

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY – ACADEMIC SENATE
Official Proceedings

May 9, 2012

Members Present: Ronald T. Brown, Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, Chair; Louis J. Romano, President, Academic Senate; Lisa Alexander; Basim Asmar; Linda Beale; Paul Beavers; Jennifer Beebe-Dimmer; Ramona Benkert; Abhjit Biswas; Tamara Bray; David Cinabro; Chardin Claybourne; Mary Cooney; Donald DeGracia; Cheryl Dove; Karen Feathers; Maria Ferreira; Jane Fitzgibbon; Moira Fracassa; Judith Fry-McComish; Andre Furtado; Ewa Golebiowska; Avril Genee Holt; Maik Huttemann; David Kessel; Rita Kumar; Kafi Kumasi; Liza Lagman-Sperl; Lawrence Lemke; Rodger MacArthur; Brian Madigan; James Martin; Michael McIntyre; Bryan Morrow; James Moseley; Patrick Mueller; David Oupicky; Abhilash Pandya; Victoria Pardo; Charles Parrish; Debra Patterson; Jeffrey Potoff; Elizabeth Puscheck; T. R. Reddy; Aaron Retish; Robert Reynolds; Brad Roth; Linea Rydstedt; Heather Sandlin; Ghulam Saydain; Mary Sengstock; Naida Simon; William Slater; James Sondheimer; Timothy Stemmler; Senthil Sundaram; Ronald Thomas; Ellen Tisdale; Karen Tonso; Harley Tse; Anca Vlasopolos; William Volz; Judith Whittum-Hudson; Derek Wildman; Jeffrey Withey; Seymour Wolfson; James Woodyard

Members Absent with Notice: Ivan Avrtusky; Veronica Bielat; Kingsley Browne; Victoria Dallas; Nabanita Datta; Michael Horn; Barbara Jones; Boris Mordukhovich; Jennifer Sheridan Moss; Michele Ronnick; Mary Width

Members Absent: Barbara Bosch; Anthony Cacace; Jerry Ku; Janine Lanza; Shawna Lee; Richard Marback; Jason Mateika; Daniel Rappolee; Lee Wurm; Zhe Yang

Others Present: Allan Gilmour, President; Gloria Heppner, Associate Vice President for Research; Alan Jacobson, Office of Budget, Planning and Analysis; Tahrima Khanom, Academic Senate Office; Angela Wisniewski, Academic Senate Office

CALL TO ORDER: This regularly scheduled meeting of the Academic Senate was called to order at 1:30 P.M. by Provost Brown. The meeting was held in the Bernath Auditorium in the Undergraduate Library.

I. COMMENTS FROM THE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT

President Gilmour mentioned that Commencement was held at Ford Field for the first time. The administration will review how well the facilities and the ceremony worked to see if changes should be made. The University, he said, is proud of all of its graduates and the faculty and all of the employees can be proud of the fact that they made it happen. Jerry Linengar, a graduate of Wayne State's Medical School and former astronaut, was the speaker. The Law School and

Medical School soon will hold their commencement ceremonies.

Last week the President held a reception for the faculty who achieved tenure or were promoted this year.

President Gilmour commented on the multi-disciplinary biomedical research building. The old Dagleish Cadillac building will be renovated for the facility. About 450 people will work in the biomedical research building, about half of them will move from other research facilities on the medical campus. With the new facility, the University's research portfolio will increase, its reputation will grow, and the work performed there will save lives. The building that housed the American Beauty Iron company will be demolished. Contrary to news reports, the space the building now occupies will not be a long-term parking lot. The University is working to develop the space.

Six new retail operations are opening near campus. This is an indication that midtown is continuing to grow and prosper. The University is not involved in most of the retail businesses.

In the winter, the Board of Governors approved the new admission process or what is now called student success, combining admissions and student retention. The purpose of the change is to ensure that students who are admitted have a good chance of succeeding. It does no good, he said, to admit students who cannot graduate or to lower academic standards so everyone can graduate. If students are admitted who cannot succeed, their being at Wayne State is at best a diversion from their pursuing a career where they could be successful. President Gilmour expressed his appreciation for the faculty's involvement in the studies that led to the changes and for their input on the recommendations. The President stressed that the University is not trying to exclude people; it is trying to include everyone who can succeed in higher education. The University has increased its recruiting efforts in the City of Detroit and its suburbs, on the west side of the state, and in the Chicago, Toledo, and Cleveland areas.

The President believes improvements have been made in the administrative areas. With the Huron Consulting Group the University has tackled human resources, facilities, admissions, and information technology. The University will soon hire a new head of human resources. The Division of Development and Alumni Affairs is being overhauled. The University is preparing for a capital campaign but it does not have the resources it needs to conduct one now.

The President mentioned the successes of the student athletes. The football team played in the 2011 NCAA Division II national championship game. The women's swimming and diving team won the NCAA Division II championship and the softball team won the 2012 GLIAC tournament title. President Gilmour attended the ceremony for athlete scholars at St. Andrew's Hall. The athletes who were honored have a grade point average of 3.5 or higher. They and their parents filled the hall.

The budget for next year is uncertain because the state government has not finalized its appropriation for the 2012-2013 fiscal year. President Gilmour expects that the University will know the appropriation by the end of May. The state appropriation for WSU has not decreased and it may increase 2% over the current year depending upon the metrics the government uses.

The federal government has tightened eligibility for all federal student assistance. Most assistance is in the form of Pell Grants. Wayne State is the largest user of Pell Grants in Michigan in absolutes and in percentages. The federal government tightened the academic requirements and the number of semesters in which students may receive grants. Students who receive the grants must demonstrate satisfactory academic progress in order to maintain eligibility for future Pell Grants. Due to the changes, the University lost about 1500 students after the fall term, creating a revenue shortfall of as much as \$15 million. President Gilmour expects the University to lose a fairly substantial number of students after the winter term. This results in an enrollment problem, which the University is addressing.

The number of first-time freshmen and transfer students for the fall 2012 term is way up, but the number of continuing undergraduate students is down. The same is true of graduate students. The number of new graduate students is up, but the number of returning students is down, partly because the number of new graduate students was down in the past few years.

President Gilmour met with the Provost and the Council of Deans to talk about the budgetary situation and enrollment. The President will hold meetings with every Dean and Vice President to discuss what can be done to have a balanced budget for fiscal year 2013 while still doing the right thing for the institution. The President wants to look at what is good that needs to be strengthened, what is almost good that can be made better, and what things the University no longer needs to do. The University cannot be everything to everyone regardless of students' interests. After reorganization and cost cutting, the best organizations

come out not worse but at least as good and may be better. Within the month the administration should receive the report of a demographer with information about southeast Michigan's population in the years ahead. The University needs to know the population trends and how many high school students are in the area to plan its future. The University needs to know what will happen to the economy because population loss will affect enrollment. People moving to the area will help the University. The administration will plan as best it can for the future.

When the President and the Provost arrived at Wayne State they found a number of issues that needed immediate attention. President Gilmour believes they have made progress on many of them. The University is facing the issue of enrollment and is moving forward to have the right students and the right faculty. Mistakes and interruptions will occur, but the President believes that the net result will be one of which everyone will be proud.

President Gilmour closed by saying that he is proud of what the faculty and academic staff do and thanked them for their work. He wished the Senate members a good summer.

II. APPROVAL OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

April 4, 2012

It was MOVED and SECONDED to APPROVE the Proceedings of the Academic Senate meeting of April 4, 2012. PASSED.

III. REPORT FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT

A. Report and Announcements

Mr. Romano reported that the potential merger of the Graduate School with the Office of Research has been postponed in favor of taking a holistic look at the Graduate School beginning in the fall to determine what organization would be best for the Graduate School. He assumed that the Senate would be involved in the review.

The Policy Committee met with Judy Tatum, Senior Director of Undergraduate Admissions and New Student Orientation, Monica Brockmeyer, Interim Associate Provost for Student Success, and Robert Kohrman, Associate Vice President for Budget, Planning and Analysis, on April 30 to discuss the new holistic admissions policy and the APEX (Academic Pathways for Excellence) Program. The Policy Committee strongly believes that a remedial reading program should be included in the APEX

Program. It has been added to the Program although initially all students will not be able to participate. The Committee recommended that full-time faculty participate in the curriculum in the summer and fall semesters. Provost Brown added that faculty who are interested in teaching in the Program should contact his office.

Following up on President Gilmour's comments, Mr. Romano said that at the end of each semester the federal government requires universities to verify that all students receiving Pell Grants are making satisfactory academic progress. In addition, the government has reduced the number of semesters that a full-time student can receive a Pell grant to 12. If students are part-time, i.e., taking fewer than 12 credits, they are eligible for 18 semesters of support.

Mr. Romano agreed with President Gilmour's assessment of the Commencement exercises. The Ford Field facilities are beautiful, but there were problems with the sound.

Mr. Volz asked whether the University needed to hire additional financial aid officers to meet the government's requirement to verify students' academic progress each semester. Students will have to write appeals if their GPA falls below 2.0. Will there be adequate staff to help them? Provost Brown said that the University is hiring advisors. If students are near the completion of their degrees the University will try to find money to help them finish. The advisors are working to ensure that if students did not do well in their first semester, they take fewer credits or less rigorous courses. Nearly 60% of Wayne State's students receive Pell Grants, a very high percentage compared with other universities nationwide.

Mr. Furtado thought the faculty needed to identify students who are having trouble in their coursework earlier in the semester. Faculty are able to put notes in STARS, but it takes a while for someone to act upon them. The system needs to be improved so that when a faculty member makes a note in STARS it is acted upon immediately.

Ms. Simon said that if a faculty member makes a note in STARS, they should send a message to the appropriate advisor for the school/college in which the student is registered. In addition, the University has Early Academic Assessment. If faculty used that system students would receive notification that they were at risk. About 80% of the faculty submit the early assessments, but the percentage varies by school/college.

Mr. Parrish thought faculty needed to be educated on how to insert comments in STARS. The Academic Senate is planning to have a presentation about STARS in the fall. The Provost will see that a workshop about STARS is put online. Ms. Simon said that anyone who needed help with STARS could contact her and she would give them a one-on-one tutorial.

Mr. MacArthur asked the average amount of Pell Grants that Wayne's students receive. Provost Brown said that the average is \$5500 per year. The University is trying to assist students, but with 60% of the student body receiving Pell Grants, that is a significant amount of money to cover. Mr. MacArthur asked if the University was letting students know that there might be other options for covering their expenses. The Provost said that the University was working with students to keep them in school.

Mr. Wolfson noted that the loss of 1500 students between the fall and winter terms has an impact on the budget. Provost Brown agreed that it did have an impact, but he did not have the details at the meeting.

B. Proceedings of the Policy Committee

The Academic Senate received the Proceedings of the Policy Committee meetings of March 26, 2012, April 2, 2012 and April 16, 2012 (Appendix A). Members asked questions about issues covered in the Proceedings.

April 2, 2012

Ms. Sengstock, the Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, commented on the action taken by the Policy Committee regarding the FAC's recommendations on student publications (item 5 in the Proceedings of April 2). She was disappointed that neither she nor the FAC as a whole was notified that Policy Committee was forwarding the report without adding its support. The FAC, she noted, felt very strongly about the issue. That strength of feeling came not so much from the Committee members but from other faculty who had communicated their concerns to the FAC. The Policy Committee intends to send the recommendations to the General Counsel and to meet with the Associate General Counsel who handles intellectual property issues, but Ms. Sengstock believes that a member of the FAC should attend such a meeting to defend the Committee's position.

Mr. Romano understood the concerns. Policy Committee had asked that a representative of the

General Counsel's Office attend a meeting to discuss the potential for changing the copyright policy to protect the intellectual property of the faculty. The General Counsel responded that they had looked at the situation and nothing more could be done. Mr. Romano plans to return to the question to devise a policy that protects the faculty but allows students to publish their dissertations. Ms. Sengstock noted that the administration is interested in protecting the rights of students who publish their theses. The FAC, she said, is concerned about protecting faculty's publication rights as well as those of other students who are involved in the research projects. Mr. Romano said that the question was not only about University policy, but also about U.S. copyright law.

April 16, 2012

Referring to item 12 in the Policy Committee Proceedings of April 16, Ms. Tonso asked which figures would be used in the Budget book for the coming fiscal year of 2013, i.e., would the figures for FY 2012 be those that were in the budget approved by the Board of Governors or the actual money spent and projected for FY 2012.

Mr. Romano said that the budget approved by the Board contained the estimated income and expenditures for the upcoming fiscal year. At a meeting on April 10 attended by Provost Brown, Mr. Woodyard, Mr. Romano, Robert Harris, the Director of Academic Administration in the Office of the Provost, Robert Kohrman, Associate Vice President for Budget, Planning and Analysis, Mr. Woodyard and Mr. Romano urged that the administration include the actual figures for the prior year with the proposed budget for the coming year.

Mr. Woodyard said that the meeting of April 10 was held to find out the sources for the additional \$14.2 million that had been allocated to the schools and colleges in FY 2012. Mr. Romano and Mr. Woodyard learned that the money came from various accounts and that this type of transfer was done routinely. They asked why that additional money was not reported in the budget for the following year. Mr. Woodyard had checked several previous years' budgets and found that revisions, whether they were additional funding or spending, were not recording in the budget and did not appear in the proposed budget for the upcoming year. The administration agreed to show the actual funds allocated to the units in the proposed budget. Provost Brown said that the money is typically allocated for start-up packages and that part of the money this year funded the retention initiatives and faculty enhancements. Mr. Woodyard suggested

that the memo about the agreement reached at the April 10 meeting be sent to the full Senate for their information.

IV. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Year-End Reports

1. Budget Committee

Mr. Romano, the Chair of the Budget Committee, said that one of its major tasks is to review the documents on the agenda for the Board of Governors Budget and Finance Committee. Details of the discussions are in the Budget Committee's minutes. Mr. Romano highlighted some of the issues discussed.

The Budget Committee discussed the technology improvements being made in State Hall and asked that a faculty representative be added to the committee that is consulting on the design of the classrooms and making recommendations about the equipment to be installed in the classrooms. The Provost agreed to the request.

The Budget Committee discussed the Capital Outlay Budget Request submitted to the state. The state will probably provide \$30 million for a multi-disciplinary biomedical research building.

The need to renovate the space in the Student Center Building that houses Counseling and Psychological Services was discussed by the Budget Committee.

The recommendation to increase the FY 2013 tuition and fee rates for the School of Medicine MD program was on the agenda of the Board of Governors meeting of May 2, 2012. The recommendation would have increased the tuition for in-state and out-of-state medical students by 1.5%, increasing the yearly tuition for in-state students to \$31,790 and for out-of-state students to \$64,065. The Senate Budget Committee passed a resolution opposing the increase in the out-of-state tuition because they thought the tuition was too high. The Board of Governors heard about the resolution and removed the proposal from its agenda to reconsider the recommendation.

Mr. Romano continued. The administration, in consultation with the Huron Consulting Group, is considering adopting a responsibility centered budget model (RCM). The Budget Committee hosted a meeting of the Chairs of the unit budget committees at which Mr. Romano presented a report about a budget model that was developed in

1999 by a joint faculty-administration committee. A representative from the Huron Group explained the RCM.

Provost Brown said that he has asked that the budget be transparent and flow from the academic side. He did not expect a new budget model to be a strict responsibility centered model. However, when colleges experience increases in enrollment, their budgets should reflect the increase.

Mr. Romano said that the Budget Committee looked at the Nursing Practice Corporation. A subcommittee is writing a report and recommendations.

The Annual Report of the Budget Committee for 2011-2012 is attached to these Proceedings as Appendix B.

2. Curriculum and Instruction Committee

Mr. Pandya, a member of the Curriculum and Instruction (C&I) Committee, made the report. The major issues with which the Committee dealt were: online instruction, student evaluation of teaching (SET) scoring, the undergraduate probation and exclusion policy, textbook disclosure, textbook purchase options and e-textbooks.

The C&I Committee developed a list of issues related to online instruction which was submitted to the Co-Chairs of the Online Instruction Task Force. Sangeetha Gopalakrishnan, Director of the Foreign Language Technology Center, discussed with the C&I Committee and with guests from the Student Affairs and Faculty Affairs Committees, the research and findings from her dissertation on implementing successful online programs at universities.

At the request of the Policy Committee the C&I Committee wrote specific points and issues they thought the SET 2N Committee needed to consider in their deliberations. The C&I Committee supported the implementation of revisions to the Undergraduate Probation and Exclusion Policy that would identify and intervene at a much earlier point the students who are not making adequate academic progress.

The Committee reviewed the report Enhancing Student Academic Success. It supported the overall goals of the report, but highlighted specific concerns related to its implementation, the development of remedial programs, and the lack of inclusion of part-time and transfer students.

The annual report of the Curriculum and Instruction Committee for the 2011-2012 academic year is attached to these Senate Proceedings as Appendix C.

3. Elections Committee

At the request of James Woodyard, the Chair of the Elections Committee, Mr. Romano read the following about the work of the Committee. The senator-at-large and hearing panel elections were carried out electronically and the results sent by email to all faculty and academic staff eligible to vote in the elections. The results of the 2012-2013 apportionment of senators was sent by the Academic Senate Office to the respective schools and colleges on February 23 and presented to the Academic Senate at the March 7 meeting.

4. Faculty Affairs Committee

Ms. Sengstock, the Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, reported that among the issues the Committee reviewed were two that were carried over from last year. First was the faculty mentoring survey. The survey was completed under the supervision of Kelley Skillin in the Provost's Office. If anyone is interested in seeing the results of the survey, they should contact Ms. Skillin. The second issue was the concern about what appears to be a student's unlimited right to publish a dissertation without considering the rights of faculty members or other students who contributed to the research. As mentioned earlier in the meeting, the FAC submitted its recommendations to the Policy Committee.

The FAC discussed the Graduate Council's new criteria for graduate faculty status. The Committee believes that departmentally-specific standards are preferable.

The Provost's Office requested faculty consultation regarding online courses. The FAC heard a presentation from James Mazoue, Director of Online Programs, about courses that were completely online. Committee members thought more comparative data was needed both within WSU and from other institutions. They also believe that the control of online classes must remain in the hands of the faculty.

The FAC contributed to the joint report on the student evaluation of teaching. FAC's particular concern was the use of online evaluations, which might compromise the security of the data. In conjunction with this discussion, FAC received concerns regarding the format change of SET

scores from PDF to RFT; RFT was believed to be more open to tampering than PDF. Dr. Laura Woodward from the SET office attended a meeting to discuss the issue. She indicated that computer requirements forced the change in format, and demonstrated that PDF is not tamper-proof. The Committee discussed ways in which SET reports could be made secure, such as using Pipeline. She indicated they already are provided on STARs, and would be happy to consider these issues with the SET Committee when it is in operation.

FAC was one of several committees asked to review the report *Enhancing Student Academic Success*. Among the Committee's suggestions were early testing to identify a student's greatest potential and continuing the University's traditional commitment to disadvantaged students.

The FAC received a complaint concerning the long delays in approval from the Human Investigation Committee. These concerns were discussed with Philip Cunningham, Assistant Vice President for Research. The University is operating under a warning letter from the federal government that requires a great deal of staff time. Mr. Cunningham indicated that the OVPR is computerizing the approval process, but it will take some time before the process is complete.

The FAC received a copy of the new conflict of interest disclosure form for faculty members serving on graduate student committees.

A member of the Committee raised questions about appropriate criteria for the evaluation of interdisciplinary faculty in the tenure and promotion process. The Committee made several suggestions.

The FAC was asked to examine the relative numbers of teaching assistants assigned to departments, with the possibility of determining whether the assignments were fairly distributed. The Committee referred the issue to next year's Committee.

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

5. Facilities, Support Services and Technology Committee

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

6. Research Committee

Mr. Cinabro, the Chair of the Research Committee, reported to the Senate. The Research Committee met with Gail Ryan and Marlene Erno from Sponsored Program Administration about the deficiencies in the Effort Reporting system, the desired improvements in the Research Dashboard, grant close out procedures, and inconsistencies in the application of grant rules.

The Committee met with Julie O'Connor, Office of the Vice President for Research (OVPR), and Matthew Lockwood and Nickolas Denardis, Marketing and Communications, to talk about how research activities are communicated. Little is known internally among the disciplines about the research that is being conducted. The OVPR and Marketing and Communications are understaffed and are unable to provide assistance.

Charles Parrish alerted the Research Committee to problems with the scientific misconduct policy. Ongoing litigation has made it impossible for the Committee to discuss revising the policy. The Committee will not try to revise the policy on its own; it wants to work with the administration to improve the policy. The Committee developed points to discuss with the administration when they are able to engage in the conversation.

The Committee considered reviewing the budget of the OVPR but after some initial discussions with the Vice President for Research, it did not proceed because the Huron Consulting Group (HCG) was undertaking a review. However when the Committee met with two consultants from HCG they learned that only the Office of Sponsored Program Administration and the research cores were being reviewed. The Committee gave their opinions about areas that needed to be looked at.

The Committee met with Deborah Charbonneau and James Van Loon of the Libraries about the National Science Foundation requirement to submit a data management plan with every proposal. The Library has extensive resources to meet the requirement. In addition, the Committee learned that the Libraries have been under invested for the last ten years and the faculty will begin to notice that the journals they need are not available.

Mr. Cinabro attended the Faculty Affairs Committee meeting when concerns about the approval process of the Human Investigation Committee were discussed. This has been a long-standing problem. Faculty should inform their Chairs and Deans about the problems so they can put pressure on the

responsible offices. Mr. Cinabro recommended that the Research Committee review the issue next fall. The Committee learned that proposals involving multiple institutions were approved at the University of Michigan and at Michigan State University but were delayed or rejected at Wayne State.

The Committee encouraged Joseph Dunbar, Associate Vice President for Research, in his pursuing approval of the research incentive plan that the Research Incentive Committee developed a few years ago. The plan would cover the tuition of externally supported graduate assistants. Mr. Dunbar is trying to get support from Deans and hopes to have the program in place by the fall. The program would be funded with the money that currently funds the research enhancement program.

Senate members commented on the information in the Research Committee's report. Regarding the Human Investigation Committee, Ms. Ferreira noted that while a form is available electronically, the researcher has to print it and return it through the campus mail. However, Ms. Tonso, who serves on the HIC B3 committee, said that full board proposals are distributed electronically to committee members. But the forms for the expedited exempt are paper. Ms. Heppner said that Mr. Cunningham has selected an online submission process that should be available to researchers by the end of the year.

Ms. Ferreira was frustrated by the fact that the same protocol was used for medical research proposals and for social science proposals. There are many questions on the form that do not pertain to social science projects.

Ms. Sengstock noted that most of the issues the Senate members raised about the HIC were discussed with Mr. Cunningham when he met with the FAC. The online HIC process should resolve most of the issues. In the new system, for example, if faculty members identify themselves as social science researchers the system automatically will bypass the medical questions.

Mr. McIntyre asked why the HCG was not reviewing the entire Office of the Vice President for Research. He is a member of the steering committee working with the HCG consultants and was not aware that only SPA was being reviewed. He believed that an overall review was appropriate and will raise the point with the steering committee. Mr. Cinabro did not know the reason for the decision. The Research Committee told the consultants from HCG that improvements had been made in SPA over the past several years and no purpose would be served by reviewing it again. The Research Committee

thought HCG would look at other aspects of the Division of Research operation.

Mr. Parrish MOVED that the Academic Senate recommend that the entire Office of the Vice President for Research be included in the review by the Huron Consulting Group. SECONDED.

Mr. Romano agreed that more information about the Research Division was needed. The best budgets are transparent. Much of the money supporting the Division is general fund money and indirect cost return brought in by the faculty. When the Huron Group was hired, the Policy Committee had understood that all non-academic units would be reviewed. However, the Division of Research was not evaluated initially, but after requests from the Policy Committee, President Gilmour agreed that it should be reviewed. It was Mr. Romano's understanding that the entire Division of Research would be reviewed and budget recommendations would be made.

Provost Brown asked if the Senate could provide specific questions. He is meeting with representatives from HCG next week and he could ask them to add areas of concern to their review. Mr. Romano and Mr. Cinabro said that the Senate would like a detailed budget for the Division of Research. It was suggested that the Policy Committee write a memorandum to the Provost with their request.

Ms. Vlasopolos noted that the Policy Committee was promised a review of the Research Division, not a review of part of it. She regarded the alteration a betrayal of what was promised. She believes that the Senate must express its opinion very strongly. Specific questions can be asked at any time, but the review should cover the entire office.

President Gilmour will hold hearings with each Dean and Vice President about their budgets for fiscal year 2013. Provost Brown said that during the hearings, in which Mr. McIntyre will participate, the budget for the OVPR will be available. He asked if that would fulfill the Senate's request. But Mr. Romano said that it would depend upon how detailed the budget is. It is usually not very detailed.

The vote was taken on the motion to ask the Huron Consulting Group to review the entire Division of Research operation including the budget. PASSED.

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

7. Student Affairs Committee

Ms. Simon, the Chair of the Student Affairs Committee (SAC), thanked the members of the Committee for their hard work. Attendance at meetings was excellent this year. The Committee met seven times and addressed six issues. It began developing a survey to learn the effects on students of the cuts in the fiscal year 2012 budget. However, the survey was not sent out because students would not be able to respond until they had experienced changes that were a result of the cuts.

Liza Lagman-Sperl and Keith Wadley developed a Military Make-up Policy that was cognizant of our diverse student body. The SAC discussed the Special Circumstances Policy and the Recalled to Active Duty Policy. They used input from the University Bulletin and from Howard Shapiro. They combined the two policies and submitted the final version to the Policy Committee.

Robert Reynolds has been serving on the Online Course Committee. The SAC selected him to serve as its liaison to the Online Course Committee. Ms. Simon attended the meeting of the Faculty Affairs and Curriculum and Instruction Committees about online courses.

The SAC was interested in the Customer Service Survey and in the student part of the survey. Mr. Woodyard was selected to serve as the SAC's representative on the group that is planning the survey. The administration wanted to conduct the survey during the summer, but the SAC voted to wait until fall of 2012. The SAC wanted the extra time to consult with the Senate and to be able to work over the summer. President Gilmour agreed with the SAC's timeline. The survey, Ms. Simon said, is now known as the WSU Institutional Reputation and Customer Survey Proposal for the Second Wave of the Study.

The SAC reviewed *Enhancing Student Academic Success* and provided comments that were incorporated into the joint report.

Concerns about the Grade Appeal Policy were brought to the SAC by the liaisons from the Student Senate. A student who wanted to appeal his grade did what he thought was necessary but because the faculty member refused to respond to the request, the process stalled. The instructor refused to meet with the student or to discuss the request. The SAC recommended that timelines be published so the instructor could not hold up the process; it is unfair to the student. This particular student's problem is

being resolved. However, the process needs to be changed.

The SAC had six guest speakers. Michelle Bruner, Interim Director of the Academic Success Center, explained the services offered by the Center. Gayle Reynolds, Director of the Student Service Center, and Robert Kohrman, Associate Vice President for Budget, Planning and Analysis, responded to questions about that Center. Timothy Michael, the Associate Vice President of Business and Auxiliary Operations and Chief Housing Officer, reported about housing and the various businesses on campus. Jodi Young, General Manager of the Barnes and Noble College Bookstore, told the Committee about work with the Student Financial Aid Office to get books to students before the sixth or seventh week of the semester when they receive their financial aid check. Matthew McLain, Academic Advisor, University Advising Center and Office of Military and Veterans Educational Benefits, attended a meeting. He is also the VA Certifying Officer. He told the Committee about the problems that students who are veterans have on campus and how faculty and academic staff can help them. Laura Birnie-Lindemann, the Ombudsperson, attended the meeting at which the Committee discussed the grade appeal policy.

Mr. Wolfson pointed out an additional problem related to the grade appeal policy. The procedure for changing a grade and who has the authority to change it is not specified. The faculty member might refuse to change a grade, but if the student appeals to the department Chair, the Chair might change it. This should not be permitted. All steps of the procedure should be spelled out. Ms. Simon said that a Letter of Agreement between the University and the AAUP-AFT specifies that the Chair cannot change a grade without consultation with the faculty member, if he/she is available. Provost Brown said that he is not in favor of a Chair changing a grade. A Dean making the change might be acceptable if the circumstances are compelling. The Provost believes that if a faculty member refused to change a grade, the grade should not be changed until the request is reviewed by the Provost.

Ms. Vlasopolos said that she and the Provost wrote a policy governing student complaints. The Provost's Office distributed the policy to the administrators and the AAUP-AFT distributed it to all faculty. She hopes to be able to work on a policy regarding grade changes that does not infringe upon academic freedom. That is also in Article VII in the Agreement between the University and the AAUP-AFT.

Mr. Romano said that the Senate would return to the issue. It might be helpful to have a faculty committee involved if there is a disagreement between a faculty and a Chair or a Dean about a grade change.

Mr. Reynolds said that the Online Task Force discussed the issue of grade changes at its meeting of May 8. The Task Force believed that a policy was needed to deal with complaints for online courses as well. The issues for online courses can be more complex than for on-campus classes because of such issues as equipment failure.

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

Mr. Romano thanked the Senate members for their participation in the various committees and specifically thanked the Chairs for their hard work.

V. NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Louis J. Romano".

Louis J. Romano
President, Academic Senate