrounds: Chancellor Wrighton and Provost Holden Thorp are working together to strengthen our efforts in this area.

4. Introduction of Provost Holden Thorp—Mark S. Wrighton

Thorp has had a distinguished career in teaching, research and administration at University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill. He earned his doctorate at California Institute of Technology, did postdoctoral research at Yale, and has held faculty positions at North Carolina State University and at UNC, rising there to Chancellor.

He has already made a significant impact at WU. He holds a joint appointment in Chemistry and SOM.

5. Faculty Senate Council Chair's Report—William Clark

The Faculty Senate Council is the elected body representing the 2500 members of the Faculty Senate. The FSC has held 4 meetings in the current year, in June, September, October and November. Clark extended a welcome to Robert Blankenship, Hilary Elfenbein, Rebecca Wanzo and Cheryl Wassenaar as new members of the FSC.

Clark gave a brief summary of FSC activities in 2013:

Report presented on Semester Online by Ed Macias at June meeting; follow-up at end of spring 2014

Report on Ombuds Office; Linda Nicholson reported on activity of Ombuds. Summary of general trends: relatively low number of visitors (10); 8 of them female. Some of these were complaints against male superiors.

Report by Ann Prenatt and Margo Jarrell on impact of new legislation: Patient Care and Affordable Care Act. Implications of full-time status vs. part-time

Diversity and inclusion: The Mosaic Project to involve students in discussions on diversity and inclusion. Sharon Stahl and Jen Smith will make a report in Spring 2014.

Discussion continues on intellectual property policy, focusing on some inconsistencies. A Faculty Committee on Technology Transfer has been formed, with Evan Kharash, Bill Clark, Patricia Kohl.

Appointments and reappointments: FSC reviews these. No appointments elicited concern.

Human Resources policies on protecting minors; review of methodology for next Gender Pay Equity report. Next report to be completed AY 2015-16.

Research Track proposal: The issue has occupied the FSC in at least 3 meetings. Spring 2013 with David Holtzman skyped in from Germany; Fall 2013 Diana Gray of SOM made a presentation. The FSC voted recommending approval, and that the issue be sent to Faculty Council for consideration.

Q: Does SOM have an Ombuds? A: Yes, appointed in July 2014.

6. Research Track and Proposed Changes to Tenure Document—Diana Gray, Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs at SOM

Gray summarized the situation. The proposal for the change comes from Faculty Council at SOM, arising from discussions ongoing over several years. The proposal is limited to changing a title. There are currently three tracks: Clinician, Investigative and Research. Research is the only one with a different job title (Research Assistant Professor, etc.). Among those on this track, as well as others in SOM, there is a feeling of unequal status, especially with regard to federal funding agencies. The title is confusing to outsiders. There is a strong perception of an unfair playing field, especially at NIH. Originally Research Track faculty were not PIs; this has changed and now Research Track faculty may direct projects and apply for grants, prompting the proposal to change the title to make them equivalent to the Clinician and Investigative Tracks. A few years ago, SOM Department Chairs were polled, showing general agreement about the need for change. Individuals could not simply drop the word Research from titles when applying for grants; the conclusion was that the language of the University Tenure Document needed to be changed in order for the SOM change to be made.

Wrighton proposed to have discussion and to vote here to hold an electronic vote of the entire University faculty at some date in the spring semester; then the Board of Trustees would vote on approving the change to the Tenure Document.

David Holtzman (SOM) comment: SOM voted unanimously to make the change of title.

Joe Sklansky, University Counsel, walked us through the change in the language of the University Tenure Document. Footnote 3 is the crux of the matter.

Discussion and questions:

Andy Sobel (A&S): why not just make the title change university-wide? A Clark: he asked for input from all the schools. The range of applicability is very great. The vast majority of Research Track faculty members are in SOM. Change for SOM does not preclude any other school from making its own proposal if it should feel the need. Kathy Miller—there was a variety of responses.

Comment Sklansky: Research status on the Danforth Campus is addressed elsewhere.

Chancellor Wrighton calls for a motion. Moved, seconded. Now the discussion is official.

Comment Anne Glowinski (SOM; Prof of Psychiatry)—the current difference produces inequities.

Comment Linda Larson-Prior (SOM; Research Associate Professor of Radiology; at WU for 10 years) Historically the predominant job of a Research Track faculty member was research. A basic—and effectively the only—difference was that these appointments were not tenure-track. Annual renew was the norm.

Question Hilary Elfenbein (Olin School of Business). Why was the distinction made in the first place?

A Holtzman: Those on the research track had one prime role—research. Clinician: practice and education; Investigative: practice, education, research. But now Research Track faculty members are competing for the same research dollars as everyone else.

Comment Thorp: all 12 of WU's peer universities are going in this direction. We should make the change because it affects only SOM.

Question Jody O'Sullivan (School of Engineering): Do we have data on the lack of success of grant applications with Research Track faculty members as PIs? A: no.

Comment Peter Burgers (SOM): Agreed, no data, but the anecdotal evidence is strong.

Comment Holtzman: It's not NIH that applies this bias, it's PIs' academic peers in the review process.

Question Larson-Prior: Some applicants get high marks verbally in discussion, but low written marks. What happened?

Comment Boris Calderon (Research Assistant Professor in SOM; at WU 10 years). His career began in an industrial lab; then academic but not on tenure track. He calls our attention to the issue of grantsmanship. Sometimes, disingenuously, a tenure-track faculty member is added to the application to mask the presence of an investigator on the Research Track.

Comment Clark: So data that provide evidence of the success rate of grant applications by Research Track faculty members as PIs might not tell the whole story.

Question Marty Israel (A&S): would the word Research go on a faculty member's c.v. if the change is made? Answer Holtzman: no.

Chancellor Wrighton advocates giving our best people, whatever their title, the best chance of success. The proposal before us seems to be the best way to address the problem.

Wrighton: In communicating with the full faculty for the vote, he wishes to call attention to the fact that SOM unanimously voted for this; FSC approved; the Deans of all the other schools agreed.

Q Douglas Char (SOM and Faculty Senate Council): could we have a vote of everyone; and also a vote for non-SOM faculty.

A Clark: A vote has to pass in at least 2 Schools to pass overall.

Q Heather Corcoran (Fox School): Are there any clinical appointments (Clinician Track) outside SOM? A Wrighton: Professor of Practice is closest parallel.

Wrighton calls for informal vote of the Senate members present. This is done. Consensus is to move ahead with the proposal; there were no nays (abstentions unknown).

Comment Israel: we should point out that the vote in the FSC was unanimous, and that the FSC has a majority of non-SOM faculty.

7. Other Business

There was no other business.

8. The meeting was adjourned at 5:10pm

Respectfully submitted

John Klein, Secretary