

Washington University in St. Louis  
Faculty Senate  
April 23, 2008

1. 4:02 The meeting was called to order.
2. The minutes from the Faculty Senate meeting of December 12, 2007 were approved.
3. Chancellor's Report

Admissions

April on the Danforth Campus is an especially exciting time of year with many prospective students visiting. The yield is ahead of last year; the official date by which students are asked to reply is May 1<sup>st</sup>. Although the number of undergraduate applications was slightly down from last year, they still numbered over 22,000. Academic indicators of those admitted are the strongest ever.

Capital projects

Three major buildings on the Danforth Campus are to be completed this summer: the Danforth University Center, Siegle Hall for Arts & Sciences and Law, the Village East. The multiple year project to redevelop the South Forty continues; the removal and renewal of the Wohl Center has already begun.

Construction on the university's largest building is proceeding on the medical school campus. To honor the \$30 million gift from BJC the \$250 million joint venture will be named the BJC Institute of Health. The space, dedicated to BioMed 21 and focusing on translational research, will be shared with Barnes Jewish Hospital. It is expected to be completed by the end of 2009.

Plan for Excellence

As part of a major comprehensive planning process, each school has completed its report. These will all be presented to the Board of Trustees by the next meeting (May 2<sup>nd</sup>). The programmatic aspirations described entail recruitment of new faculty and space expansion. The plans are exciting the interest of the planners, those who will benefit directly, as well as the trustees. Because the horizon of the plan is ten to twelve years, it is understood that there will be augmentations and enhancements over time.

Financial aid

Increasing financial aid support is a university wide issue. By shifting priorities and spending more funds from the endowment, the university is in a position to extend financial aid commitments. The university can now offer low-income students (family income of up to \$60,000) loan-free financial aid packages, and is hoping to build on this initiative.

#### Changes in administrative personnel

Executive Vice Chancellor and Dean Ed Macias will be stepping down as Dean of Arts & Sciences June 30<sup>th</sup> in order to expand his role as Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs to Provost, after a six month leave. As such he will play a very important role in the implementation phase of the aforementioned plan that calls for more collaboration and interdisciplinary work. There will be a comprehensive search for a regular (non-interim) appointment. Both the search committee and the interim dean will be announced late next week. Suggestions are welcome.

Dean Sansalone will be concluding her tenure as Dean of the School of Engineering. There will also be an announcement concerning the leadership of the engineering school next week.

#### Public Health

A major all-university initiative in public health has begun to be realized. Arts and Sciences has already announced an undergraduate minor in Public Health. G. W. Brown School of Social Work Dean Eddie Lawlor will be the director of the new Institute of Public Health and Dr. Graham Colditz of the medical school will be the associate director. New faculty are currently being recruited. The master's degree in Public Health will initially be offered as joint degree – first with the MSW, soon after with the MD. Once the program is accredited (which can only happen after it graduates a number of students) it will offer a stand-alone degree as well. Both the Brown School and WUSM had identified Public Health as an area of major interest. The program will also extend the university's work to benefit the local community.

#### 4. Necrology –Professor Nancy E. Berg

After the following names were read, all stood in a moment of silence to honor their memory.

Arthur F. Bishop  
Estelle Brodman  
John M. Cary  
Ray E. Clouse  
Fred J. Hodges III  
Carlton C. Hunt  
Joe Inukai  
Rosalind H. Kornfeld  
Tom R. Miller  
Harry C. Morgan  
Casey L. Moulson  
Albert Roos  
Daniel P. Schuster  
Margaret W. Skinner  
Jarvis A. Thurston  
Jane Weissman  
Samuel I. Weissman  
John Zaborsky

## 5. Chair's Report – Professor Jeff Lowell

(The Faculty Senate chair was performing surgery; his report was read by the secretary and quoted here verbatim.)

I would like to summarize the work of the Faculty Senate Council during the 2007-2008 academic year. The Faculty Senate of the University is the main governing body of the faculty and includes all faculty members. It meets twice a year. The Faculty Senate Council, which is a 15-member executive body of the Faculty Senate, met eight times during the year to review and provide faculty input on University-wide policies, and to amend the Policy on Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure.

During the past year the Senate Council has reviewed and approved changes to the:

- University Travel Policy
- University Judicial Code

The Council also met with University leaders to discuss their work in key areas of the University, including:

- Human Resources, where important discussion regarding initiatives regarding the establishment of on-site, high quality day care for faculty, staff and students, modification in the non-discrimination policy, a freeze on health insurance premiums for lower-income employees, and preliminary discussions regarding the implementation of a tobacco-free campus were held.
- Briefings by: Dr. Amanda McBride on the activities and opportunities for faculty in the Gephardt Institute for Public Service; Assistant Vice Chancellor Bruce Backus on the University's Disaster Management Program and future Plans; Dr. Alan Glass, Director of the Habib Health and Wellness Center on the extensive mental health resources of the University, and about an on-line training program that has been made available to faculty (that is now on the newly revamped Faculty Senate Council web page), that helps faculty recognize early warning signs for significant mental health issues in students, and how to respond appropriately; and, by Executive Vice Chancellor Ed Macias on the results of the Faculty Satisfaction Survey, that was completed in November 2006, done in cooperation with other peer institutions.
- Dr. Carl M. Bender, a world-renowned mathematical physicist, and Dr. Helen. Piwnica-Worms, whose studies have paved the way for the development of new therapies for cancer patients, were selected to receive the University's 2007 faculty achievement awards.
- 2 major proposals to amend the Policy on Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure were considered: The first, regarding prior service credit, provides faculty candidates and schools greater flexibility in negotiating the length of the probationary period. The second establishes a Professor of Practice Track, which is very similar to

the Medical School's Clinician Track, that allows the University to attract, retain and recognize outstanding teachers with professional mastery, but who do not have a major research focus or commitment.

I would like to express my appreciation to the Board members for the opportunity to serve as a Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees. I have certainly enjoyed this experience enormously.

#### 6. Proposed change to the Tenure Clock – Executive Vice Chancellor Ed Macias

Executive Vice Chancellor and Dean of Arts and Sciences Ed Macias presented a proposed amendment to the University's Policy on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure. The amendment concerns the way the University credits prior service at another academic institution when measuring the length of the probationary period before a tenure-track faculty member is considered for tenure.

The current policy establishes that prior tenure track academic service at another institution will be credited toward the probationary period. However, if more than three-six years (depending on the school) were served at another institution the Washington University probationary period will be not more than four years.

The proposed policy is as follows:

“Prior tenure-track (or equivalent) academic service at another institution of higher education will be credited toward the probationary period at Washington University. It may be mutually agreed in writing between the incoming faculty member and the University, however, that some or all of the prior academic service not be counted toward the probationary period at Washington University, even though the total probationary period is thereby extended beyond the normal probationary period of the University's school or college.”

This new language retains the presumption in the existing tenure document that prior service is credited, but gives greater flexibility to incoming faculty members and their schools to agree not to credit some or all of prior service, thereby giving the faculty member a longer period to meet tenure requirements while on the Washington University faculty. The old language significantly limits the ability of an incoming faculty member and his or her school to agree to waive prior service credit, with the result that in some schools a new faculty member has to be considered for tenure only two years after joining our faculty. Dean Macias reported that this lack of flexibility has adversely affected the recruitment of desirable faculty to Washington University, and that many department chairs and deans have found that attractive recruits are dissuaded from moving here if they have to meet our different and at times higher tenure standards in a much abbreviated probationary period.

The Faculty Senate Council has recommended the change to the prior service credit.

There was extensive discussion of the proposed amendment:

One faculty member spoke against the amendment on the grounds that it violated the fundamental principle of academic freedom, and in particular the shared goal of all in the University that professors should obtain (and be considered for) tenure as soon as reasonably possible. The proposal poses the possibility that some candidates will be considered for tenure only after a period in academe that is longer than the traditional seven years, and that is damaging to the person's rights, privileges, and research.

In response to the comment that candidates can always request to be brought up early, another faculty member spoke of a case in which the extension of the probationary period was forced on the candidate from above.

Five faculty members and three deans spoke in favor of the amendment. One faculty member noted that her department had been unable to recruit an extremely attractive candidate with prior service in another school, because the candidate was concerned about meeting the different and higher tenure standards here within a curtailed probationary period. A dean noted that one faculty member has accepted a position here this year on the condition that, if this amendment is approved, she not be required to receive prior credit for the entire period she has been at another institution. One faculty member noted that it is not the shared goal of the University that all professors be considered for tenure as soon as possible, but rather that all qualified professors who are assets to the institution obtain tenure at the appropriate time given the varying tenure standards within the university and at the schools from which we recruit faculty. The faculty member said what is important is that the tenure decisions be good ones, and that forcing people to come up for tenure when they would prefer to have more time at Washington University is not in our interest. A department chair noted that the existing rule has caused good candidates to go to other universities where the prior service credit is a more flexible rule.

A faculty member asked how the new rule would be applied to tenure-track faculty who are already at Washington University. Could they be required to give up some of the credit they received for prior service under the existing policy? Dean Macias answered that current faculty members are governed by the existing policy, so that the university could not require them to give up prior service credit they already have. However, if the faculty member wanted to benefit from the new policy, it would be possible for the faculty to ask the school or unit not to credit some or all of prior service. Both the faculty member and the school would need to agree to any change from the existing policy.

Chancellor Wrighton and Faculty Council Secretary Nancy Berg indicated that the prior service credit amendment will now be submitted for electronic voting. If it passes the Faculty Senate it will be voted on by the Board of Trustees at their next regularly scheduled meeting (October 3<sup>rd</sup>).

## 7. Proposed Professor of Practice Position – Dean Kent Syverud

Dean Kent Syverud presented the second proposed change to the tenure document: the professor of practice track. With only minor exceptions (the dean mentioned the Botanical Gardens) the current document allows only four categories of ranks at the level of instructor or higher: tenure track, tenured, research professors, and clinicians. The last is limited to the medical school campus. The proposal to add a fifth category – professor of practice – arises from the desire to attract established and respected teachers and practitioners to positions on the Danforth campus that are primarily teaching positions. These positions can include advising and administrative duties but not expectations of research.

The original proposal has already been amended following very helpful input from the AAUP, including adding clauses to make more explicit the safeguards ensuring academic freedom (parallel to those regarding the research professor track).

From the extensive discussions in the senate council it is clear that there are many different cultures within schools and departments. The challenge is to allow enough flexibility for each school within the one document that assures that the basic purposes of the tenure document are met.

Each school would need to decide whether or not to create the professor of practice track. If deciding to do so, each would need to follow its own governance process to draft and adopt its own policies regarding duties and responsibilities as well as procedures, terms and conditions for appointment, renewal, promotion and termination.

The plan is to allow vetting by multiple audiences before bringing it back before the full Faculty Senate. If approved by the Senate, it would still need to be approved by the Board of Trustees.

The dean's remarks were followed by more discussion.

The representative from the AAUP's executive committee attested to their approval of the proposal now that the new section replicates that of the research professor track. Each school will have to develop its own substantive criteria for hiring, renewal, termination and promotion including length of contract.

The chancellor gave the example of the important contribution a practicing architect could make even if - or especially because - his/her practice kept him/her from earning tenure. Another example, offered by a dean, was that of a senior business leader without a traditional scholarly background for whom financial remuneration would be less compelling than an attractive title.

One faculty member asked why, if the position were completely analogous to the clinician track, did there need to be a different title. Dean Larry Shapiro pointed out that

the clinician track in the medical school parallels similar tracks at other medical schools in ways that professor of practice does not. On the other hand “clinician” does not adequately describe an architect, for example. The chancellor added that an important distinction is in the primary purpose of each track – the clinician is foremost a clinician who teaches; the professor of practice would be hired on the basis of his/her experience and expertise, but his/her role would primarily be a teaching role.

Another faculty member asked if it would be possible to move from the tenure track to the professor of practice track. The dean replied that it needs to be addressed in each individual school’s plans. Another faculty member suggested that there must be clear rules about jumping from one track to another. A third responded that it should not matter how one becomes a professor of practice if s/he meets the criteria. Another faculty suggested that a professor of practice might, through teaching, form the desire to pursue research and thus the shift to tenure track should be allowed.

A faculty member identifying as a senior lecturer asked how is it different, and how will it affect currently-held lecturer and senior lecturer positions. Another spoke in support of the proposal, asserting, “the title would define who I am.”

Dean Macias reported that Arts and Sciences’ Faculty Council has already begun to discuss the contours of the professor of practice track, and that the relationship of professor of practice to lecturer would need to be worked out.

To the question of whether the position could be defined as part-time, it was suggested that this be decided within each school. The chancellor reminded the Senate that tenured appointments can not be part-time.

One faculty member expressed deep concern that there would be a lack of uniformity across the schools in defining the track.

The next formal step is for the Faculty Senate Council to consider the proposal. If they vote to recommend it to the full Faculty Senate, there will be another discussion at the subsequent Faculty Senate meeting followed by an electronic vote. Each individual school will take up the proposal separately.

## 8. Other Business

Executive Vice Chancellor Macias’s tremendous contributions as Dean of Arts and Sciences were recognized and he was warmly congratulated on his achievements.

## 9. The meeting was adjourned at 5:25

Respectfully submitted,  
*Nancy E. Berg*  
Secretary