

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY  ACADEMIC SENATE

Official Proceedings

November 4,

2009

Members Present: Nancy S. Barrett, Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, Chair; Seymour J. Wolfson, President, Academic Senate; Agnes Acsadi; Terrence Allen; Joseph Artiss; Basim Asmar; Tyrone Austin; Kingsley Browne; Deborah Charbonneau; David Cinabro; Alfred Cobbs; Christopher Collins; William Crossland; Victoria Dallas; Cheryl Dove; Karen Feathers; Maria Ferreira; Judy Field; Andre Furtado; Michael Horn; Patricia Jarosz; Barbara Jones; Debra Jozefowicz-Simbeni; Rita Kumar; Rodger MacArthur; Brian Madigan; Jason Mateika; Michael McIntyre; Boris Mordukhovich; James Moseley; Regina Parnell; Charles Parrish; Frederic Pearson; Sean Peters; Elizabeth Puscheck; Daniel Rappolee; Robert Reynolds; Louis Romano; Michele Ronnick; Brad Roth; Linea Rydstedt; Alvin Saperstein; Nabil Sarhan; Mary Sengstock; Bo Shen; Naida Simon; Antoinette Somers; David Thomas; Harley Tse; Anca Vlasopolos; William Volz; Arun Wakade; Judith Whittum-Hudson; James Woodyard; Russell Yamazaki; Earnestine Young

Members Absent with Notice: Ivan Avrutsky; Donald DeGracia; Doreen Head; Thomas Killion; Liza Lagman-Sperl; Janine Lanza; James Martin; Tej Mattoo; Karur Padmanabhan; Aleksandar Popadic; Assia Shisheva; Timothy Stemmler; Jianjun Wang

Members Absent: Ramona Benkert; Veronica Bielat; William Brusilow; Frederick Florkowski; Judith Fouladbakhsh; David Kessel; Winston Koo; Jerry Ku; Lisa Maruca; Prahlad Parajuli; Susil Putatunda; T. R. Reddy; Derek Wildman; Jeffrey Withey

Others Present: Johnnie Blunt, Academic Senate Office; Gloria Heppner, Associate Vice President for Research; Jerry Herron, Dean, Irvin D. Reid Honors College; Jay Noren, President; Hilary Ratner, Vice President for Research; Howard Shapiro, Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Programs and General Education; Kelley Skillin, Office of the Provost; David Strauss, Dean of Students; Lyke Thompson, Director, Center for Urban Studies; Angela Wisniewski, Academic Senate Office

CALL TO ORDER: This regularly scheduled meeting of the Academic Senate was called to order by Provost Barrett at 1:07 p.m. The meeting was held in the Bernath Auditorium in the Undergraduate Library.

I. REPORT FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT

A. Report and Announcements

Senate Procedures for Nominating Faculty Representatives for University Committees

President Noren had sent a memorandum by e-mail addressed to Mr. Wolfson and to the entire Senate membership asking for nominations for two task forces. Mr. Wolfson had followed that message with one of his own asking that members submit their nominations to him and not to the President. Mr. Wolfson reported to the members that the Policy Committee received four nominations for the Task Force on Student Success and three for the Task Force on Research Incentives. The Policy Committee nominated additional faculty and academic staff and Mr. Wolfson is contacting them to determine if they will serve.

Mr. Wolfson hoped that the University President would respect the fact that the Academic Senate follows the procedures in its Bylaws and the Board of Governors Statutes governing the Senate in naming persons to committees. He asked that the Senate members support his actions in handling President Noren's requests for nominations. Mr. Wolfson did not want the University President to divide the Senate; faculty governance at Wayne State would cease to exist.

Ms. Sengstock placed the following motion on the floor:

The Academic Senate hereby expresses its support for President Seymour Wolfson's position as stated in his letter to Academic Senate members dated October 28, 2009, in affirming the validity and appropriateness of the University procedures for the appointment of faculty representatives to committees. These procedures involving the Policy Committee have been established in the Bylaws of the Academic Senate and honored by the precedent of several decades of observance by several University Presidents. We respectfully urge President

Noren to respect them as well.

The motion was seconded.

Ms. Simon offered an amendment so the motion would read: ♦♦ the appointment of faculty and academic staff representatives to committees. ♦ Ms. Sengstock accepted the amendment as a friendly motion.

Mr. Browne offered another amendment:

that faculty and academic staff who are nominated for committee service outside of the regular Senate procedures decline to serve on the committees.

Mr. McIntyre SECONDED the motion.

Mr. Wolfson said that the President may appoint faculty and academic staff to committees. The problem that has arisen is that he is identifying them as ♦ faculty representatives. ♦ To be considered faculty representatives, committee members have to be appointed according to the procedures of the Academic Senate.

Mr. MacArthur suggested that the motion made by Ms. Sengstock and modified by Ms. Simon and the motion made by Mr. Browne be handled separately. Mr. Browne and Mr. McIntyre agreed.

Mr. Volz spoke against the motion on the floor. While he understood that the leadership of the Senate and the University President disagree on who should decide who serves on University-level committees, he did not want a motion such as Ms. Sengstock ♦s to be read as saying that only the Policy Committee of the Academic Senate had the right to appoint faculty representatives to University-level committees. Mr. Volz did not believe it was ever the case that the Policy Committee was the sole arbiter in appointing committees. There was now an attempt to make it so.

There is, Mr. Volz said, a rich history of faculty from across the University joining together to bring a broad perspective to a variety of issues confronting the academic community. He pointed out that the CTSA initiative in the Medical School appointed a number of committees with membership from across the University. None of those appointments were made with the Policy Committee ♦s approval. Mr. Volz recently served on a committee appointed by Dean Vasquez on art as an economic development engine in the Detroit community. That group was assembled from across the University and was not approved by the Policy Committee.

A number of protections are provided in the language governing the appointment of faculty and academic staff to the contractually-mandated committees formed according to Article XXX in the Agreement between the University and the AAUP-AFT. Mr. Volz supports such protection for committee appointments. As the Bylaws are now, they are, Mr. Volz said, appropriate.

Mr. Volz noted that the Senate Bylaws states that if the President requests that the Policy Committee forward names for University-level committees, the Policy Committee, may, if it chooses, provide those names. The Policy Committee does not have to provide names. Mr. Volz interprets the language as historical reluctance on the part of the Academic Senate to have a single small group of faculty, however distinguished and fair-minded that group might be, to decide who is worthy or unworthy to serve on academic committees at the University level.

The Policy Committee, he continued, is elected by the Academic Senate, but it is hardly representative of the 1600 faculty of the University. In serving on the Policy Committee over a number of years, Mr. Volz has noted that there have never been more than five colleges represented on the Committee. He was not disparaging the values of the people who serve on the Committee. If Ms. Sengstock ♦s motion was read to say that every legitimate University-level committee is a committee that has been approved by a majority of the Policy Committee, that is far too small a group with no process protection or criteria on which to base their selections. Mr. Volz opposed the motion if it was read to say that only the Policy Committee can appoint people or forward to the President nominees for University-level committees.

Mr. Parrish said that the issue was not that every committee in the University had to pass by the Policy Committee. If the President or a Dean wanted to have a committee representing them, they could appoint one. There was nothing in the duties of the Policy Committee or in the motion on the floor that prohibited it.

Mr. Parrish continued. The 82 members of the Academic Senate are elected by the faculty and academic staff. The whole Senate cannot meet weekly to discuss all the issues that come before the Policy Committee. In all representative bodies, members elect a committee to act on their behalf during the times when the Senate is not in session. The Policy Committee reports to the Senate, and the Senate may overturn anything the Policy Committee does.

Mr. Parrish noted that President Noren had stated in a meeting with Mr. Wolfson and Mr. Romano that the Policy

Committee could not speak for the entire faculty.

Mr. Parrish served in the past as an elected voting member of the Policy Committee and has served as the non-voting liaison from the AAUP-AFT. Over the years he has seen the members of the Policy Committee struggle to represent various views in the appointment of University committees. They consider issues of diversity, gender, college/ school representation, and the expertise for the particular task.

Mr. Parrish closed by asking that members support the motion on the floor.

Ms. Vlasopolos called the question. The vote on whether to close debate was taken. PASSED.

It was MOVED and SECONDED to vote by secret ballot. The Chair ruled that the minority could call for a secret ballot.

The motion PASSED AS AMENDED. The resolution reads:

The Academic Senate hereby expresses its support for President Seymour Wolfson's position as stated in his letter to Academic Senate members dated October 28, 2009, in affirming the validity and appropriateness of the University procedures for the appointment of faculty representatives to committees. These procedures involving the Policy Committee have been established in the Bylaws of the Academic Senate and honored by the precedent of several decades of observance by several University Presidents. We respectfully urge President Noren to respect them as well.

Mr. Browne MOVED the following:

It is the sense of the Academic Senate that members of the faculty and academic staff who are nominated for service on committees in a manner inconsistent with Senate Bylaws decline to serve on these committees.

The motion was SECONDED. PASSED.

B. Proceedings of the Policy Committee

The Academic Senate received the Proceedings of the Policy Committee meetings of September 21, 2009, October 5, 2009, and October 12, 2009 (Appendix A).

II. APPROVAL OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

It was MOVED and SECONDED to APPROVE the Proceedings of the Academic Senate meeting of October 7, 2009. PASSED.

III. COMMENTS BY THE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT

President Noren commented on the discussion and the motions that were passed regarding solicitation of nominees for committees.

It was his view that when there is solicitation of membership for a committee on which representation from the Academic Senate is either desired or required, it makes sense that the request be made to the whole Senate. That is why when he asked for nominees for the Task Forces on Student Success and on Research Initiatives he sent the request to the whole Senate. He did not think it was disrespectful to inform the entire Academic Senate when there is a request for committee representation. The request was not just to solicit nominations; it asked Senate members to comment on the draft charges.

President Noren said, however, that it was dependent upon the Senate to decide how it wants to manifest its representation on any committees. He thinks the way he solicited nominations for the most recent task forces was reasonable; he wants to be open and transparent about soliciting interest in committees. However, if the Senate did not believe his method was correct, he would honor the Senate's method.

Mr. Parrish asked the President for clarification. Originally, he said, the understanding of the Senate and the Policy Committee was that the President wanted the names sent directly to him; they were not to be sent to the Policy Committee. The President said that the memo asked Senate members to express their interest in serving on the task forces to the Senate President with a copy to be sent to the President. He also asked that, if they had comments on the charges, to send that to him, as well.

Mr. McIntyre noted that the resolution simply stated that nominations be made to the Policy Committee and forwarded to the President in accordance with the Senate's Bylaws.

President Noren asked that the sense of the resolutions be clarified. If the intent was that the request be sent to the Policy Committee instead of the Senate President, he would do that. Unless the Senate tells him that he should not, he will inform the entire Senate when a new committee is being formed as well as the charge if it has been drafted.

IV. STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS INITIATIVE

President Noren said that the purpose of today's presentations was to inform the Senate about the current developments in the Strategic Directions Initiative. The web site (strategicdirections.wayne.edu) contains the information to date and provides an opportunity for comment. The intent is to build on what exists guided by some major emphases. One emphasis is quantitative objectives. The current strategic plan is qualitative. He believes the next step is to set quantitative objectives that are dynamic. He wants the process to be open, participative and ongoing. The intent is not to have a five-year strategic plan that is revisited in the fifth year, but to have a continuous and ongoing strategic directions activity that does not have a point where it stops. The President wants to adjust the process as changes indicate. Part of the objective is to match resources with what we attempt to attain. Within reason, the President wants the University to be bold in its action.

Beginning last spring, six topical areas were identified and task forces were formed which developed the presentations that will be made at today's meeting. Over the next year, the specificity of the six topical areas will evolve. The topical areas themselves may change over time.

The Current Funds Budget is the resource context. The general fund comprises about two-thirds of the budget. One-third of the budget is made up of tuition and fees. The state appropriation comprises one-fourth of the budget. The remainder of the budget comes from extramural funds, i.e., private, federal, or state-competitive grants and contracts. The reliance on state appropriations has diminished greatly in the last twelve years and the prospect of its increasing is very low if not zero. The probability of a decrease in the state appropriation is very high in the near term.

Twelve of the fifteen state universities charge higher tuition than Wayne State. Of the fifteen universities, WSU is one of the three major research universities in Michigan. WSU's tuition is 30% to 35% behind Michigan State University and 60% to 65% behind the University of Michigan. Tuition revenues are critical to sustaining research and graduate and undergraduate programs. In national research rankings U of M is ranked third or fourth, MSU ranks between 25 and 30, and Wayne State is fiftieth.

WSU's undergraduate enrollment has remained steady over a period of time, but the number of credit hours students are taking have increased. Graduate enrollment has decreased. Over the past dozen years research has been increasing.

The proportion of full-time tenure-track faculty at Wayne State is substantially lower than most of its peer institutions. MSU has 35% more full-time tenure-track faculty than WSU. This is a critical issue for research. Part-time faculty cannot be expected to attract extramural funding.

One area of focus in the Strategic Directions is student success. The charge to the task force is to look at admissions, intervention to enhance retention and graduation, and community college relationships. Admitting students who are not prepared such that the probability of success is very low does not do them a favor. Giving them an alternate pathway such as through community colleges that will lead to Wayne State and a degree is more helpful. It is not a benefit to students to have them fail. The second task force examined incentives to encourage research. Other areas of focus will be the increased recruitment of full-time tenure and tenure-track faculty, resource and revenue enhancement, entrepreneurship and economic stimulus, and revitalization of the neighborhood around the University,

In the future, the University will have to rely heavily on tuition. The President believes that enrollment can be increased. An important element to increased enrollment is the retention of students. The next source of funding will be from extramural research and educational grants and contracts. The biggest portion of investment needs to be in faculty, particular full-time tenure track faculty. Other areas of support are graduate students, financial aid, and research stimulus.

President Noren intends to hold forums annually to revise the Strategic Directions and to submit a yearly progress report to the campus community. He expects the objectives to be revised as resources and needs change. The President stressed that although some aspects of the presentations are specific, they are drafts and are open to revision. Besides the forums, members of the University community have the opportunity to comment at the Strategic Directions web site.

The six task forces are: (1) Enhance Teaching and Learning; (2) Premier Research University; (3) Campus Life; (4) Urban Engagement; (5) Diversifying and Enhancing Resources; and (6) Enrollment Management.

Strategic Enrollment Management

Dean of the Honors College Jerry Herron presented the plans developed by the Enrollment Management Task Force. He

explained the plans to increase enrollment to 35,000 students in five years, noting the University's strengths, the weaknesses to overcome, what areas can be improved, and the concerns that need to be faced. The task force has five objectives: expand/enhance the recruitment pool of applicants; enhance undergraduate student success; enhance/-expand enrollment in graduate programs; enhance/expand transfer enrollments; expand marketing efforts to increase awareness and reputation of the University. Mr. Herron mentioned the strategies and the tactics to achieve the objectives. Among the tactics are: expanding the recruitment of high achieving students; increasing recruitment efforts beyond the tri-county area; increasing the participation of FTIACS in learning communities; increasing the effectiveness of advising at all levels; and engaging faculty, staff, administrators, and peers in student mentoring.

To enhance and expand graduate school enrollment the University has to ensure that graduate programs are market competitive. Tuition levels need to be competitive. The number of graduate assistantships and the stipends for the assistantships need to be increased. The University has to develop academic programs for the changing job market, develop customized programs for specific audiences, and expand its marketing efforts.

Mr. Herron said that if the University's enrollment reached 35,000 in five years, the tuition revenue would increase \$30 million with the estimated cost of the initiatives at \$4.25 million.

Teaching and Learning

Provost Barrett reviewed the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and concerns related to teaching and learning. The five objectives of the Task Force on Teaching and Learning are: enhance full-time tenure/tenure-track faculty; augment support of graduate students and programs; enhance the professional development programs for faculty; improve faculty retention; and increase support for programs that contribute to students' academic success. The target is to hire full-time, tenure and tenure-track faculty at a rate of 2% a year above the replacement rate over five years, creating approximately 21 new faculty lines per year. This would increase the ratio of faculty to students to 3.4 per 100 students. If enrollment were increased to 35,000 students, the number of tenure and tenure-track faculty would have to increase by about 5% to maintain that ratio. Provost Barrett showed graphs comparing the number of teaching faculty for Wayne State and its peer institutions. Wayne State ranks 12 among 14 peer institutions in the number of tenure/tenure-track faculty per 100 students and 10 among the same institutions in the ratio of tenure/tenure-track faculty to part-time faculty. Research is impacted by full-time faculty as well as teaching and learning. Part-time faculty cannot be expected to engage in research.

The plan would augment support of graduate students and programs by funding two PhD program enhancements each year and providing additional support for 20 centrally-funded graduate students per year, about a 6% increase over the number now supported. The task force recommended providing support for graduate directors in departments that do not now have the financial means. Another recommendation is to stimulate departments to develop curriculum-specific ways to develop faculty. To improve faculty retention additional funds are needed to counter offers from other institutions.

Other proposals are to increase support for learning communities, peer mentors, supplemental instruction, and other programs that contribute to academic success.

The estimated cost of the proposals for teaching and learning is \$6 million per year.

Research

Vice President for Research Hilary Ratner presented the plans for research. Wayne State is in the highest Carnegie rankings for research and community engagement. Its weaknesses include reductions in full-time faculty, a strained infrastructure, and under-funding of doctoral and post-doctoral students. There are opportunities for support and funding for research by the federal government, recognition of the role of research and creative activity in economic development, new partnerships available through the University Research Corridor and other collaborations.

The task force on research developed the following objectives: build on multidisciplinary and unique program strengths; strengthen faculty resources and supports for research; ensure high quality educational programs by integrating research and creative activity into the learning experience of students at all levels; facilitate commercialization of innovations and intellectual property; enhance communication of research information and awards.

Vice President Ratner said research expenditures have increased over the past several years and she projects they will continue to increase. Between 2004 and 2006 the University lost about 25% of its research portfolio. The University's National Science Foundation ranking among public universities has fluctuated between 50 and 52. The measurement of overall research activity would include total awards, research expenditures, recognition for urban research, improvement in the NSF rankings, and improvement in disciplinary rankings.

The strategies for achieving the first objective are: enhance support for the research enhancement program, which is a multi-disciplinary seed-funding program; compete for the CTSA award and strengthen components that will heighten the University's competitiveness of the award. In the event that the University does not receive CTSA funding, position it for conducting clinical and translational work. Other strategies for objective 1 are: maintain and enhance the presence of the

Perinatology Research Branch; and coordinate resources to make significant impact on issues with urban challenges.

The strategies for objective 2: expand internal research funding programs; enhance faculty research development programs; expand funding to support faculty recruitment and retention.

The third objective recognizes that learning and research are integrally connected. The strategies include: increase the number of nationally competitive doctoral programs; enhance support for post-doctoral students and fellows; and provide additional opportunities for undergraduates to participate in research.

The strategies for the fourth objective: ensure that the steps involved in bringing something to market are streamlined and efficient; make use of opportunities in TechTown; and connect the commercialization-TechTown partnership better with faculty and with business and industry.

The strategies for the fifth objective: ensure that the research profile is fully incorporated into the University brand so that students understand the opportunity afforded to them by attending a research university; and increase awareness of the research profile with internal and external audiences.

The total cost over five years is almost \$60 million.

Enhance the Quality of Campus Life

Dean of Students David Strauss began his presentation about campus life. He identified the objectives: the service culture should provide ease of daily operations; services and processes must support students, faculty, and staff in a 24/7 framework; increase campus activities and student involvement; engage faculty and staff in the university; and address facilities.

INTERRUPTION BY THE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT

At this time, President Noren interrupted David Strauss's presentation and rejoined the meeting to revisit the resolution passed by the Senate at the beginning of the meeting. He read the memorandum of October 26 to the Senate President that prompted the resolution:

Dear Seymour and members of the Senate,

I ask the Academic Senate to nominate six potential members for each of two task forces (12 total nominees) which I plan to convene shortly. The two task forces are:

1. Task Force on Student Success
2. Task Force on Research Incentives.

I have attached draft charges for these two task forces. I anticipate appointing three members for each of these task forces from those nominated by the Academic Senate. Additionally, there will be representatives of the administration, the deans, and possibly others. I also anticipate a student representative for the Student Success Task Force.

I encourage members of the Academic Senate to review the draft charges for these task forces and provide suggestions for clarification and/or emphasis directly to me as well as expressions of interest in serving to both me and Seymour.

Seymour, I look forward to receiving your nominations, if possible, by November 9.

President Noren asked Mr. Wolfson what in the memo had caused concern. Mr. Wolfson said that it was his asking the members to submit nominations to both the President and the Senate President that was of concern. The Policy Committee, Mr. Wolfson said, would like the President to submit the request for nominations to the Senate President. The Policy Committee is happy to ask the full Senate for nominations. If Senate members send their nominations directly to the University President, the Committee does not know whose names have been submitted. The Policy Committee would not have control over the nominations submitted to the President. The Committee is asking that nominations be submitted to the President of the Academic Senate. The Policy Committee will follow its processes and submit its nominations to the President.

President Noren believed there was nothing in the memo that bypassed the Senate President. He said that he would not make the decisions, the Senate President would submit the nominations to him.

Ms. Vlasopolos noted that the resolution passed by the Senate reaffirmed the procedures that have been followed in nominating faculty and academic staff to committees. The Policy Committee, in carrying out its duties, looks at nominations to consider college/school representation, representation by rank, gender, specialization, and interest. The Policy Committee spends a great deal of time determining who would best serve on a particular committee. It tries to balance the needs of a

committee in a fair and honest way. It does not want nominations sent directly to the University President. Ms. Vlasopolos added that if Senate members do not like the way the present Policy Committee is conducting business, they can elect others to serve. Elections are held every fall.

President Noren pointed out that his memo reads, "Seymour, I look forward to receiving your nominations, if possible, by November 9." In the memo, the President did not refer to the Policy Committee, and he said that if Seymour wanted to use the Policy Committee for the purpose of making nominations, that was acceptable. The President asked if Mr. Wolfson had a problem with his knowing who had expressed interest in serving on the task forces.

Mr. Parrish said that the controversy began when, at a meeting with the President's Cabinet that the Senate President and the Vice Chair of the Senate attended, President Noren objected to the Policy Committee's role in nominating faculty to committees, that the President had said that the Policy Committee did not represent the faculty.

President Noren saw nothing in the memo of October 26 that diminished the role of the Senate President and the Academic Senate to make nominations by whatever means the Senate chooses. In response to Mr. Parrish's comments about the Policy Committee being representative of the faculty, the President said that at a previous Senate meeting, Mr. Parrish asked him if the Policy Committee was representative. President Noren had said that the Policy Committee was representative in a smaller number than the Academic Senate. By simple numbers, the Academic Senate is more representative than is the Policy Committee.

Mr. Parrish noted that initially President Noren had asked that nominations be sent directly to him. If nominees are submitted directly to the President, they cannot be identified as representatives of the Senate. They are representatives from the Senate. If President Noren selects the nominees, they are his representatives not representatives of the Senate. If the President has accepted the position of the Senate that the Policy Committee is the body that submits nominations to the him, he asked that the debate cease and the two sides move on.

President Noren said that he did not understand why the issue had been raised. His initial memo was explicit. He did not expect to decide who the nominees were. He repeated the sentence in the memo of October 16, which stated that he looked forward to receiving Seymour's nominations. President Noren said that he would continue to consult the Academic Senate. He would send the message to Seymour. He would appreciate knowing how much interest there is in serving on the committees. If the Senate did not want him to know how many people expressed interest, he would accept that decision, but he did not understand why they would not want him to know how many people or who had expressed interest. If there is a lot of interest, he might want to increase the number of faculty and academic staff who serve on a committee. He asked if there was a problem with his knowing who expressed interest

Mr. Wolfson indicated that probably would not be a problem, but that was not the concern. President Noren interrupted and stated, "Then I don't see why there's a problem." President Noren did not understand how his memo could have elicited concern that he was disrespectful of the Academic Senate.

Mr. Wolfson suggested that he and President Noren meet privately to resolve the issue. The President thought the issue was resolved. He's happy to have a discussion but he would like it to be in public.

The President left the meeting rather agitated.

Enhance the Quality of Campus Life Resumed

Dean Strauss resumed his presentation.

Dean Strauss mentioned some of the University's strengths, opportunities, weaknesses, and challenges. Its strengths are the safety of the campus, its growth, and its location. A weakness is the bureaucratic and slow processes. The diversity of the student body and faculty and staff is an opportunity. A challenge is the myopic view by staff of their role and changing the customer service paradigm.

Using the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) for 2009, Wayne State was compared with urban universities, Carnegie-ranked universities, and all institutions that participate in the NSSE surveys. Students found the quality of relationships with administrative personnel to be low. The tactic to improve customer relations is to have a high level committee develop a standardized framework, training, evaluation, review, recognition, and feedback system.

WSU ranked high in the use of online resources, and the task force would like to extend that. Wayne State's students work at jobs off campus more than comparable universities, are working less on campus, and care for dependents more than students at comparable universities. A tactic to serve students better is to extend hours throughout the semester and at key points in the semester. Virtual services can be expanded.

Students were surveyed to learn what activities they want to participate in on weekends and what activities would bring

them to campus. To expand activities, the University might partner with midtown establishments to offer evening and weekend dining options and other activities, with special WSU access and discounts. The University could establish evening and weekend parking options with shuttle service to support midtown activities. Events.wayne.edu should be the portal for information on the campus and the community.

WSU students participate in co-curricular activities less than students at peer institutions and attendance at campus activities is lower. This may mean that the University is not offering the activities that students want. More students are likely to attend events that connect with the curriculum if they receive extra credit for attending. Such events would be colloquia, speakers, seminars, and research forums. The task force suggested ways to expand employment opportunities for students on campus. Offices could serve as mentors and coaches for students.

The task force wants to increase involvement of faculty and staff in University events. When students see faculty and staff at events they view them as more approachable. Among the tactics to encourage more involvement are free entrance for faculty and staff to athletic and arts events and a pride program.

Issues to address regarding facilities include eliminating the widespread proprietary use of space, consolidating reservations, assessing the current and future use of the Student Center Building, identifying potential facility public/private partnerships and assess feasibility.

All four presenters came forward to respond to questions and comments.

Mr. Saperstein noted that while most of the comments about attracting and retaining students were aimed at undergraduates, there is a need to provide social opportunities for graduate students. Graduate students come from many countries and have difficulty meeting people other than those in their own departments. Successful graduate schools make efforts to enhance the social life of graduate students. Provost Barrett said that she would talk with Graduate School Dean Mark Wardell about the issue.

Mr. Parrish and Vice President Ratner discussed research expenditures for the past several years and the items that were included in the calculation. Mr. Parrish noted that although research expenditures were growing rapidly, the actual level of grants received were only growing at about the rate of 5%.

Mr. Romano asked if the goal to increase the number of students who are better prepared meant that the University would reduce the number of poorly prepared students. If so, how would that be done? Mr. Herron said that the University would not eliminate students who have a certain range of ACT scores but make available the option to start at a community college. When they achieve a certain level of success they would transfer to the University and have a better likelihood of succeeding. Mr. Shapiro said that the University needs to create an appropriate matrix of placement to determine which students are more likely to succeed by attending a community college. Students take placement tests to determine whether they enter the Pathways program. Mr. Furtado believes additional filters are needed to find out why some students with low ACT scores perform well and others do not.

It was noted that because of the lateness of the meeting, many of the Senate members had left and did not have a chance to ask questions. It was agreed that all of the presenters would return for the December meeting so all of the Senate members will have the opportunity to ask questions of all of the presenters. Comments also can be made at the Strategic Directions web site: strategicdirections.wayne.edu.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 3:26 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Seymour J. Wolfson
President, Academic Senate

