

ACADEMIC SENATE – WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
Official Proceedings
December 12, 2012

Members Present: Rodger D. MacArthur, Chair Pro-tem; Louis J. Romano, President, Academic Senate; Basim Asmar; Ivan Avrutsky; Linda Beale; Paul Beavers; Abhijit Biswas; David Cinabro; Chardin Claybourne; Mary Cooney; Victoria Dallas; Donald DeGracia; Cheryl Dove; Karen Feathers; Maria Ferreira; Jane Fitzgibbon; Judith Fry-McComish; Nancy George; Ewa Goliebowska; Avril Genene Holt; Renee Hoogland; Michael Horn; Maik Hutteman; Kafi Kumasi; Lawrence Lemke; Brian Madigan; Kypros Markou; James Martin; Bryan Morrow; James Moseley; Jennifer Sheridan Moss; Patrick Mueller; Abhilash Pandya; Victoria Pardo; Charles Parrish; Debra Patterson; Alexey Petrov; Elizabeth Puscheck; Daniel Rappolee; Robert Reynolds; Brad Roth; Heather Sandlin; Ghulam Saydain; Mary Sengstock; Naida Simon; William Slater; Richard Smith; James Sondheimer; Senthil Sundaram; Ronald Thomas; Ellen Tisdale; Ricardo Villarosa; Anca Vlasopolos; Barrett Watten; Derek Wildman; James Woodyard; Lee Wurm

Members Absent with Notice: Barbara Bosch; Nabanita Datta; Moira Fracassa; Andre Furtado; David Kessel; Liza Lagman-Sperl; Howard Matthew; Boris Mordukhovich; T.R. Reddy; Michele Ronnick; Linda Rydstedt; Karen Tonso; William Volz; Judith Whittum-Hudson; Mary Width

Members Absent: Jennifer Beebe-Dimmer; Tamara Bray; Heather Dillaway; Judith Fouladbakhsh; Jason Mateika; Michael McIntyre; David Oupicky; Jeffrey Potoff; Beena Sood; Harley Tse; Jeffrey Withey

Others Present: Gloria Heppner, Associate Vice President for Research; Tahrima Khanom, Office of the Academic Senate; Ambika Mathur, Interim Dean of the Graduate School; Angela Wisniewski, Office of the Academic Senate

CALL TO ORDER: Rodger MacArthur, the Vice Chair of the Academic Senate, called this regularly scheduled meeting of the Academic Senate to order at 1:35 p.m. The meeting was held in the Bernath Auditorium in the Undergraduate Library.

I. APPROVAL OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

November 7, 2012

It was MOVED and SECONDED to APPROVE the Proceedings of the Academic Senate meeting of November 7, 2012. PASSED.

II. REPORT FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT

A. Report and Announcements

1. Mr. Romano extended Provost Brown's apologies to the Senate for his absence. He had to attend a meeting of the President's Cabinet that was held at the same time as the Senate meeting.
2. The Huron Consulting Group has submitted its report on the Graduate School. It is expected the report will be posted on the University's web site.
3. The Presidential Search Committee met for the first time last week. Mr. Romano, who serves on the Committee, reported that the contact person from the firm assisting in the search seems aware of the issues facing higher education and the available candidates. Mr. Romano called to the attention of the contact person and to the Board of Governors that the description on the web site did not mention academic credentials or experience in higher education. He was told that was not uncommon because most universities want to provide for the possibility that people who have worked in the corporate arena might apply. However, Mr. Romano thought some applicants might not be interested in the position if the University did not say that it was looking for someone with an academic background, and at Mr. Romano's urging the statement "Higher education experience is desirable" will be added to the web site and to advertisements.

The Board of Governors asked the Senate to submit names of faculty to serve on the search committee. There was a very short timeline in which to respond so the Policy Committee selected the nominees. Of the five names submitted, one was selected to serve. Mr. Romano believes that it is possible to hire a President before the 2013-2014 academic year begins. Some Senate members thought it was unusual for a sitting President to serve as a member of the search committee. The membership of the search committee was important to applicants.

4. On the agenda of the October 3 meeting of the Board of Governors Budget and Finance Committee was a recommendation to approve a funding plan that would increase the budget of the Division of Development and Alumni Affairs by \$5 million. The argument was that the University's only source of revenue would come through

development because it was likely that neither the state appropriation nor tuition revenue would increase. The faculty representatives to the Board Budget and Finance Committee spoke against the recommendation and submitted a motion to postpone action until the Academic Senate could review the proposal. The Board Committee tabled the recommendation and gave the Academic Senate until the December 5 Board meeting to complete its study.

A special committee, the Development Budget Review Committee (DBRC), chaired by Linda Beale was formed. The Senate committee met weekly for two months. The members analyzed the report produced by the consulting firm Marts and Lundy, which the administration had hired to evaluate the Division of Development and Alumni Affairs. The DBRC interviewed the consultants, members of the University administration, and the Deans of Medicine, Engineering, Law, and Business Administration, the colleges that are most involved in Development. The Committee did not meet with the Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences because he very recently joined the University. The administrators were responsive and they provided documents within a reasonable time frame.

The DBRC showed that taking \$5 million from the general fund would hurt academics because the money would no longer be available to hire faculty. Although the Division of Development and Alumni Affairs might raise more money, very little of the money raised supports endowed chairs, which can attract faculty.

The Senate Committee thought it was important to analyze the past history of the Development Office. However, when the Committee presented the history to the Board of Governors, it was very critical of the work. The high point of the gifts pledged or received by the University was in 2004-2005, the middle of the last capital campaign. Since then, the gift level has declined fairly consistently even though the capital campaign was not in full effect until 2008, while the budget for the Division remained fairly constant.

The return on investment, which is the ratio of dollars raised to dollars spent, is about 5.8 at Wayne State, about one-half of what it is at our peer institutions. That number includes the Fund for Medical Research and Education (FMRE), which constitutes 25% of the money reported but is not raised by the Development Office. The FMRE is the Dean's tax on clinical income, about 8% of the money brought in by the practice plan. FMRE is not included in any other university's

development revenue except at the University of Cincinnati.

Ms. Beale added that there are expenditures for raising money that are not included in the costs. The ratio of money raised to the amount spent that is reported is inaccurate. Development raises 26% less money than reported and it spends considerably more than is reported. In addition, Mr. Romano added, a number of development expenses are borne by the colleges and are not part of the Development budget. This practice may be true at other universities, as well.

Over the last 10 years the endowment increased 68%, corrected for inflation the increase was only 33%. Although this does not include the 5% payout, one would think that in addition to the investment increasing it should also increase because of additional monies being added to it. Since 2006 the increase is 6% and corrected for inflation our endowment actually lost 6%. For the last six years it has been pretty constant at about \$250 million.

Marts and Lundy compared WSU's Development operation with other universities using a ratio of total development per total enrollment. The other universities were chosen based on size. WSU's ratio is about 10,000 while our peers average about 2.5 times that amount and some peer institutions are much higher.

The DBRC laid out the problems that need to be addressed to use fundraising dollars more effectively. It did not think the FMRE should be reported as part of Development. Orientation and training of gift officers and Deans is very important. Marts and Lundy made contradictory statements in its report. Sometimes they advocated for decentralizing Development and moving the gift officers to the colleges, but at the same time, they said that the University needed to hire more people in the central Development office to pursue corporate and foundation philanthropy and principal gift donors. The Senate committee thought it would be wiser to move all gift officers into the colleges and have as sparse a central Development Office as possible. The Deans know how to work with their schools' missions. Over one-half of the increased funding for the Development Office is to be used to hire people for the central Development Office rather than the colleges.

The Senate committee's major recommendation and the reason the Board asked the Senate to review the proposal was to try to develop a different model, which it did. Not only did the committee recommend that the development officers should

have a higher return on investment, Marts and Lundy suggested that WSU's officers were about one-third as effective as their peers. One reason for the difference is that Wayne State's gift officers have multiple duties. Marts and Lundy suggested that the gift officers focus exclusively on development efforts, and the administration agreed. The Senate committee thought the pay of the gift officers should be based on their performance. At many universities, if gift officers reach a certain target they receive a bonus. At one time Wayne State had that incentive, but it no longer does. The DBRC believes that the budget of the Development Office should be partially, not completely, linked to fund raising milestones. Instead of using the general fund to increase the budget, the fee on cash gifts should be increased to 5% and that money as well as the fee on the endowment should be given to the Development Office. If the Development Office were inefficient, its budget would be reduced. This was the procedure a few years ago, but currently none of the money raised by Development goes into the Division's budget; all of the money the Division raises is deposited into the general fund or the endowment. The DBRC recommended that the Academic Senate review the budget every year or every other year to see how Development was doing.

Ms. Beale and Mr. Romano presented the report of the Senate's Development Budget Review Committee to the Board of Governors. There was little response from the Board members except for one Governor who challenged the audacity of the faculty whom, he said, had no background in fundraising to assess professional fundraisers and tell them how to do their jobs. Ms. Beale told the Board that she had been a fundraiser but had not included it in her resume and that faculty pride themselves as being able to read and analyze reports and find innovative and creative ways to achieve goals with less money than might otherwise be spent.

The Board of Governors will continue the current funding model and will pursue the plan proposed by the Development Office. The funding of the Division will be decided on a year-to-year basis. When the new administration is in place, Mr. Romano said, the Senate might have an opportunity to present its recommendations to the new President. Mr. Romano expects the Senate's Budget Committee to take a more active role in securing information from the Division of Development and Alumni Affairs.

One Senate member pointed out that the Board of Governors not only ignored the Senate's report, but

also ignored the Marts and Lundy report. Ms. Beale noted that the consultant's report was long with a lot of data but with inconsistent statements. A reader had to review the report systematically and not read only the recommendations or the bullet points. Because FMRE was in a separate line in the Budget Book, the Board's Budget and Finance Committee did not know that Marts and Lundy had included FMRE in the performance statistics in the benchmarking analysis.

Asked why the Board did not accept the report of the Development Budget Review Committee, Mr. Romano said that the Board did not want an historical analysis of the Development Office's performance. The Board wanted a new budget model but the Committee could not provide that without looking at the history. It appeared to the Senate Committee that changes were needed in areas not covered in the consultant's report. Ms. Beale and Mr. Romano did not have an opportunity to respond to the comments of the Board. If an additional \$5 million were allocated to Development, that Office would generate more money as it would by changing the duties of development officers so they focus only on fundraising. However, changing the duties of the development officers will result in another budget increase because other people will have to be hired to work with marketing and alumni affairs.

The DBRC report is posted on the Academic Senate web site.

B. Proceedings of the Policy Committee

The Academic Senate received the Proceedings of the Policy Committee meetings of October 22, 2012, November 5, 2012, November 12, 2012, and November 19, 2012 (Appendix A).

October 22, 2012

At the October 22 meeting, Interim Dean of the Graduate School Ambika Mathur told the Policy Committee that a National Institutes of Health task force had recommended that funding for graduate students be moved from research grants to training grants and the NIH would most likely require the change (See item #1). Mr. Cinabro reported to the Senate that the NIH had decided not to require training grants now because it is a major change and might not work.

III. THE UNIVERSITY'S RESEARCH RANKING

Alexey Petrov, a representative from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and a Professor in the

Department of Physics and Astronomy, volunteered to present to the Senate information he had gathered about the University's research ranking. He incorporated data that Professor Emeritus of Chemistry and former Vice President for Research John Oliver had presented to the Policy Committee.

Mr. Petrov became interested in Wayne State's research ranking after friends at universities in Russia informed him that the Russian Ministry of Education and Research (RMER) accepted degrees from foreign universities without their having to go through a lengthy procedure of confirmation if they were ranked in the top 300 in all of the following rankings: The Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU), The Times Higher Education World University Rankings (THEWUR), and the Quacquarelli Symonds World University Rankings (QS WUR). Wayne State University was not included on the RMER's list of approved universities.

Research-aggregate rankings and research-expenditure rankings are used to determine a university's ranking. Research aggregate rankings use a weighted combination of "hard data," which is quantifiable, such as the publications and citations of faculty, and "soft data," such as the results of a survey in which academics compare each university to a set of criteria. The research-expenditure ranking is based on the amount of expenditures the universities report to government agencies. That data is tracked by the National Science Foundation (NSF), and includes all sources of income. The most reputable schemes are the ARWU, THEWUR, and QS WUR.

The Shanghai Jiao Tong University/Shanghai Ranking Consultancy has published the ARWU since 2003. Mr. Petrov listed the criteria the ARWU uses in its rankings. He compared WSU's ranking with the rankings of the University of Pittsburgh, the University of Cincinnati, the University of Buffalo, the University of Alabama at Birmingham, the University of Illinois at Chicago, the University of Michigan, and Michigan State University from 2003 through 2012. Wayne State's ranking declined between 2009 and 2012. It was ranked reasonably in some broad subject areas such as natural sciences, mathematics, clinical medicine, pharmacy, and the social sciences. It was ranked reasonably high in physics and chemistry. The ARWU rankings are skewed toward the sciences.

Other rankings look at teaching excellence or other criteria. The THEWUR has been published by the Times since 2010, getting most of their data from Thomson Reuters, which indexes all publications in reasonably high-ranked journals in the World of Science. Universities have to publish more than 200 papers in a year. The THEWUR ranks teaching, research, citations,

grants from industry, and the ratio of international versus domestic professors or international versus domestic students as well as papers written with international collaboration. Mr. Petrov compared WSU to its peers and, it had the lowest ranking, dropping from 250 to below 300 between 2011 and 2012.

Quacquarelli Symonds, a company that helps students find universities for study abroad has published the QS WUR since 2004. The QS WUR ranks over 700 universities. The top 400 are ranked individually; the rest are ranked in groups. In this system, a search engine called Scopus analyzes the paper citations. The data base is provided by the publishing company Elsevier. The criteria are similar to the Times ranking. Wayne State was not in the 2010-2011 QS WUR rankings.

Next, Mr. Petrov presented the research expenditure rankings compiled by the National Science Foundation. Data that John Oliver provided showed that the University's total research expenditures by source of funding increased between 1993 and 2011, but the dollar amount was not adjusted for inflation. Again, compared to its peers, Wayne State has the lowest ranking for the period 1985 through 2010.

Mr. Petrov noted that research rankings are very important for the recruitment of students, post-doctoral students, and faculty. Russian students would not come to Wayne State because they would have to go through a confirmation process when they returned to Russia. If the students received their degrees from the University of Chicago, Russia would accept them without the students undergoing the confirmation process. It is imperative that WSU be compared with all universities, not only to "urban public research universities of similar size" because funding agencies do not care about the location or the type of ownership. Wayne State's position in major aggregate research rankings is steadily falling. While WSU's research expenditures in terms of "actual dollars" gradually rose, inflation-adjusted institutional income is likely stagnant. After peaking in 2001, the University's research expenditure rankings are falling. Mr. Petrov added that he could not find an administrator who was responsible for tracking the University's research ranking.

Mr. Petrov proposed the following recommendations. Recruit more faculty, but only those who can compete at the national level. Provide support for tenure track faculty, such as lower indirect cost rates. Where applicable, require faculty to publish in high-impact journals and require them to secure external grant support as conditions for tenure. Improve the national and international visibility of Wayne State by providing support to host large national and international scientific conferences on campus and reward faculty who

organize them. Mr. Petrov recommended encouraging faculty to publish in high-impact journals by introducing a prize for the most-impact research publications in the last five years and a prize for the single most-impact paper in the last ten years. He asked that Sponsored Program Administration provide a weekly compilation of funding opportunities organized by area such as medicine, arts, sciences, etc.

Mr. Watten asked if the humanities were factored into the rankings. He noted that the ARWU included the Science Citation Index and the Social Science Citation Index in its rankings, but did not mention the Arts and Humanities Citation Index. How, he asked, was humanities research factored into the rankings? Mr. Petrov said that he did not know. Being from the sciences, it was difficult for him to quantify research in the humanities. The criteria for tenure and for excellence are very different than in the sciences. He would like to discuss this with Mr. Watten.

Gloria Heppner, the Associate Vice President for Research, was asked to comment on the presentation. She said the Research Office does track research rankings. She agreed with the recommendations, particularly with the need to hire quality faculty and to maintain standards. The Research Office can implement the recommendations over which it has influence, but the hiring and retention of faculty is in the departments and colleges. Ms. Heppner suggested that the recommendations be transmitted to the Provost and to the Deans. Mr. Petrov said that he is interested in working with the Research Office in tracking the research ranking. He approached Provost Brown about the rankings after the Provost had talked about recruitment. He referred Mr. Petrov to Ahmad Ezzeddine, the Associate Vice President for Educational Outreach and International Programs, but nothing came of those discussions. Mr. Oliver had told Mr. Petrov that no specific individual was responsible for tracking research.

Mr. Cinabro noted that when he chaired the Research Committee he had pointed out multiple times that the University needed to hire good faculty and to improve facilities to increase the University's research ranking. What will be done to make that happen? Resources are limited and will continue to be for the foreseeable future. Mr. Petrov responded that the University could find \$5,000 to hold an international conference or \$1,000 to reward a faculty member. Ms. Heppner said that support is available to host national and international meetings, but faculty have to ask for it.

The Office of the Vice President for Research has sponsored a number of meetings.

A member pointed out that a flaw had been found in the formula used in research rankings. If there is an incentive to publish in certain journals, people cheat and retractions have to be published. People, he said, are getting paid to publish. Mr. Petrov replied that you have to assume that the peer-reviewed process works.

For Mr. Sondheimer the most disturbing aspect of Mr. Petrov's report was the fact that no one is monitoring the reporting of data. This appears to be a regulatory compliance issue. The University has to report certain data to be listed in the various rankings. Wayne State does not have the money to hire all the faculty it would like to increase research productivity, but to not supply data was totally unacceptable.

Ms. Heppner said that she would have to investigate why no data were supplied and how the data were requested. In the latest NSF rankings, Wayne State was ranked 52 among public universities. The Office of Finance and Business Operations supplies the data but the Deans and Chairs vet them. She repeated that people are paying attention to the ranking. However, she said, if the University paid more attention to improving its programs, the rankings would follow.

Mr. Romano believes the University needs very strong leadership to change the direction of research funding.

IV. REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

Provost Brown was unable to attend the meeting due to other University business.

V. NEW BUSINESS

There was
no new business.



ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 2:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Louis J. Romano
President, Academic Senate