

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY – ACADEMIC SENATE
Official Proceedings

May 8, 2013

Members Present: Margaret E. Winters, Interim Provost, Chair; Louis J. Romano, President, Academic Senate; Lisa Alexander; Basim Asmar; Linda Beale; Paul Beavers; Tamara Bray; David Cinabro; Donald DeGracia; Heather Dillaway; Cheryl Dove; Jane Fitzgibbon; Moira Fracassa; Nancy George; Ewa Golebiowska; Ellen Holmes; Avril Gene Holt; Renee Hoogland; Michael Horn; David Kessel; Kafi Kumasi; Liza Lagman-Sperl; Lawrence Lemke; Rodger MacArthur; Brian Madigan; Kypros Markou; Bryan Morrow; James Moseley; Jennifer Sheridan Moss; Patrick Mueller; Abhilash Pandya; Charles Parrish; T. R. Reddy; Robert Reynolds; Michele Ronnick; Brad Roth; Linea Rydstedt; Mary Sengstock; Naida Simon; William Slater; Richard Smith; Beena Sood; Ronald Thomas; Ellen Tisdale; Harley Tse; Ricardo Villarosa; William Volz; Judith Whittum-Hudson; Mary Width; Jeffrey Withey; James Woodyard

Members Absent with Notice: Ivan Avrutsky; Abhijit Biswas; Victoria Dallas; Karen Feathers; Maria Ferreira; Judith Fouladbakhsh; Andre Furtado; Maik Hutteman; James Martin; Jason Mateika; Michael McIntyre; Victoria Pardo; Debra Patterson; Alexey Petrov; Heather Sandlin; Ghulam Saydain; James Sondheimer; Karen Tonso; Anca Vlasopolos; Derek Wildman

Members Absent: Jennifer Beebe-Dimmer; Barbara Bosch; Randall Commissaris; Mary Cooney; Nabanita Datta; Li Hsieh; Howard Matthew; Jeffrey Potoff; Elizabeth Puscheck; Daniel Rappolee; Senthil Sundaram; Lee Wurm

Others Present: Geraldine Brown, TRIO; Allan Gilmour, President; Gloria Heppner, Associate Vice President for Research; Alan Jacobson, Office of Budget, Planning and Analysis; Tahrira Khanom, Office of the Academic Senate; Henry Robinson, APEX; Phyllis Vroom, Deputy President

CALL TO ORDER: This regularly scheduled meeting of the Academic Senate was called to order by Interim Provost Margaret Winters at 1:36 p.m. The meeting was held in the Bernath Auditorium in the Undergraduate Library.

I. COMMENTS FROM THE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT

President Gilmour, who is retiring from the University at the end of June, said that the Presidential Search Advisory Committee submitted to the Board of Governors its list of candidates for the presidency. The Board has interviewed each of the candidates and has checked their references. Board member Gary Pollard hopes to have a decision in the next few weeks.

President Gilmour thanked Phyllis Vroom for her service to the University as Deputy President since June 2012.

The President addressed budgetary issues. The state legislature will not level the sanctions it had threatened against the University for negotiating an eight-year contract with the AAUP-AFT. President Gilmour thinks the contract is balanced and that it provides stability. A year ago, the legislature applied metrics to the budget allocations to universities. They were detrimental to Wayne State because of our low graduation rate. The metrics did not include Pell Grant students and did not focus enough on research. Last year, the three research universities received the smallest percentage increase in the state appropriation; this, he said, should not happen. It is President Gilmour's understanding that the Governor wants to continue the same metrics. The House of Representatives and the Senate would provide no appropriation to universities that increase their tuition too much even if they meet the other metrics. The Governor does not want universities to increase tuition more than 4% and the legislature does not want them to increase tuition more than 3%.

The repeated cuts over the years have made budgeting for next year very difficult. The schools and colleges and the administrative units are undergoing review in developing the budget. President Gilmour believes undergraduate tuition is too low but it takes a lot of courage to have large tuition increases. The tradeoffs between cost reductions and tuition increases will be presented to the Board of Governors. There are no other substantial sources of income. President Gilmour believes the University has an unstable financial situation with costs and revenues out of line.

The administration will review financial aid to see if changes should be made. There is fair evidence that the University has given too much aid to freshmen and not enough to juniors and seniors. This is evidenced in the retention rate of sophomores to juniors and juniors to seniors. The University is under pressure to expand research. The National Institutes of Health has not grown in the last few years and now it is affected by the sequestration. The University must turn around the decrease in research. This involves new faculty and new researchers. The Office of the Vice President for Research has submitted a set of recommendations that offer seven new awards for research. In the past the research supported by that fund has had a very good return.

President Gilmour mentioned recent accomplishments. The Perinatal Research Branch was renewed; the award is for \$166 million over ten years. The researchers at the PRB have done extremely good work. Construction of the Multidisciplinary Biomedical Research Building has begun. Other facilities programs are underway, including a facility across from Macomb Community College's south campus. The renovation of the reflecting pool and the sculpture garden that are part of the McGregor Memorial Conference Center have been completed; the rededication was held on May 1. The McGregor Fund has donated more money to Wayne State than any other beneficiary of that fund. David Whitney and his wife, the daughter of Tracy McGregor contributed a sizeable amount into the fund that was started by Mr. McGregor. Some members of the Board of the McGregor Fund attended the rededication. The President would like to have the pool around the DeRoy Auditorium repaired but apparently that is more complicated than the repair of the McGregor pool.

The Detroit Revitalization Fellows Program began in 2011 under the leadership of Ahmad Ezzeddine, the Associate Vice President for Educational Outreach and International Programs. The process is underway to select the second cohort of fellows. The Program has received about 430 applications for 20 positions.

The administration signed an agreement to purchase the building that housed the Detroit Institute for Children on Woodward Avenue at Kirby. The School of Social Work will move into the space because it has outgrown its current facility. Design work for renovation of the Student Center Building has begun. Phase 1 of the curb-appeal initiative was carried out a couple of years ago and phase 2 is about 75% complete. In this initiative, graduate students walked around campus and found problems that needed to be fixed. Phase 1 had 225 projects, phase 2 has more than 300. Phase 3, which will begin soon, will focus on classrooms and classroom buildings. Progress has been made in saving money in purchasing and in energy conservation. The new classrooms on the fourth floor of State Hall are a big success. After a long and difficult negotiation, the contract between the University and the AAUP-AFT was ratified.

President Gilmour asked that faculty, deans, and staff telephone the students who were admitted but have not accepted encouraging them to come to WSU. The applicants need to know that Wayne State has a lot to offer. Dean of the Honors College Jerry Herron has mentioned that the grade point average of the students who were admitted to the Honors College last fall was close to 4.0 and their ACT score averaged 29.

Enrollment has declined to about 28,000 students. If that trend continues, the University will have to resize. Resizing will cover the whole University. The population of Michigan has been declining and the high school cohort has been declining, but about 90,000 or 100,000 students graduate from Michigan high schools every year and Wayne State would like its unfair share.

Joint committees of the Administration and the AAUP-AFT will be formed to report on the issues of online education and the health care insurance program. One group of people believes online learning is the panacea for education and another believes online learning will never work. The President believes the answer is somewhere in the middle, but that what works in 2015 may not work years in the future. Education needs to be flexible and to adapt as times change.

Faculty have expressed the desire for Marketing and Communications to publish more information about what faculty do. However, the President said, faculty, Deans, and Chairs have to let them know what is going on in the classrooms and laboratories.

President Gilmour will leave the presidency in the summer. He will leave with pride knowing all of the good the University has done and the opportunities that lay ahead. However, he has found that the University is too negative about itself and about each other. Sometimes it appears that we believe we are a legislative investigative committee that approaches people with the belief that they have made a mistake and if they ask enough questions they will find that the people made a mistake. The President asked that people assume that others are doing a good job and want to do their best.

Being President of Wayne State, he said, has been an honor. He said that people should take pride in what they are doing and let other people know what they are doing. Wayne State has many brilliant and dedicated people. There are many areas where people need to work together.

With reluctance, the President addressed the issue of culture at the University. Respecting others' work and their ability to think will improve the culture. If there are disagreements, the differing positions should be discussed civilly.

President Gilmour ended by thanking the faculty and academic staff for all they do, for their excellence, their caring, their tenacity, and for giving him an excellent education. He is proud of the work that the University does and he is proud of the faculty and staff of the University. Each time they walk into a classroom, a lab, an operating room, or a lecture hall, they change

the world a little bit, and for that the University and he are grateful.

II. APPROVAL OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

April 3, 2013

It was MOVED and SECONDED to APPROVE the Proceedings of the Academic Senate meeting of April 3, 2013. PASSED.

III. REPORT OF THE SENATE PRESIDENT

A. Report and Announcements

A proposal to dissolve the Department of Clinical and Translational Science (DCaTS) was discussed at the May 1, 2013, meeting of the Board of Governors Academic Affairs Committee. At that meeting, it was pointed out that neither the plan nor the procedures that would normally be followed to dissolve a department that reports to the Provost, which is essentially a college, had been followed. There was no consultation with faculty at the Medical School or with the Executive Committee of the School's Faculty Senate. The Chair of the Department was not consulted; he was told that the Department would be dissolved.

The Senate's Budget Committee met with Robert Sokol, the Chair of DCaTS, to get his perspective on the situation. The plan proposed to the Board of Governors would divide the responsibilities for clinical and translational research between the Medical School and the Office of the Vice President for Research. Linda Beale, the faculty representative to the Board Committee, described to the Committee what the Senate members had learned and that there would be a vacuum in leadership if the responsibilities were divided. The Budget Committee was not convinced that the University would save much money as a result of the dissolution. There was no plan in place for moving forward in the area of clinical and translational research. The stated goal of the National Institutes of Health is the transfer of basic science results to the clinic. Most funding will be for applications that show this transition. The Budget Committee believes clinical and translational science should be one area that the University should focus its research effort. Three members of the Board's Academic Affairs Committee agreed with the faculty and recommended that the administration consult with faculty. Hopefully, Mr. Romano said, the faculty will be able to provide ideas on how to focus research in this area.

Mr. Romano updated the Senate about two committees on which he serves: the proposed new laboratory classroom facility committee and the Fountain Court Renovation Project Committee. The Budget and Policy Committees learned of the plan to construct a new laboratory classroom building when the Capital Outlay Budget Request was submitted to the Board of Governors. The Senate members questioned the need for the facility. The plan is to construct a three-story building in the area that is now the parking lot for the Physics Building. The facility would have about 30 classrooms divided into three types: (1) wet labs with water and gas that are used in chemistry; (2) dry labs that are basically tables used in physics and biology; and (3) computer labs that would be used mostly by engineering and physics. More recently he learned that engineering labs might be included in the building. The rationale for the facility is twofold. Physics needs to bring its laboratories up to code, which would cost \$3 million or \$4 million. Research space is needed. Sometime ago Chairs and Deans proposed a building to house several science departments and classrooms, which would cost about \$100 million. That building would replace the Life Sciences Building, which is not well constructed and which is costing the University about \$500,000 a year for utilities. Demolition of Life Sciences would cost less than the yearly cost to maintain it. The proposal in the Capital Outlay Budget Request for a Science and Engineering lab classroom building would be a compromise between building a completely new building with a lot of research space and doing nothing. The cost would be about \$28 million, \$18 million for the new building and \$10 million to renovate some of the labs in the Physics Building that faculty will vacate.

Mr. Romano next reported on the work of the committee looking at the renovation of the Fountain Court area. He showed architectural plans for the area that include space to hold gatherings and benches near all paths and under trees. A major concern for Mr. Romano is how the project would be funded. Facilities Planning and Management has not provided a cost estimate, but it would be a major commitment. It is hoped that the Development Office would find a donor to cover the cost.

Mr. Romano took questions from the members.

Ms. Beale asked if the Board of Governors would schedule meetings with the candidates for the University Presidency so that all faculty and staff

would have the opportunity to have input into the decision on the hiring of the new President as has been the tradition. Mr. Romano said that with the Internet the procedure has changed. The search firm told the search committee that candidates are no longer publicly displayed because they would withdraw from consideration immediately. They would be embarrassed if it were known that they were not chosen for the position. Mr. Parrish added that Michigan law was changed so the search for university presidents is no longer subject to the Open Meetings Act. At some point, the candidates have to be vetted and people who know them have to be asked about their performance in past and current positions. Mr. Romano agreed that it would be best if candidates could be vetted by every faculty member but that no longer can happen. Ms. Beale argued against universities following that approach because it is important for academic governance that faculty be involved in the decision. She thinks the faculty who served on the search committee should have advocated for open meetings with the candidates. Mr. Parrish made additional comments. The search committee, he said, was remarkably in consensus about the values of each of the candidates sent forward to the Board of Governors. The committee could accept any of the candidates as President. The search committee, including the faculty members on the committee, interviewed the candidates. Mr. Parrish thought the process was as good as it could be.

B. Proceedings of the Policy Committee

The Academic Senate received the Proceedings of the Policy Committee meetings of March 25, 2013, April 8, 2013, and April 22, 2013 (Appendix A).

April 8, 2013

1. Background Checks

Mr. Roth asked for additional information about the University's contracting with a company to perform background checks on new employees (item 3 in the April 8 Proceedings). Mr. Parrish had raised questions about the initiation of background checks at the Policy Committee. Since then he was informed by Interim Provost Winters that the policy has been implemented by Vice President for Finance and Business Operations Rick Nork. Mr. Parrish was concerned that it was not known what information was being gathered. He was not aware of standards for any

positions. If someone would be working with money the standards covering that type of position would be different than knowing the credit score of a potential faculty member. The background checks apply only to new hires. The AAUP-AFT does not advocate for applicants.

Dr. Winters said that the research, not the decision, has been outsourced and the company can provide all information within 24 to 72 hours. There is no prohibition against making an offer and sending a letter of offer contingent upon the check so the check should not delay hiring. The administration does not anticipate that much of importance will be found. The discussion about conducting the checks began in 2008. If sufficient negative information were found for a potential employee for a non-academic job, the Human Resources Office and the Office of the General Counsel would look at the information and, if necessary, would consult with the hiring official. For an academic position, the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs will be involved in the decision. The administration believes it is more dangerous to set up benchmarks than to use the legal tradition of case law upon a policy, meaning that each time a decision has to be made it can build upon the decision before it. A certain amount of common sense has to be used, but it is believed it is better to apply common sense and have some flexibility in making a judgment rather than applying rigid rules.

Mr. Romano was concerned that background checks would impede the hiring of faculty. He asked if this was standard practice in academia. Interim Provost Winters said that Michigan State University, Central Michigan University, Ohio State University, the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, and Virginia Commonwealth University conduct background checks on academic personnel. The University of Michigan is instituting the checks in June. Candidates are told that there will be a background check.

Ms. Dove had been told that the background checks would apply to student employees, both regular student assistants and work study students. What will happen to work study students who receive federal grants but they are not hired as a result of the background check. Also, she asked, how would this impact international students?

Dr. Winters was skeptical that the background check for international students would take only 24 to 72 hours if the company has to contact a foreign country for information. The Human

Resources Office said that it would evaluate the information. If the company cannot get information, Human Resources and the unit hiring the international student would have to make a judgment. Dr. Winters understood Ms. Dove's concerns about work study students, but she did not know if they would be evaluated. She offered to provide more information. The policy has been approved and it will be available in the Administrative Policies and Procedures Manual.

Ms. Beale asked what problem was being addressed by the policy. If it had been discussed since 2008 and a policy was developed, why was the Academic Senate not consulted? How much is the company being paid to perform the background checks? How is the University ensuring that the material the company gathers will be kept confidential? What happens to the material after Human Resources or the Provost's Office reviews it? Does it become part of the employee's personnel file?

Interim Provost Winters said that the information is kept at the company, which is bonded by the federal government for safety and security of the information. As far as consultation, she said that no one in Academic Affairs was involved until very late in the process. In addition, the background checks are a University issue, not just an academic issue. Dr. Winters did not know the cost. As for the reason, she said that it is considered due diligence. With the Internet and more knowledge about a person's past being available, it is considered prudent to conduct background checks. The decision to hire an individual would be based on case law. Credentials will be checked. Dr. Winters suggested that, after six months, the Academic Senate might want to look at the list of the decisions that were made and how case law has been accrued.

Mr. Parrish objected to the Interim Provost's reference to case law. In case law subsequent decisions are made based on previous decisions. If the first decision is bad, why appeal to the first decision? Dr. Winters said that if the first decision is bad, we will have learned from it.

Asked if the policy set out the standards, Dr. Winters said that it did not. If questions about an individual's background arose, personnel in the Human Resources Office, the General Counsel's Office, and the Provost's Office would decide if he/she should be hired. Mr. Parrish believed standards should be established. Personnel changes could result in variability of the information used in the decision.

A member told the Senate that health care providers undergo background checks but the individual pays the cost. Since the checks are mandated by the University, would Human Resources now pay for them? Dr. Winters said that Human Resources is paying for the background checks, and individuals should contact Human Resources directly. The School of Medicine has different processes and the central administration will meet with the administration at the School to discuss the variations.

Mr. Romano said that the Policy Committee would follow-up on the policy and report back. Ms. Dove asked that they get clarification for work study students, student assistants, and international students.

2. Use of Listservs

Mr. Roth asked about the use of listservs (item 9 in the Proceedings). He questioned whether e-mail messages were considered public record and to what extent e-mail users were protected from anyone seeking information on any topic under a Freedom of Information request. He suggested that the Policy Committee look into the question and invite the General Counsel to speak to the Senate about the issue.

Mr. Romano said that Policy Committee's question was who owned the listservs, that is did a college or a cohort of the University own them. Interim Provost Winters replied that the person or entity that set up the listserv owned it. If a Dean set it up, it was that office that would determine if it was a moderated listserv. If a faculty member set it up, it was his or her decision whether it would be moderated. Information about setting up a listserv is available at computing.wayne.edu.

Mr. Woodyard understood Mr. Roth to be asking why the question about ownership had been raised. He explained that a committee in the College of Engineering reviewed the resignation of a Chair in Engineering. After conducting a fact-finding inquiry, the committee wrote a document and the Department passed a vote of no confidence in the Dean. The committee wanted to circulate the document electronically to the entire College, but the Dean blocked its dissemination. Since that time there has been discussion whether the Dean's blocking the circulation was appropriate. University Policy 00-1 *Acceptable Use of Information Technology Resources* indicates that academic freedom must be respected. Out of this discussion the following questions were raised: Who owns the server? What is the interpretation

of the University Policy? What process is used to determine if freedom of speech was abridged? The community as a whole has not discussed these questions.

Mr. Romano said that the Policy Committee believes the listservs cannot be used freely.

IV. MATTERS SUBMITTED BY THE POLICY COMMITTEE

A. Proposal to Amend Article IV, Section 3 of the Bylaws

Mr. Romano explained that at the April 3 Senate meeting a motion was introduced to amend the Bylaws. The Bylaws require five nominees to fill two member-at-large positions. Occasionally it is difficult to get five nominees. The amendment would allow the Senate to hold the election with fewer than five persons. At the April meeting Mr. Reynolds proposed that the Bylaws not require nominees to get ten signatures from two colleges to run for the at-large positions. His amendment would retain the requirement to have five nomi-nees to hold the election. The Policy Committee and the Elections Committee discussed Mr. Reynold's proposal. The consensus was to continue the requirement for signatures, believing it was important that people running for the Senate have the support of their colleagues. The Elections Committee would continue to try to get five nominees, but if they were not able to do so, the election would go forward.

Mr. Reynolds said that he is the Chair of the Election Committee in the College of Engineering. The College is holding its election to replace one of its representatives on the Senate. It used to require signatures for nomination. It no longer does and it now has no trouble finding nominees. Six candidates are running to fill one seat on the Senate.

The current language in Article IV, Section 3 of the Bylaws reads:

Nominations for members-at-large shall be made by petition signed by at least ten eligible voters representing two or more colleges, schools, or divisions of the University which are represented in the Academic Senate as prescribed in Article III, Section 2 above. No faculty member may sign more nominating petitions than there are offices to fill. The Elections Committee shall make additional nominations if necessary to bring the total up to five persons when the number to be elected is two, and twice the number to be elected when that number is more than two.

If amended, the language would read as follows, with the proposed addition in bold print.

Section 3. Nominations

Nominations for members-at-large shall be made by petition signed by at least ten eligible voters representing two or more colleges, schools, or divisions of the University which are represented in the Academic Senate as prescribed in Article III, Section 2 above. No faculty member may sign more nominating petitions than there are offices to fill. The Elections Committee shall make additional nominations if necessary to bring the total up to five persons when the number to be elected is two, and twice the number to be elected when that number is more than two. **If the Elections Committee is unable to identify sufficient additional persons willing to run for election, the member-at-large election can be held with fewer than five persons.**

Mr. Romano pointed out that to change the Bylaws a majority of Senate members, not a majority of the members present and voting, must approve the amendment.

The vote on the proposed amendment was taken. FAILED.

It was MOVED and SECONDED to return the proposed amendment to the Senate in September 2013. PASSED.

V. YEAR-END COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Curriculum and Instruction Committee

Mr. Pandya made the report. Karen Feathers chaired the Committee during the first half of the year and Mr. Pandya chaired the Committee during the second half. One of the main issues that the Committee studied was Massively Open On-line Courses (MOOC). James Mazoue, the Director of On-line Programs, met with the Committee. This is an on-going issue. The government, in the future, may allow granting credit for MOOCs.

Monica Brockmeyer, Interim Associate Provost for Student Success, and Monica Davie, Director of the Academic Pathways for Excellence (APEX) Scholars Program attended a meeting to report on the initial results of the APEX Bridge Program. CIC decided to give the Program more time before looking at the success of the program.

Another issue was how the student evaluation of teaching (SET) scores are assessed. Should the faculty be present to collect the evaluations? Does anything underhanded occur when students return the completed forms? Mathew Ouellett, the Associate Provost and Director of the Office for Teaching and Learning, attends the CIC meetings. He chairs a committee that is reviewing the SET.

Joseph Rankin, the Interim Associate Provost for Undergraduate Affairs, is the administrative liaison to the CIC. He sought input from the Committee about a common set of requirements for syllabi for every course. This has been implemented on Blackboard.

Mr. Rankin also brought to the Committee the need to have course learning outcomes as required by the Higher Learning Commission for the upcoming accreditation process.

The Committee talked about the need to improve the scheduling of courses. Software is available that coordinates the time when faculty are available and how courses are related. Improving course scheduling might reduce the time to graduation. Gabriel Sauvie, the Scheduling Manager, and Kurt Krushinska, Senior Associate Registrar, met with the Committee. CIC asked that the system include a wait list for classes.

Professor of Chemistry Andrew Feig is leading an effort to get funding from the National Science Foundation for evidence-based reform within the University. CIC will support him in submitting the application that is due in the summer.

Mr. Pandya thanked the members of CIC and the guests who attended the meetings.

The Annual Report of the Curriculum and Instruction Committee is attached to these Proceedings as Appendix B.

B. Elections Committee

Mr. Woodyard, the Chair of the Elections Committee, reviewed the Committee's work. The Committee conducted the election of the Policy Committee at the September 5, 2012, Academic Senate meeting. It presented the apportionment for the 2013-2014 academic year at the March 6, 2013, meeting. The member-at-large election was held with two representatives being elected for three-year terms. The President of the Senate was elected at the April 3 meeting. Anca

Vlasopolos resigned from her position as member-at-large. As stated in the Bylaws, the alternate, Moira Fracassa, was contacted and agreed to fill the position. The election of the faculty and academic staff hearing panels was carried out as mandated by the Board of Governors Statute.

In the winter term, the Committee determines the number of representatives to which each unit is entitled based on the number of full-time and at least one-half fractional time faculty and academic staff in the unit. The Human Resources office provides the list of faculty and academic staff members but a great deal of work has to be done to determine if some of the persons listed are eligible to serve. Mr. Woodyard recommended that the Provost's Office, which rules on a person's eligibility, develop the list rather than Human Resources.

Mr. Woodyard thanked the members of the Committee for their work this past year.

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

C. Facilities, Support Services and Technology Committee

Ms. Whittum-Hudson chaired the FSST Committee. She reported that the Committee met six times in addition to a joint meeting with the Budget Committee. She thanked the members of the Committee and the liaisons for their hard work this past year.

In October Associate Vice President and Chief Information Officer Joseph Sawasky, who serves as the administration liaison to the FSST, gave an overview of the changes and additions that had been made to the computing enterprise in recent months.

In November, Vice President for Finance and Business Operations Richard Nork and members of his division discussed insurance coverage and power outages, floods, and other calamities including thefts. A Risk Management Overview is available regarding processes. The Capital Outlay priorities were discussed with Mr. Nork in relation to the 2020 Master Plan. The priorities were presented to the State prior to the FSST meeting and prior to vetting by the Board of Governors. The plan was modified for the joint meeting of the Senate's Budget and FSST Committees on January 9, 2013. At this latter meeting there was extensive discussion about

the lack of consultation with faculty regarding priorities for undergraduate education. At the February meeting of the FSST Committee the members expressed concern about the disconnect between some of the projects planned and the projected student enrollment over the next several years.

Parking innovations, renovations, and pricing were the topic at the December meeting. The Committee received updates of the May 2012 Parking and Transportation Services (PTS) five-year plan. Divergences from the Parking Task Force recommendations and current PTS plan were discussed at length, in particular the need to protect students from increased charges. The recommendations of the Walker parking consultant group will be analyzed annually.

In February the committee discussed the cost of repairs, renovations, and moving of equipment between buildings. The lack of faculty input into decision making and inaccurate estimates for services were among the concerns. Mr. Avrutsky prepared a memo about the faculty's concerns that was sent to Mr. Nork, with copies to Vice President for Research Hilary Ratner and President Allan Gilmour.

In April Mr. Nork, Associate Vice President for Facilities Planning and Management James Sears, and Director of Small Capital/Customer Funded Construction Steven Pecic met with the FSST Committee to clarify the issues raised in the memo. Mr. Sears presented the data and explanations of how pricing for services of design, repairs/renovations are derived. There are plans to make the process of bids, commitments and cost-effectiveness more transparent. More input from faculty in these processes will be facilitated. Modifications in choices of preferred vendors from the State lists will be implemented to find the best value for services, perhaps using the model of WayneBuy. Mr. Sears has a presentation on Key Performance Indicators that he would like to present to FSST. The FSST Committee recommends that the Research Committee be invited to the presentation, unless the Senate President thinks it would be of value for the entire Senate.

In March, the committee met in the newly renovated/reconfigured classrooms on the fourth floor of State Hall. Dean of the Library System Sandra Yee made a presentation describing the genesis of the process with many focus groups giving input into needs for space. The

Committee toured the classrooms. The Committee was quite enthused about the forward thinking of the space design.

The Annual Report of the Facilities, Support Services and Technology Committee is attached to these Proceedings as Appendix D.

D. Faculty Affairs Committee

Ms. Moss chaired the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC). She reported that the Committee focused on the mentoring of faculty. Although the vast majority of faculty on the tenure track do get tenure, others leave the University before they are tenured. The cost of faculty searches and the cost of start-up packages are high. In addition, a department may not be able to fill that faculty line again. Departments need to mentor faculty appropriately.

Another issue related to mentoring is the number of faculty who achieve the rank of associate professor and are not promoted to professor. The people who stagnate at the rank of associate professor tend to be female. Mentoring of associate professors to promote them to full professor could be very fruitful.

The Committee began a statistical analysis that affirmed the observations that it had made. The data needs to be gathered and analyzed. Once the data has been analyzed, the Committee recommends that a formal mentoring program be implemented and be introduced by someone with expertise in mentoring. Department Chairs have not been held accountable for the career trajectory of their faculty. The Deans should be held accountable, also, and the Provost should be involved in the process as well. The University makes an investment when it hires faculty. It cannot afford to lose that investment by faculty leaving.

Mr. Reynolds spoke in favor of a strong mentoring program for senior faculty, as well. Ms. Moss agreed. One of the problems on the campus is isolation. Campuses that have a well-established well-run mentoring system integrate the junior and senior faculty and they learn from each other. Mentoring may initiate relationships that otherwise would not happen.

Mr. Pandya asked if there was a way to standardize the expectations for promotion and tenure, what the faculty need to have accomplished at the different levels, such as

funding. There seemed to be variation from year-to-year.

Ms. Moss said that the FAC discussed the fact that expectations change, that a new Chair might decide the rules that applied in the past no longer apply. If faculty seeking promotion or tenure have a support system the people in that system could serve as the memory of the department to know what standards were in place when the junior faculty member was hired. Mr. Romano said that each department is supposed to have factors that describe what is required. He has found that the factors are vague and are open to different interpretations. Sometimes they do change when a department gets a new Chair. He believes the Dean and the Provost should control the process.

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

E. Research Committee

David Oupicky chaired the Research Committee in the fall. David Kessel assumed the chair in the winter term after Mr. Oupicky left the University. Mr. Kessel reported that the Committee met with Vice President for Research Hilary Ratner about the state of research at the University. She explained that WSU is not keeping up with other universities due to several factors including the amount of endowments and tuition rates at the other institutions. However, the research enterprise at Wayne State is holding steady. Mr. Kessel has confidence that Associate Vice Presidents for Research Gloria Heppner and Joseph Dunbar will do their best to support research.

The Research Committee met with Kenneth Doherty, Assistant Vice President for Procurement and Strategic Sourcing, when ProCard purchases were limited to \$200. The policy was rescinded.

The most interesting interview, Mr. Kessel said, was with Donal O'Leary, who heads the research committee of the School of Medicine, where about three quarters of the University's research is conducted. Mr. O'Leary pointed out the same problems that the Senate's Research Committee identified, that there is not enough consultation on research issues. For example, the School of Medicine decided they would no longer launder lab coats, which seems trivial until you realize what some of the lab coats are exposed to. The

loading dock was moved. There is a lot of anxiety in research. The National Institutes of Health is funding 7% of the grants that are submitted. With the amount of anxiety present, faculty need to be consulted. During the next year, the Research Committee must promote several issues including the need for consultation and conflict of interest.

Mr. Reynolds noted that one of the discussions in the Research Committee was about post-tenure review and how it might be added to contracts and how it might affect faculty hiring.

Mr. Parrish responded to Mr. Reynolds's comments. There is no post-tenure review in the Agreement between the University and the AAUP-AFT. The power of the administration to review tenure is the same as in the past. In the current contract if, in the view of a department's salary committee, a tenured faculty member is performing substantially below the factors and the expectations, that person may become a candidate for mentoring. If the salary committee believes mentoring is necessary, it would make a recommendation to the Department Chair. If the Chair agrees, a mentoring committee would be established that would consist of faculty selected by the salary committee, faculty selected by the Department Chair, and faculty selected by the person being mentored. The mentoring process can be as long as three years. The AAUP-AFT does not think this is an onerous program. If the AAUP-AFT finds that Chairs are trying to make the process punitive, it will respond vigorously. The purpose of the program is to help faculty. The faculty member may opt out of the mentoring program by taking on more teaching.

The Annual Report of the Research Committee is attached to these Proceedings as Appendix F.

F. Student Affairs Committee

Ms. Simon, the Chair of the SAC, thanked the Committee for its diligence in carrying out its functions. She also thanked Michele Ronnick for substituting as Chair while Ms. Simon was ill and Mr. Woodyard, who chaired the Student Survey Committee. Five speakers met with the SAC during the year. Dr. Dwayne Simmons from the University of California, Los Angeles, who heads UCLA's minority undergraduate research program was a guest on campus at the time of an SAC meeting and attended the meeting. He made some very interesting observations, one of which is that minority at-risk students are strongly advised not to attend college full time. Their at-

risk students graduate. Wayne State pushes at-risk students to attend full time, and they do not graduate.

The SAC dealt with five issues. First was the issue of part-time graduate student employees being charged employee parking rates rather than student rates. Mr. Martin was successful in getting the overcharge rescinded. The second issue was on-line teaching. Third was the renovation of the Student Center Building. Timothy Michael, Vice President for Business and Auxiliary Operations, invited members of the Student Affairs Committee and members of the Senate to attend a special session with the architects about the renovations. The fourth issue the Committee looked at was the APEX (Academic Pathways for Excellence) Scholars Program. Ms. Simon will pull information about the Program after all the grades for the winter term are submitted. The fifth issue was the Reputation and Customer Service Survey of Students, also known as the Student Survey 2012. The SAC worked with the administration in conducting the survey. Five thousand four hundred sixty-eight students responded to the survey, which is more than double the number of students who responded to the 2010 survey. If the survey is repeated in 2014, the Committee will make recommendations to the administration. When the report of the survey is final, it will be sent to the Senate. The report contains very interesting information about how students view the University and how they see the teaching and the student service units.

The Annual Report of the Student Affairs Committee is attached to these Proceedings as Appendix G.

Thank you

Mr. Romano thanked the Senate members for their service on the committees. He singled out the Chairs for their hard work in heading the committees and for the work they accomplished.

VI. REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

Dr. Winters assumed the position of Interim Provost one month ago. She reported on the events of the last month. The faculty/staff recognition ceremony was held. It was rewarding to see how many people were recognized for teaching, for research, for mentoring, and for graduate student teaching.

The promotion and tenure cycle has ended for the 2012-2013 academic year. There were about 70 applications for promotion or tenure or for both. All who applied were promoted or tenured. The committee was thoughtful and thorough. It was clear that all members of the committee were reading the dossiers and they participated in the discussions. The reception for those who were tenured or promoted was held last week. The new cycle of promotion and tenure for the 2013-2014 academic year has begun.

Graduation, as President Gilmour said, is on May 9 for the general campus and on two consecutive Mondays for Law and Medicine.

The budgetary process continues. Dr. Winters is attending the budget hearings with the Deans and the Vice Presidents. The administration is gathering materials to determine where the necessary cuts will be made. She noted that Mr. McIntyre, who Chairs the Senate's Budget Committee, is attending the hearings and is an enormous help in the deliberations.

Enrollment is slightly up for the spring/summer term and is slightly up for the fall term compared with last year. First time at any college students have not increased. It is very early to know how the fall enrollment will look.

Interim Provost Winters wished the Senate members a very good and productive summer. She reminded them that relaxation is part of being productive after an academic year. She is looking forward to working with the Senate next year.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Louis J. Romano

President, Academic Senate