

**WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY – ACADEMIC SENATE**  
**Official Proceedings**

May 4, 2011

Members Present: Louis J. Romano, Chair Pro Tem; Seymour J. Wolfson, President, Academic Senate; George Alangaden; Tyrone Austin; Ivan Avrutsky; Ramona Benkert; Veronica Bielat; Abhijit Biswas; David Cinabro; Mary Cooney; Victoria Dallas; Nabanita Datta; Donald DeGracia; Cheryl Dove; Judith Fouladbakhsh; Ewa Golebiowska; Robert Holley; Renee Hoogland; Maik Huttemann; Patricia Jarosz; Barbara Jones; Christian Kreipke; Jerry Ku; Janine Lanza; Shawna Lee; Rodger MacArthur; Brian Madigan; Boris Mordukhovich; Bryan Morrow; James Moseley; Jennifer Sheridan Moss; Abhilash Pandya; Prahlad Parajuli; Charles Parrish; Elizabeth Puscheck; Susil Putatunda; T. R. Reddy; Aaron Retish; Robert Reynolds; Linea Rydstedt; Heather Sandlin; Alvin Saperstein; Mary Sengstock; Naida Simon; David Thomas; Karen Tonso; Anca Vlasopolos; William Volz; Jianjun Wang; Judith Whittum-Hudson; Mary Width; Jeffrey Withey; Lee Wurm; Eanesting Young

Members Absent with Notice: Barbara Bosch; Kingsley Browne; Deborah Charbonneau; Karen Feathers; Andre Furtado; Avril Genee Holt; Michael Horn; David Kessel; Rita Kumar; James Martin; Jason Mateika; Michael McIntyre; Bart Miles; David Oupicky; Michele Ronnick; Brad Roth; James Sondheimer; Timothy Stemmler; James Woodyard

Members Absent: Basim Asmar; Anthony Cacace; Jane Fitzgibbon; Randall Gretebeck; Liza Lagman-Sperl; Regina Parnell; Daniel Rappolee; Derek Wildman; Zhe Yang

Others Present: Johnnie Blunt, Academic Senate Office; Brett Green, Total Compensation and Wellness; Kelley Skillin, Office of the Provost; Mary Ann Wilson, Total Compensation and Wellness; Angela Wisniewski, Academic Senate Office

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 1:40 p.m. by Mr. Romano, the Vice Chair of the Senate, who served as Chair in the absence of Provost Brown. The meeting was held in the Bernath Auditorium in the Undergraduate Library.

**I. MATTERS SUBMITTED BY THE POLICY COMMITTEE**

**Special Retirement Incentive Plan**

The Policy Committee invited Brett Green, the Director of Total Compensation and Wellness, and Mary Ann Wilson, Benefits Officer, to discuss and clarify information about the Special Retirement Incentive Plan being offered to employees.

Mr. Green reviewed the eligibility guidelines. Employees must be age 50 or older and have a total of 75 or more points, which is a combination of age and years of service, as of June 1 to participate in the program. Non-tenured employees have to be funded 50% or more from the general fund or from independent operations or auxiliaries. The funding source does not apply to tenured employees. The incentive of 6, 8, or 10 months would depend upon the total points. An employee would need 75 to 84 points to receive 6 months' salary, 85 to 99 points to receive 8 months' salary, and 100 points to receive 10 months' salary. Tenured faculty would receive the 10 months' incentive amount regardless of their total points. The incentive could be taken as a lump sum or spread over a period of months. Six months' salary could be spread over 12 months, 8 months' salary over 16 months, and 10 months' salary over 20 months.

The money is taxable. If the incentive is taken in a lump sum a Health Reimbursement Arrangement (HRA) option is available. The HRA is a way to defer a portion of the lump sum to a tax deferred account to be used to pay medical expenses, including medical care premiums, as a retiree. If the individual opts to take the incentive continuation the HRA option is not available.

Mr. Green explained how to compute the incentive. Twelve-month employees divide their annual salary by 12 months. Multiply the result by 6, 8, or 10 depending upon the allotment to determine the incentive amount. Nine-month employees divide their annual 9-month salary by 12. Then multiply that amount by 6, 8, or 10 to determine the incentive allocation. If the employee chooses the continuation incentive, the money would be spread over 26, 35 or 43 pays. Mr. Green showed the calculation for an employee whose annual salary is \$100,000 and who is eligible to receive 10 months' salary. Divide the annual salary of 100,000 by 12 = 8,333.33/mo. X 10 months = a total incentive amount of 83,333 divided by 43 (the number of pay periods for those receiving 10 months' salary) which equals the bi-weekly amount of \$1937.98.

Another benefit of the program is the continuation of medical coverage for up to three years. Pre-65 retirees would continue to pay their standard contribution until they are 65. For employees who are 65 or who turn 65 during the program, the benefit changes from paying the employee contribution to receiving an annual payment of \$2,000 per year that can be used to offset medical costs. If an individual

turned 65 partway through a year, the \$2,000 payment would be prorated based on the date when he/she turned 65. If an individual who elects the retirement program accepts employment at another institution and is eligible for the new employer's healthcare, Wayne State would discontinue the subsidy or the support for medical expenses.

The standard life insurance benefit for retirees is \$2,500. Under the incentive retirement plan that amount is increased to \$25,000. Employees who retire under the SRIP would have access to the other standard retiree benefits, including dental insurance, vision insurance, and parking. Dental and vision coverage would be available at 100% of the retiree's cost; they are not subsidized.

The University made arrangements with TIAA-CREF and Fidelity Investments to have additional counselors on campus for employees to review their situation to help them decide if the program is good for them.

Employees electing the SRIP must submit the completed Separation and Release Agreement by May 31. Retirements will occur between June 30 and September 30, 2011. The individual's unit will determine the retirement date.

Employees who have questions about their number of years of service were asked to contact Mary Ann Wilson in Total Compensation and Wellness for clarification.

The standard age for retirement from the University is 55, but the age for retirement under the SRIP is 50. Although the SRIP applies to people who are under 55, they will have the same rights as the persons who retire at age 55.

Mr. Green said that a number of people have asked about returning to work. During the 3-year benefits continuation period people cannot return to a benefits-eligible position and must have an appointment of less than 50% time. For non-teaching assignments, employees can return for only up to one year subject to the temporary employee policy, which means working a maximum of 1,000 hours. For teaching assignments, the program will permit, during the 3-year period, up to two courses per academic year with none of the courses lasting more than one semester.

The HRA allows people to defer part of their lump sum and avoid taxation. The account is active for 10 years. Individuals can allocate up to 100% of the lump sum to the HRA in 10% increments.

Mr. Green reviewed how the employee's contribution to health insurance would be paid and the health plans available to retirees.

Mr. Green said that no exceptions would be made regarding the qualifications for the SRIP. Questions can be directed to the Total Compensation and Wellness Office. There is also a website with information about the program.

This ended Mr. Green's presentation. Members of the Senate and guests asked questions and commented on the plan. Mr. Green responded to the questions. However, he did not allow video recording of the question and answer period.

## II. APPROVAL OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

April 6, 2011

It was MOVED and SECONDED to APPROVE the Proceedings of the Academic Senate meeting of April 6, 2011. PASSED.

## III. REPORT FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT

### A. Report and Announcements

#### 1. The Academic Senate

Mr. Wolfson thanked the Senate members for their support during his 13 years as Senate President. He noted that he served under four University Presidents. While there have been ups and downs during his presidency, working with the Senate members has been a rewarding experience. He expressed his appreciation for the members' indulgence and cooperation. He thanked the Chairs of this year's Senate committees: Michael McIntyre, who does a yeoman's job chairing the Budget Committee; Karen Feathers, who chaired the Curriculum and Instruction until recently, and Veronica Bielat, who took over when Ms. Feathers had to step down; James Woodyard, who chaired the Elections Committee; Deborah Charbonneau, who chaired the Facilities, Support Services and Technology Committee; Mary Cay Sengstock, who chaired the Faculty Affairs Committee. Mr. Wolfson added a special thank you to Ms. Sengstock for the many positions she has held in the Senate including her years as President of the Senate and the many committees she has chaired. He thanked Mr. Cinabro for his work as Chair of the Research Committee over the past few years and Naida Simon for the years she has

served as the Chair of the Student Affairs Committee.

Mr. Wolfson thanked the members who are serving on the Policy Committee this year: David Kessel; Rodger MacArthur; Louis Romano; William Volz; Anca Vlasopolos; Victoria Dallas; James Woodyard; and Charles Parrish, who serves as the AAUP-AFT liaison. Mr. Wolfson also thanked the secretary Angela Wisniewski.

## 2. The Huron Consulting Group

Mr. Wolfson mentioned that the Policy Committee met with representatives of the Huron Consulting Group who are looking at the University's administrative functions to improve efficiency and reduce costs. Mr. Wolfson understands that the Huron Group also may work with employees to help implement changes.

## 3. The University Budget

Mr. Wolfson reported that, at the most recent meeting with the President's Cabinet on April 28, the Policy Committee had expressed concern that the Blue Ribbon Committee appointed by the Provost to look into ways of cutting expenses on the academic side did not receive the information it requested. Provost Brown had told the Blue Ribbon Committee it would be given any data it wanted, but, after several meetings, it had received none. At the Cabinet meeting, President Gilmour said he would consider giving the Blue Ribbon Committee some of the data it wanted.

As a result of the meeting, Mr. Wolfson sent the following message to President Gilmour:

In regard to the discussion at the joint Cabinet meeting yesterday, I just wanted to summarize what we wanted to accomplish.

The following items were requested from the administration during the Cabinet meeting yesterday, April 28, 2011, with the argument that they are necessary in order for there to be a transparent and open process that involves the Provost's budget committee:

1. the data that the deans received to develop their original proposals,
2. the dollar amounts for the Academic cuts,
3. the original proposals submitted by the deans to the Provost,

4. the final proposals submitted by the deans and

5. that the Provost's budget committee have access to the deans.

It is our understanding that you agreed to provide the first two items and that you will consider the remaining items, 3 thru 5.

If our understanding is correct, could you let us know when items 1. and 2. will be transmitted to the committee, and a time frame for a response to the request for the rest of the items. The sooner the committee receives the data, the better result will occur overall.

We look forward to your reply in the near future as we try to be helpful in a meaningful way in this budget reduction process.

The President responded to Mr. Romano. Mr. Wolfson asked Mr. Romano to inform the Senate about the response.

Mr. Romano noted that the Blue Ribbon Committee had requested information for more than a month. It took a meeting with the President to get the budget information given to each of the Deans about their own school or college. The information gives the number of faculty in a college, the number of credit hours generated, dollar amounts for staff and part-time faculty. There was budget information by departments but not to the degree that the Committee wanted. There was no information about the quality of the programs and it did not break out the information about departmental quality.

The Blue Ribbon Committee does not have the intimate knowledge Deans have about the quality of their departments. When a budget lists \$200,000 in staff or technical support, the Committee does not know the people and cannot make a recommendation whether or not to cut the support.

The Blue Ribbon Committee also was given the dollar figure that the academic part of the University, which includes the Provost's Office and the Libraries, would need to cut. That number is much larger than the number required based on the budget information from the state. The Committee is concerned that large cuts will be made to the academic side and the administrative cuts will be smaller. One cannot tell if that will occur based upon the information

provided. There was no guarantee that the cuts would be equivalent on both sides. The amount to cut was purposely large so the administration could have flexibility, but the Blue Ribbon Committee does not know what that flexibility means.

The Blue Ribbon Committee thought the most important information was the information from the Deans. If the Committee could see the cuts recommended by the Deans, it might prioritize them based on the rationale for the cuts given by the Deans. Although the Committee originally had been promised the information from the Deans, it now appears that will not be forthcoming.

The Blue Ribbon Committee, Mr. Romano said, is somewhat frustrated and unsure how to proceed. It will continue to meet, but it cannot make recommendations.

Ms. Sengstock MOVED the following:

The Academic Senate supports the request of the Policy Committee for the information in Mr. Wolfson's e-mail message of April 29, 2011, to President Gilmour and urges the administration to provide it forthwith.

SECONDED. PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

#### B. Proceedings of the Policy Committee

The Academic Senate received the Proceedings of the Policy Committee meetings of March 28, 2011, April 4, 2011, April 11, 2011, and April 18, 2011. They are attached to these Senate Proceedings as Appendix A.

### IV. COMMITTEE REPORTS

#### A. Curriculum and Instruction Committee

Ms. Bielat gave the report on behalf of the Curriculum and Instruction Committee. The Policy Committee requested that the C&I Committee review several issues and reports. The first issue was related to a student's publishing her thesis containing data from a research project involving many parties. There were ethical issues that needed to be addressed. The Committee recommended that the Graduate School lead in the development of a compact or agreement to clarify the rights and responsibilities of faculty, research assistants, and students. This resulted in the *Wayne State University Guideline for Creating Faculty-Student Compacts*, draft dated February 15, 2011. The Committee approved a

motion supporting the Guideline at its April meeting and submitted it to the Policy Committee.

In January the Policy Committee asked the C&I Committee to address curriculum issues and provide feedback to the proposal to move the Computer Science Department from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences to the College of Engineering. The Committee Chair, Karen Feathers, attended multi-committee meetings as the C&I representative. The Committee submitted its report, as requested, to the Faculty Affairs Committee detailing several curriculum-related issues, which were incorporated into the final report compiled and submitted to the Policy Committee by Ms. Sengstock.

The Policy Committee asked the C&I Committee to comment and vote on the *Parking Operations: 5-Year Business Plan*. The Committee submitted its comments and vote in February.

In March the Policy Committee asked the C&I Committee to provide feedback on the *Retention Implementation Task Force Final Report*. Committee members generally supported the Retention Report but felt there were some areas not discussed that should be part of the retention plan implementation. C&I submitted a report on the retention plan to the Policy Committee supporting the recommendations of the Final Report along with additional recommendations regarding implementation.

At the April C&I meeting, Laura Woodward, Interim Director of Testing, Evaluation & Research, Kristi Verbecke, Assistant Director, Office for Teaching and Learning, Hamid Siddiqui, Testing, Evaluation & Research, and Timothy Spannaus, Program Coordinator, Instructional Technology, College of Education, discussed the student evaluation of teaching. Dr. Woodward presented various statistical analyses regarding return rates, impact of student interest on scores, etc. She also presented information on an outside vendor that provides student evaluation management services, such as data gathering, report generation, and tracking. The service allows for real-time reporting of SET data. Given concerns expressed last year by the C&I Committee regarding the SET especially related to the evaluation of online teaching, the SET process, question items, the report of SET scores, and their use in faculty evaluations, the C&I Committee recommended that, before considering whether to retain outside services for SET management, the aforementioned issues in addition to the issues in the ASSET (Academic

Senate Student Evaluation of Teaching) Report of 1995 be thoroughly examined. The C&I Committee sent a memo to the Policy Committee requesting that a 2N committee be formed to investigate and make recommendations on the composition, collection, dissemination, and use of the SET.

Ms. Bielat thanked Karen Feathers for her leadership during the past year and thanked the members of the C&I Committee for their work.

In response to a question about the student's publishing her thesis, Ms. Bielat said the C&I Committee recommended accepting the Guideline developed by the Graduate Council. The Guideline is not a set policy, but a set of recommendations from which faculty or departments might choose to create policies for their particular situations to guide ethical behavior involving research data. Mr. Wolfson said that the specific case that sparked the issue was handled by the administration. The proposed policy is still in draft form.

B. Facilities, Support Services and Technology Committee

Ms. Charbonneau, the Chair of the Facilities, Support Services and Technology Committee, was unable to attend the meeting, but she submitted the Committee's Annual Report, which is attached to these Proceedings as Appendix B.

C. Faculty Affairs Committee

Ms. Sengstock, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, reported on the work the Committee carried out this year. The Committee met six times and considered seven issues. For over a year, the Committee has been working on the effectiveness of faculty mentoring. It developed a survey and thanks to Elizabeth Puscheck and to Kelley Skillin from the Provost's Office, the survey was carried out this year. The analysis of the data has not been completed.

The Faculty Affairs Committee dealt with the ethics issue where a student published her Master's thesis as though it were an individual project although it involved several people in the research group in which she worked. The FAC did not like the Guideline developed by the Graduate Council because it did not include sanctions. The Guideline suggests how faculty might advise students of proper professional behavior, but does not mention consequences if they do not observe the guidelines.

FAC was one of the committees involved in evaluating the proposal to transfer the Department of Computer Science.

The FAC commented on the *Retention Implementation Task Force Final Report*. The Committee was asked to consider a complaint from one of the Review Advisory Panels about the report form. The Committee made suggestions about how to deal with the situation.

The FAC was asked to deal with a faculty concern about the loss of reserve books from the Libraries. The problem has increased because of reduced staff to monitor the exits in the Libraries. The Committee suggested that the Libraries return to the enforcement policies used in the past.

A member asked the Committee about developing appropriate tenure standards for clinical faculty. The Committee suggested they consult with the AAUP-AFT about the policies for clinical faculty review in the Agreement between the University and the AAUP-AFT.

Ms. Sengstock thanked the Committee members for their hard work.

The Annual Report of the Faculty Affairs Committee is attached to these Proceedings as Appendix C.

D. Research Committee

Mr. Cinabro, the Chair of the Research Committee, thanked the members of the Committee and the members of the University community who attended meetings to provide information. The Committee met six times and it hosted a special meeting about the students' publishing of theses. The Committee tried to get a new Research Incentive Program in place, but it remains in limbo. In the fall the Committee will renew its advocacy for an incentive program.

The Research Committee looked into the Animal Research Protocol Review program that was set up because it is expected that the National Institutes of Health (NIH) will mandate such a program. While no one likes being reviewed, the program is valuable in keeping the protocols up-to-date.

The Committee held a meeting about the issues related to the publication of students' theses. The Research Committee concluded that it was impossible to ban the publication of students'

theses but students should be informed about their responsibilities to their research partners. Advisors should discuss with students the ethical conduct of research. The Research Committee commented on the draft Graduate Compact developed by the Graduate Council.

The Research Committee reviewed a proposed revision to the University Statutes that would allow restricted research. The Vice President for Research would be able to grant waivers at the request of principal investigators and evidence that the people working on the project have been informed that the project on which they're working might have publication restrictions. If the principal investigator disagrees with the decision of the Vice President, he/she may appeal to a 2N committee, which would review the decision.

The Chair of the Research Committee regularly meets with the Associate Vice President for Research to exchange views and information on research matters. The Research Committee reviewed and commented on the plans, which have since been implemented, for an electronic research effort reporting system. The Committee reviewed and commented on the plan to move the Department of Computer Science from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences to the College of Engineering. The NIH now requires that any publications be publicly available. The University Library has developed tools to make it easy to put the publications on-line. The Office of the Vice President for Research sought the opinions of the Committee on new programs to stimulate research. The report *How the University Supports Research* was presented to the Senate in April 2010. The Committee finalized the report this academic year and submitted it to the Policy Committee.

The Annual Report of the Research Committee is attached as Appendix D.

Mr. Mordukovich asked about the status of the research incentive program. Mr. Cinabro said that because of the uncertainty of the budget no one wants to commit to spending money on a new program. He wants to reopen the discussion of the research incentive when the budget is known for next year.

#### E. Student Affairs Committee

Naida Simon, the Chair of the Student Affairs Committee, presented the report. The Committee met seven times during the 2010-2011 academic year. The directors of various student services

units were invited to the meetings to inform the Committee about the services their units provide, including Counseling and Psychological Services, the Student Health Center, which is the nurse practitioner managed health clinic, the Office of International Students and Scholars, Undergraduate Admissions, the University Advising Center, the Office of Student Financial Aid, and Housing and Student Center Operations. The Committee plans to invite the Directors of Student Disability Services, the Academic Success Center, and Career Services to meet with the Committee next year.

The Committee also reviewed and commented on the move of the Department of Computer Science. The SAC surveyed Computer Science students to get their opinions about the move and analyzed the data.

The SAC contacted the Division of Computing and Information Technology and the Registrar's Office in an effort to determine if faculty could obtain photographs of their students. It can be done and is in the testing phase.

Two members of the SAC served on the Housing Market Analysis Committee. Timothy Michael, Director of Housing, received a \$40,000 grant to review WSU's housing to see if it met standards. The Housing Office hired the Brailsford and Dunlavey Company to survey students to determine if the University was meeting students' housing needs. The survey showed that most students like the housing, but some would like a different type of housing.

The Policy Committee asked the SAC to make recommendations on how to prevent the removal of reserve textbooks from the Libraries. The Library System purchases one textbook for every general education course and puts it on reserve. Because of a reduction in staff in the Libraries, students remove the books. They tear chapters from the books but the Library does not have a record who is responsible for the damage. Unless staffing increases to police the use of reserve books, the problems will continue.

The Committee looked at the use of the Fitness Center. Every student pays the \$25 Fitness Center fee when they register, but, at the most, 19% of the students use the facility. Maybe the University should revisit the issue of every student paying the fee when so few students use it.

A member brought to the SAC the subject of handling disruptive students. The Committee

learned that the University has a Student Update and Information Team (SUIT) consisting of the Dean of Students, the General Counsel, and the Chief of Police, which meets every other week to deal with disruptive students. When a student threatens suicide he/she is suspended. The Committee will carry this issue forward to next year to meet with the General Counsel and the Chief of Police to discuss the issue.

The Committee worked on the "broken audit" or help@wayne.edu project, a joint venture with the Student Senate. If employees or students see something that is not working, they can report the problem and it will be fixed.

The Committee commented on the *Final Report of the Retention Implementation Task Force* and the *Parking Operations: 5 Year Business Plan*.

Ms. Simon thanked the Committee members for their work.

Mr. MacArthur asked what type of housing students would like. Ms. Simon said students want more apartment-style housing. However, 87% of the survey's respondents were pleased with the housing we have.

V. RECOGNITION OF PRESIDENT SEYMOUR J. WOLFSON

In recognition of Mr. Wolfson's thirteen years as Senate President, Mr. Romano presented him with a plaque that reads as follows:

The Academic Senate of Wayne State University recognizes and applauds Seymour J. Wolfson for thirteen years of extraordinary service and outstanding leadership as President.

In addition, the members of the Senate presented Mr. Wolfson with a gift of an iPad2.

Mr. Wolfson thanked the members for their generosity and for working together on the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT: It was MOVED and SECONDED to ADJOURN the meeting. PASSED. The meeting adjourned at 3:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Seymour J. Wolfson  
President, Academic Senate

After the meeting, a reception was held in honor of Mr. Wolfson.