

Washington University in St. Louis

Faculty Senate

May 9, 2011

1. Call to Order and Introductions

Mark S. Wrighton, Chancellor

The meeting was called to order at 4:04 p.m.

2. The minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of December 9, 2010 were approved.

3. Chancellor's Report

Mark S. Wrighton

The Board of Trustees met last Thursday and Friday at their regular meeting and all of the university officers in the administration were re-elected. However, two of the university officers will be retiring. Vice Chancellor Fred Volkmann of Public Affairs, will retire at the end of September, so his election is only through that period. Hank Webber and Ed Macias are leading the process to help identify the next vice chancellor for public affairs, and the process will be underway by the end of this month. We've already had a review of the activities of the office by a three-member committee whose report is complete and will be reviewed as we begin a search. Second, Vice Chancellor Shirley Baker has been elected for the next full year, but she too will be retiring from the university on June 30, 2012. Chancellor Wrighton thanked Shirley for her great job with the university libraries and for making this position far better than when she found it. Her work has been exemplary.

In terms of next year's undergraduate class we will enroll approximately 1500 first-year students. This is a talented group representing all 50 states, so we feel very good about the incoming students. We were over in applications by 15% but we offered admission to 15% fewer students, intentionally, but that causes us to move to our wait list to recruit 1500 students.

The university is in the public phase of the scholarship initiative, and as of last week we have raised about \$110 million toward our \$150 million goal. This is for scholarships at all levels for undergraduates, professional students, and Ph.D. students. We feel good about our goal, but \$150 million is just a start toward our goal to enroll the most talented students. But we feel the program is moving along nicely.

Also noted is the gift of \$30 million from the Danforth Foundation to establish the John C. Danforth Center on Religion and Politics. Wayne Fields was the chief architect of this new center. He worked with search committee chair Gary Wihl and Ed Macias to secure a leading academician to fill the permanent role as the director. Marie Griffith was recruited from Harvard for the position. Her husband, Lee Schmidt, also from Harvard will join her. Also we have applied to host a presidential or vice

presidential debate here in the fall of 2012, and if we do have the opportunity it will give a boost to the Center. However, as it unfolds we will have a special event to put a focus on Washington University.

This year we've engaged in significant discussions regarding our international relationships. Our lead initiative is the McDonnell International Scholars Academy, under the direction of Jim Wertsch. This year we've asked him to take on broader duties as the Associate Vice Chancellor for International Affairs. He has convened a committee of academic and administrative leaders representing all seven schools to consider issues of international engagement by the university. The Board is also interested in this, and a committee on global engagement will be appointed. Finally, we have enjoyed for a long time the benefits of students from other countries. Presently, we see other opportunities our faculty would like to develop with other universities. So we've expanded interactions with Fudan University to include social work and Arts & Sciences, and we are establishing a presence on the Fudan University campus. And finally, this summer we will have 40 students from Fudan University here for a summer program.

Questions: none.

4. Faculty Senate Council Chair Report

Heather Corcoran

The Faculty Senate Council met four times since December 9, and considered three major themes. The first is diversity, which has been a big theme over the past few years. The Gender Pay Equity reports were significant, and Provost Macias and Dean Shapiro updated the Faculty Senate Council at our March meeting. Also Adrienne Davis, the new Vice Provost for Diversity, summarized her new role in the Provost's office and Susan Appleton and James Davis from the office of the Ombudsman reported to us.

The second area is international research, an area the Council identified as key early in the year. It culminated in a presentation to the Council at a meeting this spring by Jim Wertsch, Marshall S. Snow Professor in Arts & Sciences and Eddie Lawlor, Dean, School of Social Work. Some of the themes that were discussed were the challenges between international research hubs and people working more independently, the need for infrastructure support to promote international research, the potential of thematic issues like women's health or energy and the environment to work across the campus, and possibilities for the better integration of these efforts across the university. As the Chancellor mentioned, there is a committee working on these issues and it is expected the Faculty Senate Council will hear from the committee chair in the fall.

The last category relates to the role of the Faculty Senate Council as a group that spans the university in a unique way, and how it provides a vehicle to consider issues that cross school boundaries. One example is our participation in a review of the IT services, and an interesting conversation that followed about how individual and departmental needs coincide and don't. The second is also coming out of the Provost's office about procedures related to new university degrees. The Council is interested in hearing about issues that cross school boundaries, and appreciates the opportunity to work with the Provost as these new policies and procedures are developed.

Other topics discussed were the open access policy, which will be covered today, and a report by Hank Webber about policy changes related to surveillance and security on our campus. There were two

areas discussed: establishing closing times for buildings on campus, and increasing video surveillance, particularly on the perimeters of our property. Details of the report can be found on the Faculty Senate website.

Finally, Heather reminded the Faculty about the Chancellor's gala that will be held on December 3, thanked the faculty for participation in the recent survey, and demonstrated the new Faculty Senate Council website.

5. Open Access Resolution

Heather Corcoran

Chancellor Wrighton announced resolution of the Faculty Senate Council regarding open access policy, and invited Heather Corcoran to discuss it. Heather described the actions of the Senate Council in reviewing the resolution. It went through a number of reviews, and was modified to address concerns of the Council. The two central themes of the resolution are to promote wide dissemination and access to scholarly works produced by the university and the faculty, and to request support from the library and the university to build a repository for storing these works. Shirley Baker and Paul Schoening are here to answer questions.

A question was raised about doctoral students/junior faculty related to protecting young faculty in the Arts & Sciences from participating in open access because their work may not be considered for tenure track positions. Shirley Baker responded that the resolution was made general to allow faculty to balance a goal of open access with protecting their interests in gaining tenure. Another question related to the role of the university library policy vs. the intent of the authors. Paul Schoening replied that the role of the library was to facilitate open access, but not to direct it. Individual faculty members would be able to publish their work according to their professional interests. Another question related to how publication in electronic journal formats, which are as peer-reviewed as current traditional publications will be viewed by tenure and promotions committees. Chancellor Wrighton responded that tenure committees typically consider the publication quality and its impact, and electronic journal formats are and will be equal in impact to traditional modes of publication. As always, the most talented people will publish in the most prestigious formats, so as electronic publication methods evolve, the highest quality papers will be submitted there.

Chancellor Wrighton stated the purpose was to disseminate as widely as possible the scholarly works of the faculty of the university. A motion for approval was made and seconded, and the motion was passed with a strong degree of affirmation, with only one dissenting vote.

The resolution listed below.

Open Access Resolution

The Faculty of Washington University in St. Louis is committed to making its scholarship and creative works freely and easily available to the world community. Faculty members are encouraged to seek venues for their works that share this ideal. In particular, when consistent with their professional development, members of the Faculty should endeavor to:

Amend copyright agreements to retain the right to use his or her own work and to deposit such work in a University digital repository or another depository, which is freely accessible to the general public;

Submit a final manuscript of accepted, peer-reviewed publications to one of the University's digital repositories whenever consistent with the copyright agreement; and

Seek publishers for his or her works committed to free and unfettered access (often referred to as *open access* publishers) whenever consistent with his or her professional goals.

This resolution applies only to scholarly articles authored or co-authored by a member of the Faculty since the adoption of this policy.

Currently, there is no systematic University-wide coordinated program to assist Faculty with managing the rights to their scholarly articles, nor is there any mechanism for facilitating the accessibility and dissemination of these works from within the University. The Faculty encourages the Offices of the Provost and the University's Libraries to establish digital repositories and to provide author support services to aid the Faculty in providing greater access to their work. At this time and as a practical matter, this resolution covers only scholarly articles and does not extend to other forms of scholarly and creative work such as books, art, music, blogs, presentations, or curriculum materials. The Offices of the Provost and the University's Libraries should encourage any faculty member who would be willing to join in this resolution, regardless of type of scholarly and creative work generated.

6. Gender Pay Equity Report

Gender Pay Equity Studies: Chancellor Wrighton noted that among the most troubling reports the university has received are the two gender pay equity reports completed recently. The findings were not altogether settling with the Chancellor and Provost Macias.

Ed has followed his commitment to work closely with the deans and he reported on the progress.

Gender Pay Equity: The report of the Faculty Senate Committee on gender pay on the Danforth campus last year said there was an inequity in that women faculty were paid less than men. Later a report was completed from the medical campus using different methods and different personnel, but the conclusion was roughly the same. It was clear we had to do more. Issues of diversity are discussed at monthly meetings with the deans, and we were aware of the issue as the reports were developed. The report for the Danforth campus was conducted by Lynn McCloskey of the Provost's office, and a committee appointed by the Faculty Senate Council co-chaired by Bob Pollack and Shanta Pandey. After the report, the Provost met regularly with the deans trying to find out why there was a difference between men and women. At Washington University and at every other university that the Provost reviewed, the comparisons always seem to come out negative. The numbers are small, but they are a real concern.

Over the past year a number of changes were made. Adjustments in pay were made where issues of inequity or compression seemed clear. I reviewed the data with the deans and the deans met with others, such as department chairs. More women have been put into endowed chairs and in one school they are nearly gender equal. There has been strong recruitment of women, and perhaps at another time Adrienne Davis can report to you on our efforts in that direction. And there are more women faculty

leaders than there were; for example, at the medical school there are now three female department chairs. We took a look at the results for pay equity for the current academic year. It was not done formally, but quietly with the deans. We used one model in the report, and as the deans were doing salary setting, they could do some salary setting and see the results. As a result, in 2010-2011, we now have three schools where women are paid more than men, and three schools where, although women are not paid as much as men, we have substantially reduced the gap. I discussed this with the Senate Council, met with the committee, learned a bit about how to do this, and I think it's quite a wonderful result. What you'd expect in general is that there would be small variations, but they would vary around zero. Ed has proposed the data be reviewed at the end of the year, but using only one of the models. This is a result of a lot of hard work. It's not all fixed, but we're making progress in this area. As an example of some of the difficulties we see, in small schools, the pay for one person can make a big difference. So we saw the results of someone leaving making quite a difference; we also removed some people just to determine the effect, and it often made a big difference.

I'm encouraged by the results and hopeful that we'll continue going in the right direction. We will continue the process. The medical school is doing a similar process. Annually the dean reviews the difference scores for individual faculty by department, and the differences between men and women can be seen. I think the dean will complete another analysis in the next year or so. This can be used as an effective tool to address the issue. We're not trying to set salaries using the tool; it's just a way of measuring differences between men and women.

Diversity: With the appointment of Adrienne Davis three months ago we're working more actively on issues of diversity and will report at future meetings

Cross school policies : A word about cross school policies. We have worked with the deans to develop a new policy on joint appointments across schools. We have a new way to work on new degrees. Washington University has slightly more than 400 degrees, and in the last 10 years there have been 100. Over the last ten years, an average of 10 degrees per year was added. Some of these are not truly new degrees, but we needed a new way to look at degrees. Working with Priscilla Stone we've developed a new process for approval of new degrees.

Finally we had a set of teaching grants that were offered to promote cross school teaching and those have been awarded. The vice chancellor for research has put out an announcement of cross school research grants with a similar objective.

Questions from the floor: A report from the AAUP indicated that women often stayed at the associate professor rank longer than men at many schools. Could this have been a factor in the W.U. data?

Response: Pay and rank are related. So yes, the longer you stay in rank, it could have an effect. The problem is the studies are descriptive, and do not identify the cause of the difference. For example, if men seek other jobs and negotiate more aggressively than women, as has been written, a difference can

occur. There are lots of other issues. By the way, there was a diversity grant on negotiations that was very successful, with 80 women participating, half from each campus. The question should be asked, is it structural or something else, and it seems to be structural here.

Question: What are the differences in compression in departments versus gender differences?

Response: The issues are different. For example, if you have a small department and find two equally experienced and qualified male and female faculty who are paid differently, then there is clearly a gap and it can be addressed. The compression issue is that if new people are coming in with higher salaries because of market pressure, that clearly is a different issue, but could have some gender possibilities in it.

Question: Did you address compression issues with the deans?

Response: Yes, we did, but it was part of a process that included consideration of many facts.

Question: What about rotating endowed professorships? Could that be used to address inequities?

Response: We've discussed this before. It's interesting, but has problems. For one, to rotate, someone will have to lose a position for another to get it. And their pay might go down. Or if the pay doesn't go down, it can serve to ratchet up salaries. But there are better ways to address gender pay inequities.

Rotating chairs can be useful for other purposes. For example, at some research universities rotating chairs are used to support an activity, such as teaching, or service. It's worth thinking about.

Question: Is there a way to offer a stipend to stimulate an individual to complete a project, and then to cycle it?

Mark Wrighton: I had the aspiration to work to create an endowment so that every tenured professor can look forward to holding an endowed chair. In the last 14 months we've been creating a new endowed chair about once a month for the last two years. We did raise prices, to \$2 million for endowed professorships and \$3 million for a distinguished professorship. I agree with Ed and I wouldn't be opposed to having a donor give a professorship with a 5-year term for a research purpose. This could also be used for junior career development professorships to allow them to develop their careers.

Chancellor Wrighton thanked Provost Macias for his work in these areas.

7. Necrology report

William W. Clark, Secretary

Chancellor Wrighton noted an unusually high number of faculty who passed away in April and introduced Secretary Clark who read the necrology report:

Dr.	Walter	F.	Ballinger
Dr	James	W.	Carson
Dr	Israel	Jerome	Flance
Dr	Norma	A.	Fletcher
Mr	John	C.	Georgian

Dr	Jerome	J.	Gilden
Dr	Samuel	E.	Guyer
Dr	Robert	S.	Hicks
Dr	F. Edmund		Hunter
Dr	Saulo		Klahr
Dr	Allen	P.	Klippel
Dr	Victor	T.	Le Vine
Mr	Charles	L.	Leven
Dr	Paul	R.	Manske
Dr	Annelise		Mertz
Dr	Rudolphe	L.	Motard
Mr	John	M.	Perkins
Dr	Roy	R.	Peterson
Ms	Valerie	B.	Safron
Dr	Robert	H.	Salisbury
Ms	Georgia		Shearer
Dr	Srinivasan		Sridharan
Dr	Frank	J.	Stadermann
Dr	John	A.	Stern
Dr	Willard	B.	Walker
Dr	Harold	D.	Wolff

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5: 10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

William W. Clark, Ph.D.

Secretary, Faculty Senate and Senate Council