

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY- ACADEMIC SENATE
Official Proceedings
December 14, 2011

Members Present: Ronald T. Brown, Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, Chair; Louis J. Romano, President, Academic Senate; George Alangaden; Ivan Avrutsky; Linda Beale; Paul Beavers; Jennifer Beebe-Dimmer; Ramona Benkert; Veronica Bielat; Abhijit Biswas; Barbara Bosch; Tamara Bray; David Cinabro; Chardin Claybourne; Mary Cooney; Nabanita Datta; Donald DeGracia; Karen Feathers; Moira Fracassa; Judith Fry-McComish; Ewa Golebiowska; Renee Hoogland; Michael Horn; Maik Huttemann; Barbara Jones; David Kessel; Jerry Ku; Kafi Kumasi; Janine Lanza; Lawrence Lemke; Rodger MacArthur; Brian Madigan; Jason Mateika; Bryan Morrow; James Moseley; Jennifer Sheridan Moss; Patrick Mueller; David Oupicky; Abhilash Pandya; Charles Parrish; Debra Patterson; Jeffrey Potoff; Elizabeth Puscheck; Daniel Rappolee; T. R. Reddy; Aaron Retish; Robert Reynolds; Michele Ronnick; Brad Roth; Linea Rydstedt; Heather Sandlin; Mary Sengstock; Naida Simon; William Slater; Senthil Sundaram; Ronald Thomas; Ellen Tisdale; Karen Tonso; Anca Vlasopolos; William Volz; Derek Wildman; James Woodyard

Members Absent with Notice: Kingsley Browne; Victoria Dallas; Cheryl Dove; Jane Fitzgibbon; Avril Genene Holt; Michael McIntyre; Boris Mordukhovich; Victoria Pardo; Ghulam Saydain; James Sondheimer; Timothy Stemmler; Judith Whittum-Hudson; Mary Width; Jeffrey Withey

Members Absent: Basim Asmar; Anthony Cacace; Maria Ferreira; Judith Fouladbakhsh; Andre Furtado; Rita Kumar; Liza Lagman-Sperl; Shawna Lee; Richard Marback; Santanu Mitra; Seymour Wolfson; Lee Wurm; Zhe Yang

Others Present: Frances Ahern, Facilities Planning and Management; Gloria Heppner, Associate Vice President for Research; Kenneth Jackson, Liberal Arts and Sciences; Alan Jacobson, Office of Budget, Planning and Analysis; Tahrira Khanom, Academic Senate Office; Ambika Mathur, Associate Dean, Graduate School; James Sears, Associate Vice President, Facilities Planning and Management; Angela Wisniewski, Academic Senate Office

CALL TO ORDER: Provost Brown 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. CONVERSION OF THE FOURTH FLOOR OF STATE HALL TO CLASSROOMS.

James Sears, Associate Vice President for Facilities Planning and Management (FPM), introduced Frances Ahern, the Director of Design and Construction Services. Ms. Ahern is managing projects that will

convert the fourth floor of State Hall, which had been offices for the Computer Science Department, into classrooms. At its December 7 meeting the Board of Governors authorized \$4.4 million for the comprehensive renovation of the space into general-purpose classrooms. Mr. Sears said that FPM is seeking faculty and students to work with Ms. Ahern and the architectural engineering team because the best outcomes are achieved with participation from customers.

Ms. Ahern explained that when the Computer Science Department occupied the fourth floor of State Hall water infiltrated the building through the windows on that floor. In order to repair the windows, Computer Science had to be relocated, and it was decided the best option was to permanently relocate the Department. The windows have been renovated and there is now an opportunity to gain some much-needed general-purpose classrooms. FPM wanted to set up classrooms that could meet the needs of the new pedagogy of small discussion groups of students. In addition, information showed that students who work in groups and form bonds with other students are more likely to re-enroll, improving retention.

FPM engaged an architect to help define the physical layout that would best use the space. They looked into what other universities were doing with their classrooms. Ms. Ahern showed two videos. One showed the classrooms Grand Valley State University developed with Steelcase Furniture and how technology could be incorporated into the rooms. The goal was to allow active engagement of the professor and students as they broke into small collaborative groups. The faculty and students in the videos spoke about the benefits of the new style of classroom. Some faculty believed the arrangements helped students think creatively, work collaboratively, and engage with others in the classroom. The furniture could be arranged to accommodate different learning styles.

Likewise, a video from McGill University showed students in a class sitting in small groups at round tables and working on boards behind the tables. The faculty believed the arrangement and teaching style made the students more confident in participating in discussions in the classroom. The design of the room gave the opportunity for more equality and a sense that the student was part of a team.

Ms. Ahern said that the team also toured some of the new classrooms at the University of Michigan. Although U of M has some caster chairs with a tablet

arm, a mixture of tables and chairs and lounge furniture makes group work easier in the classroom. There are security issues with the technology. U of M gives students card access to the room for the semester. Wayne State would have to determine how to secure the technology.

The Registrar has told FPM that the University needs more classrooms that hold between 40 and 60 students and more seminar rooms for graduate students. Ms. Ahern showed the Senate members diagrams of how the renovated floor plan and the new rooms in State Hall might be configured. FPM wants to purchase different chairs and tables to see which the faculty prefer and which work best for the teaching methods. They are working with Media Services to address issues related to technology in the classrooms.

FPM is seeking assistance in the planning. Dean of the Library System Sandra Yee will hold focus groups to learn how faculty want to use the rooms and what technology would be beneficial. A number of questions remain, including which departments and faculty should be scheduled in the new rooms and how the technology will be secured. FPM is hopeful that the classrooms will be ready by January 2013.

Mr. Parrish complimented Ms. Ahern for the thoroughness of her work. However, he pointed out that a particular classroom setting did not teach. Rather, professors teach students. The University, he said, needs seminar rooms for graduate courses.

Questions and comments from Senate members covered several areas: the type of classrooms needed, the interest of faculty to use the new arrangement, whether departments and colleges had been contacted to learn which faculty or which disciplines might use the new configuration, accessibility to the fourth floor of State Hall, equipment maintenance, and whether the faculty and students in the universities featured in the videos were still enthusiastic about the classrooms after using them for several years.

Ms. Ahern and Mr. Shapiro, the Associate Vice President for Student Services and Undergraduate Affairs, responded to the members. They noted that the project is an experiment. A lot of people have been involved in the project and they would like more people to be involved. Mr. Shapiro and Dean Yee will meet with focus groups of faculty to discuss how the rooms might be used and to gauge their interest in using the new arrangement.

Ms. Ahern said that the Department of Biology and the School of Business Administration expressed interest in the rooms. Only a few instructors have students

work in groups but she did not know if that was because of the physical limitations of the lecture-style classroom or because they are not interested in having students work in groups. The plan would add eight classrooms bringing the University's total number of classrooms to 197. If the breakout arrangement of furniture did not work, the room could be converted to the traditional lecture-style classroom.

The stairways between the third and fourth floors of State Hall are narrow. Mr. Sears has met with the office that provides services to the disabled about access to the fourth floor. The elevator shaft will have to be expanded so a larger elevator can be installed.

Ms. Ahern said that the administration is in the early stages of addressing the issues about equipment maintenance and service in the rooms. Richard Dunbar, the Manager of Media Services, James Mazoue, Director of Online Programs, and Dean Yee are involved in the planning of the IT equipment and how to best use the facilities.

Ms. Ahern is following up with the universities in the videos to find out if, after several years of working in the new classroom environment, the faculty and students were still enthusiastic about the arrangement.

Mr. Romano asked Senate members who are interested in working with the committee to notify him of their interest. He ended the discussion by noting that while some faculty are not interested in the new room set up and the technology, there likely are other faculty who would like to teach in those rooms.

Mr. Romano thanked Ms. Ahern for her presentation.

II. APPROVAL OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

November 2, 2011

It was MOVED and SECONDED to APPROVE the Proceedings of the Academic Senate meeting of November 2, 2011. PASSED.

III. REPORT FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT

A. Report and Announcements

1. Travel Expenses

Mr. Romano reported that at the December meeting of the President's Cabinet and the Policy Committee, it was announced that travelers would not have to submit receipts for meals. The per diem for the city will be used. People who travel

will have a University credit card and will be able to put other charges on the credit card.

2. Statute on Centers and Institutes

About six years ago representatives from the faculty, the Council of Deans, and the Office of the Vice President for Research (OVPR) wrote the current Statute on Centers and Institutes. The Policy Committee was given the task of reviewing the applications for the initial chartering of the University centers and institutes and the applications to renew the charters.

The Policy Committee is concerned about the amount of general fund money allocated to the centers and institutes and the amount of grant funding they receive. The Policy Committee recommended to Vice President for Research Hilary Ratner and to Provost Brown that the centers produce approximately as much in indirect costs as they get from the general fund. Mr. Romano asked the Provost and Associate Vice President for Research Gloria Heppner if they wished to comment.

Provost Brown said that only one of the centers and institutes that reports to him receives general fund support. The others are self-supporting, receiving money from foundations or endowments.

Ms. Heppner said that, in general, the OVPR agreed that centers and institutes should bring in more money or at least bring in funds equal to their general fund support with the exception of the salaries of the tenured faculty because they would be paid whether or not there was a center. With that proviso, Ms. Heppner thinks most of the centers meet the goal set forth by the Policy Committee.

However, Mr. Romano noted that most of the costs in a center are faculty salaries. The purpose of the large centers is to stimulate research activity. The faculty in the centers do not teach or engage in other academic responsibilities to allow them to focus on securing grants. Some departments, he continued, do fairly well in obtaining grants despite the faculty's teaching 80 hours per year compared with the faculty in research centers that teach very little. In general, the Policy Committee believes the centers should bring in a considerable amount of grant funding so the general fund money is offset by the indirect cost from grant support.

Ms. Heppner said that the amount of teaching the faculty in the centers and institutes do depends on the center. The faculty have joint appointments in departments and many do substantial teaching. In general, Ms. Heppner said, the expectation is that the faculty in centers and institutes would bring in sizeable grants even in the current economic times.

Mr. Romano asked Mr. Cinabro to comment. Mr. Cinabro is a member of the Type II Centers and Institutes Advisory Committee and has served on two review panels. He said that the Policy Committee's request for detailed information about the current activity of the centers has been very helpful in the review process.

Mr. Romano said that centers and institutes have primary faculty and secondary faculty who are adjunct in the centers/institutes. Some center directors claim every faculty member who has anything to do with the center as part of the center. The center should calculate its grants by the indirect cost distribution as stated on the grant application. If 100% of the indirect cost goes to the academic unit and none goes to the center, that grant should not be counted for the center; it should count only for the academic unit. If 50% of the indirect cost goes to the academic unit and 50% to the center, the center gets credit for 50% of the grant. That is what was envisioned when the Statute was written.

Another problem that the Statute was intended to eliminate was the establishment of rogue centers. In the past, anyone could put a sign on their office door and say they had a center. The Statute requires that certain rules be followed if someone uses the word "center" or "institute" in the name of a unit. Recently, it was learned that the College of Education set up a Center for School Health. Although its establishment was approved by the Provost, the rules were not followed. Mr. Romano urged faculty and Deans who were considering setting up a center or institute to read the Statute to learn the procedure to be followed.

3. Capital Outlay Budget Request

In past years, the administration had given to the Senate's Budget Committee the Capital Outlay Budget Request that is submitted to the state of Michigan. Due to the changes in the University administration, that was not done this year. The Budget Committee mentioned this to Vice President Nork and to the Board of Governors, and Mr. Romano expects the Request will be given to the Committee in the future.

This year's Request is for the funding of a multi-disciplinary biomedical research building. The request is the same as last year but on a smaller scale. Last year the University asked for \$90 million from the state and the Granholm administration had promised to allocate \$30 million. If the money were appropriated it might be for only \$30 million. Originally Henry Ford Health System (HFHS) had agreed to participate in the cost and use of the building but it is not able to do so at this time.

The Budget Committee thought more consultation was needed particularly about the location of the building. When HFHS was a participant, it was decided to locate the building on Woodward Avenue by the former Dalgleish Cadillac dealership, putting it near Henry Ford Hospital and TechTown. Since HFHS has withdrawn from the project and the biomedical research building would be associated mostly with the Medical School, it might be better to locate it near the medical campus. Perhaps, Mr. Romano said there would be more consultation about the building's location in the future.

4. Nursing Practice Corporation

The Budget Committee and the Policy Committee are trying to get information about the budget of the Nursing Practice Corporation (NPC) and have requested information from Dean Redman, who is the Director of the Corporation. The Dean has not been willing to give information to the Committee. Vice President Nork gave Policy Committee information that the University has and Provost Brown has urged the Dean to provide the requested information. The Nursing Practice Plan is the group of nurses that treat students on campus. It is difficult to view the NPC as an entity separate from the University when it is using University facilities and is treating our students.

B. Proceedings of the Policy Committee

The Academic Senate received the Proceedings of the Policy Committee meetings of October 24, 2011, November 7, 2011, November 21, 2011, and November 28, 2011 (Appendix A).

November 7, 2011

Item #6 in the Proceedings of November 7 mentioned the proposed research incentive to waive tuition for Ph.D. students supported on grants. Mr. Lemke asked if the committee had considered waiving tuition for Master's students supported on grants. Mr. Cinabro, who is a

member of the committee studying how to cover tuition for these students, said that he would take the question to the committee. He noted that the committee has met only once.

November 28, 2011

Mr. Lemke asked for an explanation of "persistent links" mentioned in item #2 about eReserves. Ms. Bielat explained that persistent linking is a way to link to library resources that can be included in the syllabus, on the instructor's Blackboard site, on a web site, or sent to students. It allows faculty to put a copyright compliant link to course readings and allows the Library to count usage. The usage count provides an important assessment of the journals used in classrooms. The Library has a link on its homepage to a form to request that persistent links be created. Faculty also may create their own persistent links. Ms. Bielat will send the links to the Senate Office for dissemination to the members.

Mr. Romano has asked that a presentation be made to the Senate about copyright issues to inform faculty how to be copyright compliant.

IV. MATTERS SUBMITTED BY THE POLICY COMMITTEE

Resolution – Criteria for Graduate Faculty Appointment

At the November 2 Academic Senate meeting there was a discussion of a policy passed by the Graduate Council revising the criteria for graduate faculty status. At the December 14 meeting, Mr. Romano re-opened the topic by stating that the Policy Committee was not opposed to having more stringent criteria for graduate faculty status. They do not want faculty who are not qualified directing doctoral students. However, they believe that if there is a disagreement between the Dean of a school/college and the Dean of the Graduate School about the criteria, the Provost should decide what the criteria should be.

It was MOVED and SECONDED that the Academic Senate request that the following paragraph be added to the Criteria for Graduate Faculty Appointment that was passed by the Graduate Council on October 19, 2011:

Following consultation with the appropriate faculty bodies, Deans and/or Chairs can submit different or more specific publication criteria to the Dean of the Graduate School. The Graduate Dean can accept or reject the proposed criteria. If the criteria are rejected, the dean or Chair can

appeal this decision to the Provost, who will then consult with the faculty, Chair, and Dean of this unit and make the final decision for the unit's Graduate Faculty Appointment publication criteria.

Mr. Thomas commended the Policy Committee for adding to and clarifying the issues related to the criteria for graduate faculty. He asked if the Academic Senate or the Graduate Council had the final decision in this matter and if the General Counsel had been consulted.

Mr. Romano said that many years ago, the General Counsel ruled that "where the Graduate Council's recommendations 'affect... fundamental educational policy' the University Council [now Academic Senate] has the responsibility and authority substantively to review the Graduate Council recommendations before those recommendations go to the Administration for action."

Provost Brown reported that the current General Counsel stated that the Graduate Council is its own governing body and has priority in this instance. The Provost expressed the hope that the two bodies would settle this dispute through frank discussion.

Ms. Beale said that in most research universities with graduate schools, the Academic Senate is the body that sets fundamental educational policy and the Graduate Council functions as a baseline constituency body that establishes policies that are reviewed by the Academic Senate, which has the final say. That appears to be the prior General Counsel's interpretation of the existing Statute. Ms. Beale thought it odd that the current General Counsel would go against the precedent of his own office.

Provost Brown understood there was disagreement on one point, i.e., who should decide the criteria for graduate faculty appointment if the Dean of a school/college and the Dean of the Graduate School disagreed. He again asked that the Graduate Council and the Policy Committee meet to resolve the disagreement. Mr. Romano explained that he had invited the Dean of the Graduate School and the Chair of the Executive Committee of the Graduate Council to a Policy Committee meeting but the Dean of the Graduate School did not want to meet. Mr. Romano attended a Graduate Council meeting and discussed the concerns at length. Because the Graduate Council has proposed revised wording for the policy, if the Senate endorsed the resolution, Mr. Romano would incorporate the wording into the Graduate Council's most recent statement and forward it to the Council.

Mr. Biswas is a member of the Academic Senate, the Graduate Council, and the Academic Standards Committee of the Graduate Council. He participated in the development of the criteria. He had understood that the Graduate Council was the final arbiter of the policy. The decision to revise the policy was faculty driven. At no time did he feel pressure from the administration in setting the new criteria. He saw the willingness of the two bodies to meet and discuss their differences as a positive step.

In principle, Mr. Parrish said, policies that affect the basic programs in departments should not be established without extensive consultation with the affected units.

Mr. Woodyard supported the collaborative approach. The criteria for tenure is determined by departments. Likewise, departments should be empowered to determine who was qualified to lead Ph.D. students. There are many variations among disciplines; one rule cannot apply to all of them. To submit an appeal for an exception would be an unnecessary and cumbersome process.

Mr. Parrish called the question.

The vote was taken. The resolution PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Romano asked the guests from the Graduate School and Graduate Council if they wanted to comment.

Mr. Jackson, the Director of Graduate Studies in the English Department and Chair of the Executive Committee of the Graduate Council, has worked on the issue since last January. He worked throughout the summer with the Academic Standards Committee and the Ph.D. Advisory Committee. He commented, mentioning that he has expressed his willingness to meet with the Policy Committee and to explain the process. The process, he noted, was faculty driven. Mr. Jackson has strongly urged the Dean that this is a faculty-to-faculty matter. He has told Mr. Romano many times that he would be happy to meet and discuss the matter, as were the other members of the Graduate Council.

Mr. Romano pointed out that the Policy Committee is not a faculty committee. It is a joint faculty-administration committee chaired by the Provost. Mr. Romano believes the decision is an administrative one. According to the Statute governing the Graduate School, the role of the Executive Committee is to propose policy, which is decided on by the Graduate Dean. The Dean of the Graduate School decides policy, and she, along with the Provost, should be

involved in the discussion of the issue. The key players in the decision are the Provost, the Dean of the Graduate School, representatives from the Executive Committee and from the Academic Standards Committee of the Graduate School, and the Policy Committee.

Ambika Mathur, Associate Dean of the Graduate School, commented. She chairs the Academic Standards Committee. The policy, she said, was the result of many months of deliberation by faculty from every school and college. The representatives on the Graduate Council consulted with their colleagues in their units several times. The Graduate Council wanted to work to resolve the issues. Ms. Mathur understood no one disputed the need to raise the standards. She thought the needs of the students were being ignored in the current disagreement. She expressed the need for the Graduate Council and the Academic Senate to work together.

Ms. Vlasopolos thanked Ms. Mathur and Mr. Jackson for attending the meeting, but she thought the Dean of the Graduate School, who is in charge of making policy and will enforce the policy, should meet with the Senate or the Policy Committee. When administrators are invited, they usually graciously agree to discuss the issues. The Policy Committee maintains professional courtesy however sharp the questioning may be. Ms. Vlasopolos did not understand why the Dean of the Graduate School did not meet with the faculty who are in the field advising students, publishing, and getting grants. All of the faculty on the Policy Committee have the credentials to be graduate advisors.

Provost Brown said the Dean believed the advisory board should meet with the Policy Committee, that she did not speak for the standards of the Graduate School. The Executive Committee and the advisory board have that responsibility.

Mr. Parrish found it astonishing that the Dean of the Graduate School had the attitude that her leadership had nothing to do with what happened in the Graduate Council and the Graduate School. In his long years at the University, Mr. Parrish has never seen a situation where an administrator refused to meet with the Policy Committee. Mr. Parrish has raised questions about the representation on the Graduate Council. The Graduate Council represents the doctoral programs, but each school/college has two representatives on the Council. The Law School, which does not have a doctoral program, has the same number of representatives as the largest colleges, the School of Medicine and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. The Academic Senate, in contrast, has proportional representation based on the number of faculty in the

schools/colleges. Mr. Parrish is not criticizing the faculty who serve on the Graduate Council. The Council and the Senate need to work together. The attitude of the Graduate Dean was not contributing to a resolution of the problem.

Ms. Mathur said that Dean Ratner was happy to come, but as was said previously, she believes it is a faculty-to-faculty interaction. The Statute governing the Graduate School specified the number of representatives from the schools and colleges. In addition, the Dean of the Graduate School selects three additional representatives.

Mr. Jackson responded to the comments made by Ms. Vlasopolos and Mr. Parrish. He did agree with the point of looking at ways to reconfigure the membership of the Graduate Council. Dean Ratner has been very responsive to concerns from faculty that many aspects of the administrative structure of the Graduate Council need to be changed. Mr. Jackson had told the Dean to let him talk with the Senate about the graduate faculty policy. He felt the faculty could articulate well the reasoning behind the policy.

Provost Brown noted that when an issue develops between two Deans, the Provost is the referee in the process. The Senate was proposing that the Provost ultimately decide. He asked the representatives from the Graduate School if that would be acceptable. If this issue went to the President and the Board of Governors, the decision would be to let the Provost referee.

Mr. Jackson understood that if two Deans were in a dispute the Provost would be involved significantly in the decision whether or not it was written in policy. He and Dean Mathur said that they would be happy to take the resolution back to the Executive Committee of the Graduate Council for its review and consideration.

Mr. Romano will insert the language passed by the Academic Senate into the new document produced by the Graduate Council and submit it to the Graduate School.

The Provost offered to assist if he was needed.

V. REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

Provost Brown updated the Senate on the searches for the Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences, the Dean of Social Work, and the Associate Provost and Director of the Office for Teaching and Learning.

Dean Ratner is working with the Deans to increase graduate enrollment. The Provost is searching for a Director of Enrollment Management. The University

needs to think creatively and strategically to admit students who can succeed in college and graduate. The administration reviewed the Student Success Report with the Board of Governors and, in general, the Board supports the plan. The Provost will distribute the plan to the Policy Committee. Eventually, it will be distributed to the full Senate.

The Huron Consulting Group continues to work on increasing efficiencies at the University. The University likely will adopt a responsibility center management (RCM) budget where Deans will collect tuition for the courses taught in their colleges and be taxed for certain services. If a college's enrollment drops, its budget will decrease.

Mr. Parrish warned that RCM budgeting would have a tremendous impact on academics. The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences teaches a large number of credit hours, and presumably would receive the money from tuition. What will happen to the smaller colleges? The Provost noted that other universities that have used responsibility center management have superior academic programs. Asked about the participation of the Deans in the discussions about the budget process, the Provost said that Associate Vice President Robert Kohrman and Vice President Rick Nork are meeting with the Council of Deans about the proposed model. There are parameters that have to be worked out before the model can be adopted.

Ms. Beale, who is on the Law School Budget Committee, believes that the Huron Consulting Group has had little input from faculty and that the plans have not been thoroughly reviewed. The administration must bring such plans to the Academic Senate before they are taken to the Board of Governors. Ms. Beale urged the Provost to give the Deans full information about the budget proposals and have the Deans share that with their faculty.

The Provost continued with his report. Research funding is up 20%. Monica Brockmeyer is the Interim Associate Provost for Student Success. Stephen Calkins resigned from the position of Associate Vice President for Academic Personnel and has taken a leave of absence from the University to accept a position on the trade commission in Ireland. Margaret Winters is serving as the Interim Associate Vice President for Academic Personnel.

The Provost expanded the committee on online learning that was established under President Noren. The committee is investigating the type of technology students expect either in stand-alone online courses or in courses with a combination of online and classroom teaching. Ms. Bielat, who chairs the Senate's Curriculum and Instruction Committee, serves on the

online committee. The Provost asked her to comment on the committee's work. Ms. Bielat said that the online committee met twice and has planned the order in which it will address the issues. The committee hopes to have a report available in April.

Provost Brown said that the report would be given to the Policy Committee. Mr. Romano noted that in addition to the Curriculum and Instruction Committee, the Senate's Faculty Affairs and Student Affairs Committees are looking at the issues from the faculty's and the student's perspectives.

Ms. Beale asked if the charge President Noren had given to the online committee had been revised. The original charge had referred only to online courses but the Provost also mentioned the committee's looking at hybrid courses. The Provost said he wanted the committee to take a broad look at the subject because students have different expectations, some wanting hybrid courses and others wanting solely online courses. Ms. Bielat said that at the December 13 meeting of the online committee, James Mazoue made a presentation about WSU's online offerings. We have many online courses, but do not have a framework or context within which the faculty can know what support is available to them. Students do not know what is expected of them, and they do not know what kind of technology to buy. The online committee is trying to establish a framework that supports faculty and students.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 3:38 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,



Louis J. Romano
President, Academic Senate