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CALL TO ORDER: Provost Whitfield called this regularly scheduled meeting of the Academic Senate to order at 1:30 p.m. The meeting was held in the Bernath Auditorium in the Undergraduate Library.

I. REVISION TO THE GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

Mr. Romano introduced the topic. The Budget, Curriculum and Instruction, Faculty Affairs, Research, and Student Affairs Committees have reviewed the Provost’s proposal for general education reform. At today’s meeting, the Chairs of the Committees presented reports to the full Senate to give the members an opportunity to comment and to offer suggestions. The Committees will incorporate suggestions into their final reports. The Policy Committee will prepare a final report for the November 1 Senate meeting, at which time a vote will be taken.

Curriculum and Instruction Committee

Mr. Roth reported that the CIC focused on four areas: the inquiries formula proposal; the Wayne Experience (WE) course; the restructuring of the intermediate composition (IC) course; and the quantitative experience (QE) proposal.

The inquiries formula includes natural scientific inquiry, cultural inquiry, social science inquiry, civic literacy, first year inquiry, and global learning/diversity, equity, and inclusion. The CIC members and the people with whom they met found that combining global learning (GL) and Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) was a major problem. They are distinct and important components of Wayne State’s mission. It was the unanimous view of the CIC that they should be distinct requirements. The question was how to do that consistent with the limit of 32 credits of general education requirements.

To address GL and DEI requirements, the CIC unanimously recommended that the First Year Inquiry (FYI) requirement be satisfied within, rather than in addition to, the substantive Inquiry categories. A FYI would be a course that also would fulfill one of the other six criteria so students could satisfy the substantive inquiry area with a course designated as FYI. This would be beneficial because we do not yet have FYI courses and do not know how quickly they can be approved by the General Education Oversight Committee.

The CIC found the proposed WE course to be not well developed. It thought a pilot project should be carried out. Specific concerns were that the learning outcomes were not well focused, the courses were expected to do too much, and there was a laundry list of goals. There did not appear to be enough academic content to justify academic credit. It may be better to have a range of WE courses because students with different backgrounds and different skill sets had different needs.

The proposed IC requirement would merge intermediate composition and the writing intensive, thereby eliminating the current writing intensive requirement. The proposal encourages departments to create their own intermediate composition courses with an
emphasis on writing as required in their discipline. The CIC thought that was a good idea but was concerned that, if loosely interpreted, departments might label a term paper as fulfilling the intermediate composition requirement. That would not accomplish the goal of having a true writing course taught according to the learning objectives associated with intermediate composition classes. The CIC recommends that the courses be closely monitored and evaluated to ensure that they are substantive writing courses focused on the particular discipline.

Mr. Roth introduced Yang Zhao, a member of the CIC who chaired the CIC’s task force on the QE. Mr. Zhao said that the task force sought input from the members of the QE subcommittee of the GERC and faculty in math education in the College of Education and faculty in the Mathematics Department. One concern was the categorizing of students as STEM and non-STEM in an early stage of general education. Students should take one of the three courses described in the GERC/GEOC (General Education Reform Committee/General Education Oversight Committee) proposal of May 2017: (1) a mathematics class at the level of MAT 1050 or above; (2) Statistics 1020; or (3) an approved Quantitative Reasoning (QR) course. These courses should have STEM learning objectives to give all students a rigorous and meaningful quantitative experience. Students who initially lack strong math skills may obtain proficiency in the subject and might want to pursue a degree in a STEM field.

The second concern was the proposed fourth credit hour of co-requisite support. It was not clear if all students would be required to take that fourth credit hour. CIC believes all courses should have the STEM-standard meaningful Quantitative Experience within a three-hour credit course. There is no evidence that an additional credit will enhance the learning experience.

Budget Committee

Ms. Beale chairs the Budget Committee. It was difficult for the Committee to consider the budgetary implications of the proposal because the proposal itself did not address potential budgetary implications.

One issue is the relationship between the University general education requirements and the individual school and college general education requirements. For example, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences requires three science courses; the proposal requires one science course. How would faculty be affected if CLAS continues to require three courses or if it reduces the number of science courses?

The reduction of general education credits will have an adverse effect on the departments that will no longer teach general education courses. The University should conduct a complete assessment of the budgetary impact of the proposal on departments and on graduate enrollment. The Budget Committee recommended that the University allocate resources for a period of time to mitigate the effect of the reduction of credit hours.

The Budget Committee believes funding should be available to encourage faculty to develop new courses for the general education program. The Committee recommends that the Provost’s Office provide budgetary support for oversight and coordination of the Math co-curricular courses. If graduate students in the Math Department continue to teach the math competency courses, money must be spent to improve the English skills of foreign-born instructors and to instruct them in how to teach the subject.

Other concerns that need to be addressed are:

1. funding to support the development of new courses;
2. the impact of the credit hour reduction on part-time faculty and the attrition of senior faculty;
3. administrative costs for the training of advisors and the cost of increasing staff hours for advisors to address students’ needs;
4. mechanisms under responsibility centered management for revenue allocations if administrative offices teach the WE course;
5. budgetary impact of marketing the new curriculum;
6. the possibility of delaying full implementation to ensure quality courses and adequate preparation.

Faculty Affairs Committee

Ms. Hoogland, the Chair of the FAC, presented that Committee’s perspective of the issues. Their discussions revolved primarily around practical and implementation issues, with the exception of the collapse of the DEI and GL courses and the addition of a civic literacy requirement.

The FAC did not take a position on the math requirement due to a lack of information about the requirement. The Committee was concerned that the math course that was suspended last year would be reinstated as the starting point for quantitative reasoning classes. The FAC was concerned that the instructors have been and may continue to be graduate students with limited English-language and teaching skills.

The FAC is concerned about the lack of faculty input in the development of the Wayne Experience course. It was not clear if it would be skills- or content-oriented.
Some FAC members were upset that the DEI and GL elements of an earlier proposal were collapsed into one course. It appeared to have been done to allow for the inclusion of a civic literacy course as a separate requirement within the 32-credit limit of the general education program. Other members felt that DEI and civic literacy could be developed in combination. Yet others feel that the three distinct components should be offered separately, either as alternative options, or with one (or the other) as a required course. There is too little information on what the new DEI or GL courses would consist of for the Committee to respond. The FAC members believe it is essential that they have a primary role in the discussions on this aspect of the proposal, since its success or failure will ultimately depend on the input and investment by the faculty developing and teaching these courses.

The Committee’s primary concern was the feasibility of implementing this new general education program in fall 2018 since many aspects of the content have not been fleshed out and more input is needed from faculty and students. The FAC is concerned about the ways in which students will benefit from this program beyond the reduction in the number of credit hours.

Research Committee

Mr. Petrov, the Chair of the Research Committee, said that the Committee commented only on the reduction in the number of natural science courses. The Committee believes it would be imprudent for the University, which positions itself as a biomedical and scientific hub of Detroit and Michigan, to reduce its science requirement. Methods employed by life sciences and natural sciences are diverse enough to warrant two different courses. The Committee believes it is important that students have a basic understanding of natural and life sciences that leads to political decisions. The change probably would not affect students in CLAS because that College has additional science requirements, but it would affect students in the College of Education and students in the Mike Ilitch School of Business.

Teachers need a basic knowledge of science so they can instruct their elementary school students. Business leaders who want to develop new companies or make proposals should be aware of scientific methods that can improve their success.

According to the MTA, students must successfully complete “two courses in Natural Sciences including one with laboratory experience (from two disciplines)”. The proposed reduction in the science requirement would explicitly violate the MTA requirement. The change would not affect incoming students, but it would affect students transferring out of WSU and students seeking admission to graduate or professional schools. This change will adversely affect Wayne State’s reputation.

Mr. Petrov offered some ways of dealing with the change. There are courses in Physics, and probably in other departments, that could fulfill the quantitative reasoning requirement.

Student Affairs Committee

Naida Simon, the Chair of the SAC, reported that the Committee unanimously supported the foundation courses (Basic Composition (BC), Intermediate Composition (IC), and Oral Communication (OC)) as proposed. The Committee assumed that the math competency would be waived if students entered the University with high ACT/SAT scores, as was done in the past. Because we do not have FYI courses yet, the SAC recommended that DEI and GL be separate until there are enough seats in the first year inquiry course for all students who are eligible to take the course are able to take it. The WE is not well developed at this time. Students should be able to choose the type of WE course depending upon their interests and skills. The SAC thought a good starting point was the current freshman year seminar.

Current students may want to transfer to the new general education program. Under our bulletin-in-effect policy, current students will have the choice of staying in the current general education program or of moving to the new program. Since the current program does not have a math competency requirement, many students are likely to remain in it.

The SAC considered implementation issues. The University must roll out a plan as soon as the Board of Governors acts on the proposal. The new requirements can be coded by the end of January 2018. It is assumed that the old designations will be used until the General Education Oversight Committee assesses them. The GEC will decide which new courses fulfill the requirements. Whether there are new courses for fall 2018 will depend upon how quickly new courses can be developed and approved.

SAC recommends that everyone who advises students be required to attend the training. This includes academic advisors, academic services officers, university counselors, extension program coordinators, and faculty.

The scheduling of classes for fall 2018 was to begin on October 16. That was changed to December 1.

Under the MTA, universities that accept students from community colleges must guarantee them 30 credits toward graduation. SAC recommends that students
with the MTA stamp fulfill all of the foundational courses.

Associate Provost for Student Success Monica Brockmeyer said that new software, CourseLeaf, should facilitate the updating of the websites.

Discussion

Mr. Romano commented on the math competency requirement. The math competency is one of the general education requirements listed in the printed Undergraduate Bulletin. After former Provost Margaret Winters decreed that the math requirement would be suspended for 18 months, the webpage was updated and did not include the math competency. It is not clear if math competency is required for students who entered the University under the suspension. It is Mr. Romano’s contention that the math competency was suspended, not eliminated, and when the 18 months expire, students would be required to fulfill the math requirement whether they are in the old general education program or the new program. Requiring students to demonstrate competency in mathematics is important to the reputation of the University.

Mr. Reynolds asked how the people who studied the issues thought the new program would affect retention and graduation rates. Mr. Romano did not think reducing the number of general education credits would affect graduation rates, in general. Students still have to complete 120 credits. The graduation rates in programs that require many more than 120 credits might improve. He thinks the biggest impact will be changing the math competency pathway. The math competency requirement has been an impediment to graduation. Improving the delivery and the content of the course should be the highest priority.

Ms. Beale said that if the University devoted resources to developing interesting FYI courses, developed options for the Wayne Experience course, and developed quantitative experience courses and trained the graduate students who teach them we might be able to attract and retain students. If we code our current courses into the inquiry courses and do not develop the FYI across the broad spectrum of the University, if we don’t develop interesting WE courses and don’t improve the math competency, the new program will not have an impact on retention and graduation rates.

Ms. Simon believes the new general education program has to be a living document. It must change depending upon what is happening in the world. Although there are aspects that she does not like, Ms. Simon thinks the change will be positive with the incorporation of the suggestions of the various committees. Students don’t come to Wayne State because of the general education program; they come here because it has what they want to study. The reduction in general education credits will allow students to explore different subjects and take courses in which they are interested outside of their major.

Provost Whitfield commented. People are referring to the proposal as “the Provost’s proposal.” It is not his proposal. It was developed through many iterations by many people. He thanked the Chairs of the committees for their work in moving the proposal forward. The Board of Governors wanted the University to stay on the timeline that was established when the process began. The Academic Senate responded and thought deeply about the issues. There is no perfect curriculum or general education program. If the new program is approved, the work will not cease. We have to assess the courses as we proceed. Provost Whitfield thinks a new program will improve retention and graduation rates. A reduction of 14 credits and the attendant tuition savings can shorten the time to a degree.

The Provost said that many universities are using a corequisite model for general education math courses. The new Chair of the Math Department understands the gravity of the problem with the competency. Faculty in the Math Department are thinking about how to improve the course offerings. The Senate committees have examined the framework of the general education program. Discussion needs to continue on how to improve the quality of the courses and it will take time to create new courses. The Provost’s perspective is to try not to get ahead of the faculty. We need to determine the framework of the program before developing courses. The Provost offered to provide data collected about schools that have tried to change the quantitative reasoning experience. What we create must be good for our students.

Ms. Fitzgibbon asked who would approve the courses for the intermediate composition course and for the quantitative methods course. Mr. Romano expects that every department or college would decide what their students need to learn. The GEOC would ensure that the proposed courses include everything that should be taught in an intermediate writing course. In the latest proposal, departments would propose courses for the quantitative reasoning competency. The GEOC would determine which ones meet the requirement. Up to 10 courses could be approved.

Mr. Edwards asked who initiated the complete revision of the general education program. Mr. Romano believes it was President Wilson’s decision. The President thought students had to take too many general education credits. Reducing the number of credits would shorten the time to graduation and would
save students money. Mr. Romano noted that it is a misconception that the general education program was not changed in the last 30 years. Revisions were made to the requirements; some courses were eliminated and others were added. The changes were minor and did not have to go through the formal approval process. Over the years, at least three committees reviewed the general education program.

Ms. Ozgun-Koca said that the faculty in mathematics education believe we need to think about the substance of the quantitative reasoning or math competency requirement. We need to focus on the standards for mathematical practices like logical reasoning, the ability to connect relationships, solving problems, analyzing, and communicating ideas of mathematical thinking.

 Asked about the next steps in the process, Mr. Romano said that the committees would prepare their final reports. The Policy Committee would write a recommendation for Senate action on November 1. The Senate has to submit its recommendation to the President by November 3. The administration will submit its recommendation to the Board, which will hold a special meeting on November 10 to act on the administration’s recommendation.

The reports of the Senate’s committees are attached to these Proceedings as Appendix A.

II. CONFIRMATION OF THE PARLIAMENTARIAN

The Bylaws gives to the Policy Committee the responsibility of electing the Parliamentarian and submitting the choice to the full Senate for confirmation. The Policy Committee elected Stephen Calkins to serve as Parliamentarian. It was MOVED and SECONDED to CONFIRM Mr. Calkins as the Parliamentarian for the 2017-2018 academic year. PASSED.

III. CONFIRMATION OF THE VICE CHAIR

The Bylaws of the Academic Senate gives to the Policy Committee the responsibility of electing the Vice Chair and submitting the choice to the full Senate for confirmation. The Policy Committee elected Linda Beale to serve as Vice Chair. It was MOVED and SECONDED to CONFIRM Ms. Beale as the Vice Chair for the 2017-2018 academic year. PASSED.

IV. APPROVAL OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

It was MOVED and SECONDED to APPROVE the Proceedings of the Academic Senate meeting of September 13, 2017. PASSED.

V. REPORT FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT

A. Proceedings of the Policy Committee

The Academic Senate received the Proceedings of the Policy Committee meetings of August 28, 2017, and September 11, 2017. They are attached as Appendix B.

VI. REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

Provost Whitfield mentioned that the Office for Teaching and Learning is offering additional sections of their workshops because some of them were filled. Faculty who are interested in attending any workshops should contact Sara Kacin, the Interim Director of the OTL.

The University will kickoff the Innovation and Entrepreneurship Initiative on November 15.

Provost Whitfield returned to the subject of general education reform. He asked that the Senate be vigilant because our time is short. The administration needs the faculty’s input. The input so far has provided information for a framework with which people can feel comfortable. The Administration, he said, appreciates the Senate’s work on the issue. Although Ms. Simon said that students don’t necessarily come to the University because of the general education program, we need to have a strong program that reflects our values and provides students with solid basic knowledge.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Roth called attention to an online petition circulated by Professor John Patrick Leary. The letter asks President Wilson to take certain steps to help ensure the safety and security of our students who are trying to achieve a university education and are affected by President Donald Trump’s rescinding of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program. If people who have not signed the petition want to do so, they should contact Mr. Leary or Mr. Roth.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Louis J. Romano
President, Academic Senate