

# Washington University in St. Louis

# Faculty Senate

December 14, 2009

3:34 Call to order

1. Introductions Mark S. Wrighton, *Chancellor*
  2. The minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of May 4, 2008 were approved
  3. Chancellor's Report Mark S. Wrighton

Financial

A brief summary of activities since the last report in May, 2009 is provided. The fall semester was very good, and things are going very well. On an economic front we're much better off today than we expected to be when I last reported in May, largely because we predicted a larger decline in our endowment than we actually realized. As of the end of November, after 5 months of this fiscal year, our endowment is up 13%, and we're hopeful the remainder of the fiscal year continues to go well. The Board of Trustees met recently and decided to reduce endowment spending next year, holding it to the same percentage they did for this fiscal year, resulting in a reduction in spendable income of about \$10 million for FY '11. Their decision is a prudent move, and was not as much of a reduction as we feared might be imposed. Working with that as a constraint, and consistent with my report in September, we have anticipated financial challenges largely on the Danforth Campus. Although the economy has affected all of us, the School of Medicine has fewer immediate challenges due largely to its clinical revenue.

Finalizing changes for the next fiscal year, we will reduce expenditures in the Central Fiscal Unit by about \$7 million; this, combined with a reduction of a few million already in place this fiscal year, will result in a total savings of \$10 million. As most of the faculty knows, a large percentage of the faculty and staff did not receive raises this year, which avoided about \$17-20 million of expenses. In making plans for next July 1, we seem to be in pretty good shape; we will still grow, but we're predicting slow growth.

### Scholarship initiative

In response to a university-wide and compelling case, the Board has launched a new initiative to secure commitments for scholarships. There are organizations and individuals who are doing well, and we thought they might be of a mind to help us provide scholarship support. The campaign has already attracted 250 volunteers locally, and its goal is to raise \$150 million. It is a fairly ambitious plan, but there are plans to hold local events in urban areas that have substantial numbers of alumni. The first event was held last week in Washington, D.C. Nearly 250 people attended and the lead volunteers made gifts of \$500 thousand; it looks promising for getting additional major gifts. So far we've had good progress and today we have raised more than \$25 million, and we're only counting since July 1 of this year. There will be public events in major cities over the next couple of years- e.g., Boston, New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, and hopefully we will exceed our \$150 million goal. The scholarship initiative is especially important because we have had to adjust financial commitments to students as families have experienced personal financial changes.

### Construction

On the physical front Brauer Hall on the Danforth Campus is on schedule to be completed for occupancy in late May. The BJC Institute of Health on the Medical School Campus will be completed this month, and the formal dedication will be in late spring. It will feature a courtyard plaza designed by Maya Lin and promises to be a beautiful place.

### ARRA

We commend the commitment of our faculty to the ARRA stimulus funding opportunity. Over 900 applications were submitted and resulted in \$80 million in funding for the first year of the package. Funding for year 2 is still unknown, but we expect additional funds to be awarded.

### Incoming class

Finally, we had a very good year at the application level; we saw a record pace in number of applicants. Those who sought early admission were informed last Friday and Saturday. The final deadline for applications is January 15. We think it will be a very challenging recruiting season this spring, but we are up to the task.

#### 4. Faculty Senate Council Chair's Report

Andrew C. Sobel, *Chair, Faculty Senate*

A rough overview of major issues considered by the Faculty Senate Council since last Faculty Senate meeting was provided.

So far it's been a productive year. Last year we adopted a proposal by Nancy Berg to limit the number of University Committees with sitting faculty members and to streamline the appointment process of faculty members to such committees when they need faculty involvement. Essentially the proposal was to create an omnibus committee similar to a "jury pool," with its membership available to be called upon to sit on a committee when needed. This reduced the number of faculty needed from approximately 60 to 15-20, and simplified the workload of the Secretary of the Senate.

We appointed two sub-committees of the Faculty Senate Council hoping to institutionalize several processes. One sub-committee identifies and suggests names to staff the omnibus committee. This sub-committee reports to the Secretary of the Senate and sought to cast the net broader for faculty, not return to the same people over and over.

The other sub-committee was tasked to assist the Secretary and the Schools with elections to the Faculty Senate Council – identify candidates, etc.

The Provost has briefed the Faculty Senate Council several times on the University's efforts on diversity. He has appointed a working group, and divided that group into sub-committees. He will report today on the initiative. This is part of the commitment to develop transparency as a mechanism for change.

The Interim Vice Chancellor for Research, Dr. Evan Kharasch, assembled a sub-committee to review the University's authorship policy and met twice with the Faculty Senate Council to discuss its progress. Between the sub-committee and his briefings to the Faculty Senate Council, he heavily involved the faculty in the design of a new policy. Dr. Kharasch is on today's agenda.

Last year the Faculty Senate Council appointed a committee to examine gender pay equity on the Danforth Campus. It is co-chaired by Shanta Pandey and Bob Pollak, other members include: Pauline Kim, Kathleen Clark, Jody O'Sullivan, Ed Spitznagel and Jeff Gill. The committee was chosen based on a mix of methodological skills, institutional connections and some institutional history. They have worked closely with Lynn McCloskey from the Provost's office. They are just about finished with their analysis of A&S and are going to broaden their analyses to other schools on the Danforth Campus. We anticipate a full report at the next Faculty Senate meeting.

At our last Faculty Senate Council meeting, we invited Shirley Baker and her staff to brief us on issues of scholarly communication and open access publication. NIH already requires open access publication as a condition of its grants, and NSF is moving in this direction. The

Europeans have moved forward more quickly, and many of the faculty senates at our peer institutions—Harvard, Chicago, University of California system—have taken a position. In conjunction with the Provost’s office, the Faculty Senate Council will suggest faculty to serve on a committee to consider open access publication and make suggestions.

Chancellor Wrighton thanked Andy Sobel and introduced Evan Kharasch, thanking him for his efforts in securing \$80 million in grants from the stimulus package.

## 5. Authorship Policy

Evan Kharasch, *Interim Vice-Chancellor  
for Research*

A revision to the Policy for Authorship on Scientific and Scholarly Publications, originally issued in February 2002, was approved by the Executive Committee on Research on June 15, 2009. The purpose of the policy was to provide lofty language and be regulatory, but also to guide the faculty and students regarding appropriate procedures required to protect our commitment to integrity in reporting research and scholarly activities.

The revision issued in June, 2009 addressed a number of issues. It:

- Clarified roles and responsibilities of authors and co-authors;
- Clarified senior author’s responsibilities for review and approval by co-authors prior to submission;
- Addressed conflicts of interests;
- Expanded discussion on unacceptable authorships;
- Clarified responsibility and provided guidelines for resolution of authorship disputes;
- Added sanctions to address policy violations that may be considered research misconduct.

After the policy was issued, it became clear that the revised document did not meet the needs of the faculty. Specific concerns expressed included:

- It did not address the substantial diversity of standards among the various research disciplines (biomedical, physical, behavioral, and social) it covered;
- There was a need for definition of scholarly contribution;
- Procedure for final approval of the manuscript needed to be revised because it was not feasible for many disciplines (i.e., physics).

As a result, a committee composed of members from the School of Medicine and the Danforth Campus was established and the policy was reviewed and revised. The committee met a number of times electronically, and in its deliberations it considered the current authorship policy, the authorship policies of 9 peer institutions, and the policies of various non-biomedical societies, as well as the International Council of Medical Journal Editors and the Council of Science Editors.

The revised policy covers definitions of authorship, responsibilities of lead and co-authors, authorship order, acknowledgments, dispute resolutions, reporting research funding, and financial conflicts of interest. An important additional policy covers unacceptable authorship practices, including guest (honorary, prestige, respect), gift (obligation, tribute, anticipated benefit), and ghost (unidentified major author). Evan Kharasch thanked Marty Israel for his contributions that were seminal to modifying the policy.

A question was raised concerning feasibility of policy for scientists who work at the national labs where there can be many authors. This practice is common in physics. Marty Israel responded, saying that was precisely the reason he reacted to the policy when he found about it. He said the revised policy deals with it in a pretty reasonable way. Increasingly, there now is a practice that everyone who's involved gets informed about it, and given an opportunity to respond. The earlier version that required written approval from every author was overly onerous. The revision is still a little ambiguous, but overall is acceptable. There were concerns that if it was too general it would not meet the biomedical requirements.

Evan Kharasch commented that as worded the revised policy would not exclude other authorship policies; the major concern related to the failure to notify authors. Mark Wrighton added that the successful work of the genome center results in multiple authorship publications. Washington University can take pride in the identification of the corn genome—with Rick Wilson as the lead author and a long list of co-authors, it was an example of teamwork at its best. Another example is the high energy physics institute in Geneva, where projects require an army of investigators. Another example is the Mars rover studies that have a very large number of co-authors. We'll see more of this in the future, and we may want to revisit our policy in the future.

Evan Kharash added the committee surveyed other institutes, and some mentioned that their policies were based upon our model policy upon which they developed theirs. Dean Larry Shapiro commented the policy addressed two things we're trying to fix: having an author listed without his/her approval, and ghostwriting, which has become a problem in the biomedical community.

Mark Wrighton thanked Evan Kharasch for his work, and introduced Provost Ed Macias for a report on the plan for diversity and other initiatives.

## 6. Diversity and Related Initiatives

Ed Macias, *Provost*

### Update on Searches

First is an update on two searches. One is for the Vice-Chancellor for Research, chaired by Deanna Barch, Professor of Psychology. The second is for the Dean of Engineering and Applied Science, co-chaired by Joseph Ackerman, Professor of Chemistry, and Shelly Sakiyama-Elbert, Associate Professor of Biomedical Engineering. The nominations close today; Joe and Shelly will get their committees together soon and both positions are slated to begin on July 1, 2010.

### Appointments

Secondly, this fall I appointed three faculty as Provost Faculty Fellows: Marion Crain, the Wiley B. Rutledge Professor of Law, Mark Rollins, Professor and chair of the Department of Philosophy in A&S, and Elzbieta Sklodowska, Randolph Family Professor in A&S and chair of the Department of Romance Language and Literature in Arts and Sciences. The Fellows are working with me on important University topics. Within this role, each has taken on different duties and brings different experiences from their academic fields as well as varying perspectives from their departments and schools. Marion is working to find ways to increase and coordinate interdisciplinary research and teaching collaborations across school and departmental lines. Part of our focus is on how to better coordinate the activities of Centers, which are critical sites of interdisciplinary exchange. We are particularly interested in exploring ways to incentivize interdisciplinary research and collaboration that further our race and diversity initiatives.

Mark is working on issues regarding undergraduate education. Currently he is chairing two faculty/student committees. One is the Writing Review Committee, which will make recommendations for teaching writing across the university, including the first-year Writing 1 course and courses that are concerned with the more specialized writing needs of particular disciplines and schools. The other is the Task Force on Undergraduate Education Across the University, which will make recommendations about what every student graduating from Washington University in the 21<sup>st</sup> century should know and be able to do, that is, the broader goals of education, including and going beyond what the curriculum explicitly requires. Both efforts will concentrate on common features of the first-year experience and special programs for undergraduates in all schools.

Elzbieta has been concentrating on faculty leadership development. Among other efforts, she has been coordinating, with Jim Wertsch, focus groups dealing with internationalization strategies for Washington University.

Also, Ed Macias proudly announced two new appointments in the Provost's office: Gerhild Williams as Vice-Provost, and Priscilla Stone as Assistant Provost for International Education. Priscilla will continue as Director of Overseas Programs and Undergraduate Studies in IAS.

## Diversity

Diversity is essential for an excellent University. As Provost, a significant portion of my time is dedicated to this effort. Washington University has a real opportunity for progress and leadership in this area. A small executive working group has been appointed to help the Provost execute the action plan, and move Washington University forward with its plans to achieve goals including: increasing the number of women and underrepresented faculty, promoting faculty leadership, strengthening faculty retention, paying faculty equitably, and creating standards for accountability.

Efforts are going forward through a number of subcommittee working groups. They include:

- Data, chaired by Helen Piwinica Worms. They reviewed faculty trends and posted them on our website; a brief report is online describing the makeup of the faculty (gender, race), but the committee will provide a report with data that is more useful.
- Targets of Opportunity, chaired by John Baugh. Committee has developed a general definition of what a target of opportunity is, met with deans of schools to refine the definition with the expectation that it will create a standardized, campus wide definition.
- Exit Interviews, chaired by John Carpenter. Currently developing an exit interview.
- Mentoring, chaired by Mary Ann Dzuback. Have created a report on current best practices that will be circulated widely.
- Accountability, chaired by Debra Haire Joshu. This is a very important committee- it's one thing to talk about diversifying, another to make it happen. Committee looked at other university's procedures and put together a document to be used to make people accountable. They hope to make it available in the spring.
- Search Procedures, Mary Ann Dzubek and Luis Zayas, chairs. Luis is on sabbatical, and Mary Ann is working on best search procedures to tailor a process that suits Washington University.
- Faculty Leadership, Elzbieta Sklodowska, chair, is reviewing peer institutions that foster faculty leadership and development.
- Ombudspersons (one Danforth, one medical school). These would be independent of schools or deans. Both would report to Provost, as well as to Faculty Senate Council.
- Gender Pay Equity. Lynne McCloskey is working on a final version and the Provost is eagerly awaiting it.

### Diversity and Inclusion Grants

The Coordinating Council for Diversity Initiatives (CCDI) will fund \$250k in grants each year for the next five years. This year there were 13 award winners who were notified last week. Funded activities included symposia, workshops, community connections and speaker series, and mentoring, etc. Special thanks were offered to Leah and Kent Severrud for their support.

### Child Care

The University will construct a new child care facility on north campus that will be ready by fall, 2010 . It will have 20,000 sq. ft. of space and will accommodate over 150 children. This is in addition to our existing relation with University City Child care which is ongoing.

### 7. Other Business

There was no other business and no additional questions were raised. Mark Wrighton thanked Larry Shapiro for recruiting a female clinical department head, and wished everyone a great holiday break.

### 8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:54 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

William Clark

Secretary, Faculty Senate