

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY – ACADEMIC SENATE

Official Proceedings

September 7, 2011

Members Present: Ronald T. Brown, Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, Chair; Louis J. Romano, President, Academic Senate; George Alangaden; Basim Asmar; Ivan Avrutsky; Linda Beale; Paul Beavers; Jennifer Beebe-Dimmer; Ramona Benkert; Veronica Bielat; Abhijit Biswas; Tamara Bray; Kingsley Browne; David Cinabro; Chardin Claybourne; Mary Cooney; Victoria Dallas; Nabanita Datta; Cheryl Dove; Karen Feathers; Maria Ferreira; Jane Fitzgibbon; Judith Fouladbakhsh; Moira Fracassa; Andre Furtado; Ewa Golebiowska; Avril Genene Holt; Renee Hoogland; Michael Horn; Barbara Jones; Jerry Ku; Rita Kumar; Kafi Kumasi; Liza Lagman-Sperl; Janine Lanza; Lawrence Lemke; Rodger MacArthur; Brian Madigan; Richard Marback; Jason Mateika; Santanu Mitra; Boris Mordukhovich; Bryan Morrow; James Moseley; Jennifer Sheridan Moss; Patrick Mueller; David Oupicky; Abhilash Pandya; Victoria Pardo; Charles Parrish; Debra Patterson; Jeffrey Potoff; Elizabeth Puscheck; Daniel Rappolee; T. R. Reddy; Aaron Retish; Robert Reynolds; Michele Ronnick; Brad Roth; Heather Sandlin; Mary Sengstock; Naida Simon; William Slater; James Sondheimer; Timothy Stemmler; Senthil Sundaram; Ronald Thomas; Ellen Tisdale; Karen Tonso; Anca Vlasopolos; William Volz; Judith Whittum-Hudson; Mary Width; Derek Wildman; Seymour Wolfson; James Woodyard; Lee Wurm

Members Absent with Notice: Anthony Cacace; Donald DeGracia; Judith Fry-McComish; Renee Hoogland; Maik Hutteman; David Kessel; Shawna Lee; Michael McIntyre; Linea Rydstedt; Ghulam Saydain; Jeffrey Withey

Members Absent: Barbara Bosch; Zhe Yang

Others Present: Johnnie Blunt, Academic Senate Office; Allan Gilmour, President; Gloria Heppner, Associate Vice President for Research; Geraldine Johnson, Academic Pathways for Excellence; Angela Wisniewski, Academic Senate Office

CALL TO ORDER: This first meeting of the 2011-2012 academic year was called to order by Vice Chair Seymour Wolfson at 1:30 p.m. The meeting was held in the Bernath Auditorium in the Undergraduate Library.

- I. INTRODUCTION OF NEW MEMBERS: Mr. Wolfson began the introduction of the new members and the members who were re-elected. Provost Brown arrived at 1:33 p.m. and assumed the Chair. Mr. Romano completed the introduction of the members. The membership roster is attached to these Proceedings as Appendix A.

II. ELECTION OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE

Ms. Simon, a member of the Elections Committee, conducted the election of Policy Committee members. She replaced the Chair of the Committee, Mr. Woodyard, because he is seeking re-election to the Policy Committee. Five members had to be elected: one to a five-year term and four to one-year terms. Nominated prior to the meeting were: Linda Beale, Law; Victoria Dallas Communication, Fine, Performing and Communication Arts; Rodger MacArthur, Internal Medicine, Medicine; Boris Mordukhovich, Mathematics, Liberal Arts and Sciences; Anca Vlasopolos, English, Liberal Arts and Sciences; James Woodyard, Electrical and Computer Engineering, Engineering.

Ms. Simon opened the floor for additional nominations. There were none. It was MOVED and SECONDED to CLOSE NOMINATIONS. PASSED. The candidates identified themselves and stated their reasons for seeking election. The members cast their ballots.

Ms. Simon announced the results of the voting. Seventy ballots were cast; to be elected the candidates needed 36 votes. Rodger MacArthur was elected to the three-year term. Linda Beale, Victoria Dallas, Anca Vlasopolos, and James Woodyard were elected to one-year terms.

III. APPROVAL OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

May 4, 2011

It was MOVED and SECONDED to APPROVE the Proceedings of the Academic Senate meeting of May 4, 2011. PASSED.

IV. REPORT FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT

A. Report and Announcements

1. Welcome: Mr. Romano welcomed the members to the new academic year. He hoped that the Senate would continue to provide leadership to improve the level of faculty consultation and faculty governance.
2. Huron Consulting Group: The administration hired the Huron Consulting Group to review the policies and procedures on the administrative side and improve the processes used in such areas as human resources and purchasing. The

implementation of new processes has begun. The Policy Committee was concerned that there was no faculty input on the implementation and it asked that at least one faculty member serve on the committee so that the interests of the faculty and academic staff might be accommodated. One of the recommendations involves travel reimbursement. At the October Senate meeting, there will be a presentation of the new travel software called Concur.

3. Fiscal Year 2012 Budget: Earlier in the year, Provost Brown established the Blue Ribbon Committee on Budget Cuts. The Committee was involved in recommending cuts to the academic side of the University in response to the cut in the appropriation from the State of Michigan. The members became concerned about the process and the size of the cuts being recommended for the academic side. The recommended cut of \$18 million was much higher than the amount needed to balance the budget. The Committee was concerned that if a cut of \$18 million were made to the academic side, very little would be cut from the administrative side, and, Mr. Romano said, that is what happened.

The Policy Committee asked for a list of positions cut from both the academic and the administrative sides of the University. The list included the vacant positions that were removed, the positions from which employees retired, and the positions that were eliminated where employees lost their jobs. Mr. Romano identified three divisions: (1) administration; (2) academic administration, which included the Provost's Office, Computing and Information Technology, the Libraries, and Research; and (3) the schools and colleges. He calculated the positions cut in the different divisions and analyzed the budget implications of the cuts. The total number of positions lost on the administrative side was 66, but only 16 of those positions were filled. In academic administration, almost 65 people lost their jobs and in the schools and colleges 60 positions were eliminated with 27 people losing their jobs.

The 66 positions lost on the administrative side resulted in a budget cut of \$249,000 or 0.4% of their budget. The academic administrative division lost 3.5% of its budget. The schools and colleges suffered a cut of 4.7% of their budget. On the academic side, most of the cuts were targeted at the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, which does most of the teaching and brings in most of the income. Of the 60 positions lost, 29 were in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. In contrast, the School of Medicine probably could have afforded more cuts than they offered because they not only receive general fund money but they have a huge political income side. The Medical School cut no

one from the payroll; six positions were lost through retirements.

Mr. Romano summarized his report. The administrative division lost 66 positions and \$249,000 or 0.4% of their budget. The academic administration and the schools and colleges lost 4.4% or \$13.5 million of their budget.

Mr. Romano added that there is concern that the State will continue to cut the appropriation to universities. The Academic Senate, he said, would strongly reject the type of budgeting that resulted in the huge loss to the academic side of the University. The Senate will try to protect the academic side.

B. Proceedings of the Policy Committee

The Academic Senate received the Proceedings of the Policy Committee meetings of April 25, 2011, May 2, 2011, May 23, 2011, June 6, 2011, June 20, 2011, June 27, 2011, July 25, 2011, and August 8, 2011.

July 25, 2011

Mr. Roth asked for an explanation of the Faculty-Student Compacts mentioned in item 4 of the Policy Committee Proceedings of July 25, 2011. Mr. Romano explained that the *Guideline for Creating Faculty-Student Compacts* was in response to an incident in the Department of Nutrition and Food Sciences. A student in that Department published a book based on her Masters thesis in which she used data from the principal investigator and other students. The Department took the problem to the administration but was told that nothing could be done. Former Dean of the Graduate School Mark Wardell developed the guideline for compacts to be made between the advisor and the graduate student laying out their roles and rights. Senate committees commented on the guideline; the draft is being returned to the Faculty Affairs Committee for revision.

It was MOVED and SECONDED to APPROVE the Policy Committee Proceedings. PASSED. They are attached to these Senate Proceedings as Appendix B.

V. REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

Provost Brown addressed the budget challenges. He expects the State to adopt a performance-based budget model where universities will be evaluated on their retention rates, the number of students they graduate, and research output. The State has not

taken any definitive steps in that direction, but Wayne State will have to address these issues.

The Provost mentioned the new Deans that have joined the University. Margaret Williams, after consultation with the faculty of the School of Business Administration, was appointed Interim Dean of the School for a period of two years. Carolyn Shields has assumed the position of Dean of Education. The Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences Robert Thomas will retire at the end of the academic year and a search has begun for a new Dean. Dean of Social Work Phyllis Vroom is retiring after 42 years of meritorious service to the University. Cheryl Waites will serve as the Interim Dean.

One hundred new faculty attended the faculty orientation in August. The Provost said that some faculty lines have been sequestered for colleges that are experiencing high growth rates.

The administration took to the Board of Governors several recommendations to improve student retention that range from hiring more advisors to having a retention czar. Related to student retention was whether the University was admitting students who could succeed. There is a group of students who are not prepared for the University. If the University admits such students, it is responsible for insuring that they will do well. The Student Success Committee has made a series of recommendations to assist these students. President Gilmour is reviewing the recommendations before submitting them to the Board of Governors.

Provost Brown noted that students are interested in having more courses that have both classroom and on-line instruction. Some courses lend themselves to that type of instruction. The Provost will establish a task force to look at on-line courses. He will ask the Policy Committee to appoint someone to the task force.

The administration hired the Huron Consulting Group to advise it on improving various administrative functions such as human resources and purchasing. The University is now implementing some of the recommendations.

The Provost ended his remarks by saying that the University needed to be strategic in its hiring, in improving its processes, and in obtaining additional revenue streams. Wayne State can no longer depend upon the State. Tuition is low. The budget has been trying to cover too much. It may be better to do less with fewer resources. The University needs to capitalize on its strengths.

Ms. Simon asked if the Policy Committee would be given a copy of the report of the Huron Consulting Group. The Provost said that there are a large number of slides but there is no written report.

Ms. Beale suggested that rather than appointing a special task force, the Academic Senate Curriculum and Instruction Committee should be the body that looks at on-line courses. Provost Brown said he believes Wayne State is dangerously behind other institutions in its on-line curriculum offerings and needs to act quickly to change that. He thought a task force would be the appropriate venue to handle the issue.

Mr. Parrish noted that the administration had authorized the hiring of a number of faculty for fall 2011 with a focus on general education. He asked how many slots had been filled. The Provost thought that 57 of the new faculty were tenured or tenure track faculty. Mr. Romano added that one year ago, the budget called for a 2% tuition increase for the summer and that the Senate Budget Committee argued that these funds should be specifically designated to hire new faculty. Two enhancement mechanisms were accepted by the Board of Governors as part of the FY2011 budget. The proposals required that the money be tabulated separately and reported as a line item to the Board of Governors, and the Board agreed to this stipulation. To Mr. Romano's knowledge that has not been done, but he is hopeful it will be. He had heard that there were few faculty hired using these enhancement mechanisms.

Provost Brown said that historically many Deans have used money allocated for hiring faculty for one-time expenditures. He is not letting Deans spend that money except to hire faculty. Hiring was going slowly in some colleges and part of the budget cut was to divert that money to departments and schools that are more successful in hiring faculty.

Provost Brown was asked to explain the process for the search for the Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences. He explained that first he interviewed search firms who might assist with the search. Heidrick and Struggles International was hired. Ellen Brown, one of the firm's principals, will conduct the search. The Provost appointed Dean of Nursing Barbara Redman to chair the search committee. The Provost met with the College's Faculty Council. The faculty in the College will elect three faculty to serve on the search committee. After their election, the Provost will appoint two additional members to the search committee. Ms. Brown will meet with the current Dean, the administrators, and the Faculty

Council to learn what type of person the College needs.

Mr. Parrish added that the College's nominees for the search committee will be from the social sciences, the humanities, and the life sciences. The call for nominations will go out soon and there will be an at-large election within the College. The Provost asked those who know of candidates for the position of Dean to give that information to Dean Redman.

VI. COMMENTS FROM THE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT

President Gilmour congratulated Mr. Romano on his election to the presidency of the Senate. He mentioned some of the concerns which the University has faced in the past few months.

The State cut the University's appropriation by 15%. Professor Parrish and two students did a good job testifying before the joint Senate and House of Representatives Subcommittees on Higher Education. When asked by a legislator if they would be in favor of higher taxes, the students responded that they would if the money was used well.

The community colleges want the authority to grant four-year degrees in five subjects, which the state universities oppose. Governor Snyder invited representatives from six community colleges (five attended the meeting) and six universities to a meeting, which President Gilmour attended. It was clear to the President that the community colleges wanted the five subjects and any others they could get. At that meeting he stated that Michigan did not need more capacity in higher education because more capacity meant more money. Having more capacity did not mean that the number of students would increase. If the State were to appropriate more money, the community colleges would receive more money, but if the State did not appropriate more money, the counties and municipalities would have to increase taxes. The community colleges claimed that it would not cost more money to educate more students, nor would they need new equipment. Governor Snyder told the universities and community colleges to settle the issue themselves.

President Gilmour said that state universities and business leaders are developing measures to see how universities are performing. As in many professions, the universities have been measuring input rather than output. If retention rates and graduation rates are measured, Wayne State will not fare well.

The Henry Ford Health System announced that it would not be able to participate with WSU in the construction, management, and use of a new biomedical research building. They have other capital needs and, in the near term, cannot invest in the project.

There are many questions about the future of higher education. Wayne State will have to decide what type of institution it will be as the discussion moves forward.

President Gilmour mentioned reading articles in *Newsweek* magazine about Steve Jobs of Apple, Inc. Three phrases in an article about Mr. Jobs that was written by Paul Theroux grabbed the President's attention. Mr. Theroux described the world as "the nervous incurious world" of today. Our students, the President said, are not the incurious ones and we have to insure that they are not. The President paraphrased a statement attributed to H. L. Mencken, "For every complicated problem a simple solution regrettably is wrong." There are, the President said, many complicated problems in the world today. The world is looking for simple solutions, but there are none. Think, he said, of the phrase "incurious solutions."

The second phrase in the article that struck the President was a quote from Steve Jobs' speech at the 2005 Commencement at Stanford University. The last three words were "follow your heart." We open and broaden the perspectives of students and of ourselves as we discover. We all learn from the interchange with students, from reading, and from seeing what other people are doing.

The third phrase, President Gilmour thinks, is the best of all. It is from Walt Whitman: "Unscrew the locks from the doors." We unscrew the locks from the doors that hide the knowledge or keep us from a better understanding of what is going on. That is the essence of what a university does.

Two week ago there was a reception for new faculty. The latest numbers that the President has seen show that in the last 13 or 14 months, WSU hired 131 new faculty. He credited the Provost, the Deans, the Department Chairs, and all the faculty involved in the process. Hiring new faculty and getting new ideas is the single most important thing we did this year.

President Gilmour listed some of the accomplishments and the work in progress as he begins his second year. The first accomplishment was the hiring of new faculty. Second, the freshman class is better prepared than in the recent past. He guessed

that the entering freshmen scored one or two points higher on the ACT than in the prior year. Third, eighteen National Merit finalists are in the freshmen class. Fourth is the excellent progress being made in retaining students. Last year the retention of freshmen to sophomores was 77%. Three years earlier it had been 69%. Seventy-seven percent is respectable in the State of Michigan. We still have work to do in retaining students. Intensified programs are being put in place to assist students who need help to progress academically. The Student Service Center will open in the Welcome Center on October 3 with the services students need in one location. Monica Brockmeyer, the Interim Chair of the Department of Computer Science in the College of Engineering, has agreed to oversee the retention efforts.

We are working on admissions standards. We want Wayne State to be a university of opportunity but it is also a research university. Not every student can succeed in a university like Wayne State. We must do a better job of reviewing applications. Some students will be admitted because they could go to any university in the world. Some will not be admitted because they could not be admitted anywhere. Decisions will have to be made about the students in the middle. Students may be asked to write essays to see what they think and that they can write.

Some students should go to community colleges. The President has visited six of the eight community colleges, and he will visit Monroe Community College next week. He wants to make it easier for the good community college students to transfer to WSU. Admissions from community colleges are up 18% over last year.

A new program, which will admit some students on a provisional basis, will have them taking mathematics and writing. If they do well in those courses they will be admitted. If they do not do well, the University will suggest remedial work for them.

The review of administrative functions that began last spring is almost complete. Some of the recommended changes are being implemented. A committee will oversee the implementation. To ensure that what is needed is done, a project manager was hired. The Policy Committee asked that a faculty member be appointed to the implementation committee, and President Gilmour agreed.

The President will ask the Board of Governors to consider an alternative plan for the biomedical research building. For now the University will work

with existing buildings in Tech Town. Work would be done in two phases. In the first phase, the University will use the capital outlay funds from the State plus borrowing. The first phase will cost around \$60 million. A second phase that the President hopes would start 12 months after the first phase was started, would depend upon money from the State, philanthropy, and the University's debt situation. The building would be a major step forward in our research facilities. Our science research facilities, particularly in health care, are not up-to-date, and we need better facilities to attract good researchers and to do good research.

The President's Cabinet went on retreat recently. Nancy Schlichting, CEO of the Henry Ford Health System, talked about transformation and turn around. One of the most important things the Cabinet learned was how you inculcate service into an organization and do it over and over and over. Market research shows that patients expect that the doctors know what they are doing, but if patients can't park their cars or the bills are not correct, they begin to worry about the doctors, as well.

The Cabinet talked about the items that the President presented to the Senate and they talked about the undergraduate experience, the Masters and Ph.D. candidates, the professional schools, and the research enterprise. They talked about the long term and what the university of the future would look like. President Gilmour is convinced that the biggest issue is on-line learning broadly defined. There are major challenges ahead as we try to figure out how students learn and they try to figure out how faculty teach and we try to put the two together. On-line learning, he thinks, is a subset of that. Students will decide when they will learn.

The President said that he has to understand both the views of the faculty and what they do better than he did in the first year. The faculty are entrusted with the most important responsibilities of preparing the students to be successful and performing the research that leads to discovery and builds on the University's reputation and stature. The President said that he would attend a few classes in the fall. He will have dinners with some faculty with no agenda other than talking about whatever the faculty wanted to talk about. The Provost will hold dinner meetings with new faculty to see what questions they have as they move into, in most cases, a new city and a new institution. It is enjoyable, the President said, to see the enthusiasm the faculty have for working with students and for their research.

People have asked the President about his vision for Wayne State. He believes that vision and strategy come out of daily work as much as daily work comes out of vision and strategy. He will talk more about that on September 12 in his campus-wide address. He also plans to talk about the culture and how we work with each other inside and outside the University in a time when communications are more complicated and there are more opportunities for success or even failure. Until then, he said, he wanted to delete the word "failure" because after one year he sees a University that is moving ahead to be better and better. He thanked the faculty and academic staff for all they have done in the journey and for all they will do as we jointly accelerate.

VII. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Report from the Blue Ribbon Committee on Budget Cuts

Mr. MacArthur and Mr. Volz co-chaired the Blue Ribbon Committee on Budget Cuts. They both made reports to the Senate.

Mr. MacArthur told the Senate that the Provost's Blue Ribbon Committee on Budget Cuts was formed in March 2011 at the request of the Provost. It was to be a faculty and academic staff led effort to analyze where cuts could be made and ideally to minimize the impact of the cuts on core functions of the University. Two other budget-cutting groups were in place at the same time. The Deans of all the schools and colleges were charged with developing a plan to cut the budget. The other committee was composed of key members of the President's Cabinet who were meeting to put together a plan to cut the budget.

Michael McIntyre was appointed Chair of the Blue Ribbon Committee. The other members of the Committee were William Volz (Accounting, Business Administration), Linda Beale (Law), Victoria Dallas (Communication, Fine, Performing and Communication Arts), Kenneth Jackson (English, Liberal Arts and Sciences), Catherine Lysack (Occupational Therapy and the Institute of Gerontology), Simon Ng (Chemical Engineering, Engineering), Louis Romano (Chemistry, Liberal Arts and Sciences), James Woodyard (Electrical and Computer Engineering, Engineering), and Mr. MacArthur (Internal Medicine, Medicine).

Under Mr. McIntyre's leadership, the Committee produced its first document, "Some Principles to Govern Academic Budget Cuts," dated April 4, 2011. Among the principles were that the cuts must not impede the core academic programs. The

Committee recommended protecting high priority expenditures from reductions. Especially important was that tenure and tenure track faculty positions should be vigorously protected and that cuts that would reduce enrollment should be avoided. Early on the Committee opposed across-the-board cuts but the members also wanted to avoid large cuts to any particular academic unit.

There were challenges early in the process. The Committee's recommendations originally were due by mid May, not long after the Committee was formed, but it became apparent that it would not get a lot of the information it needed. Despite assurances that the Committee would have access to the Deans and the Deans' proposals for cutting the budget, the members were denied access.

The Committee sent a memo to Provost Brown on April 25, 2011, giving the rationale for the request. President Gilmour sent a memo to the Committee on May 2 in which he agreed to give the Committee quite a bit of information including the complete fiscal year 2012 budget data and the five- and six-year enrollment data and faculty hiring history, but not access to the Deans. The stated explanation was that it was desired to keep the Committee's recommendations independent of the Deans' recommendations.

About this time, Mr. McIntyre resigned as Chair because of health issues. The Committee members discussed whether they should continue or disband. They decided to continue and Mr. Volz and Mr. MacArthur agreed to serve as co-chairs.

In a memo dated May 16, 2011, to President Gilmour, the Committee reiterated its request for access to the Deans and to their proposals and it stated the members' concerns about the perceived direction that the budget cutting process was taking. Shortly thereafter, the co-chairs met with President Gilmour and Provost Brown to continue to move the process forward.

Ultimately, the Committee produced a report titled, "Interim Report: An Alternative Approach to Academic Budget Reductions," dated May 31, 2011, which was unanimously supported by the Committee and was sent to the Provost and the President. Shortly afterwards, the entire Committee met with President Gilmour, Provost Brown, and some members of the President's Cabinet to discuss the Committee's recommendations and to compare and contrast its recommendations with the recommendations of the President's Cabinet. While there were substantial areas of concordance, there were three main areas of difference.

First, the President's Cabinet targeted some so-called administrative cuts at positions, such as secretarial positions, that were on the academic side as opposed to making cuts to secretarial positions on the administrative side. This was important because originally it was stated that about one-half of the cuts would come from the administrative side and one-half would come from the academic side.

A second area of disagreement was that the Committee recommended larger cuts to the School of Medicine's general fund subsidy than did the President's Cabinet. The 10% cut that the Dean of the School of Medicine proposed and was accepted by President Gilmour resulted in a reduction to the total budget of the School of about 1.7%. The Committee recommended a cut about 50% higher, which would have brought the School's total cut to around 2.5%.

The third issue of disagreement involved tenure lines. The President's Cabinet proposed that over 40 promised tenure lines (most of them unfilled) be eliminated. The Committee had a vigorous discussion with the Cabinet about this issue. The Blue Ribbon Committee sent a copy of its report to the Academic Senate Budget Committee as well as to the Board of Governors. In early June, the Board of Governors met with members of the Senate's Budget Committee.

Mr. MacArthur summarized the accomplishments of the Blue Ribbon Committee. The Committee was successful in preserving the 40 plus tenure lines. However they will be held by the Provost until they are filled instead of being added to the budgets of the schools and colleges. The second accomplishment was that the documents the Committee produced will provide a framework for future budget planning, including several important statements of key principles. Budget cuts, he said, are not a one-time event; they will continue. In an era where all universities are increasing the number and salaries of administrators and where more and more of these decisions are being made by administrators, the Committee demonstrated that faculty and academic staff working together could produce a viable plan for budget reductions that is independent of any recommendations made by Deans and administrators and should serve as a model for moving forward.

Mr. Volz then spoke. He thanked the members of the Blue Ribbon Committee for their fine work. The faculty and academic staff on the committee, he noted, give credibility to consultation. The quality of the Blue Ribbon Committee's work was first rate.

The FY 2012 budget was the first budget for this administration. This was the first year President Gilmour has been President and the first year Provost Brown has been Provost. The budget process was an opportunity for them to learn about the University. In the Business School the faculty teach that, through its budget, an institution makes a statement of its values, a statement of what is important to an institution, a statement of what the leader of an institution is about. Mr. Volz thinks the President and the Provost are learning what Wayne State is and what it can be. What disappointed Mr. Volz about the budget reduction process was that he did not think the cuts were made with a vision of what Wayne State could be.

He saw the central struggle in the budgetary process to be between the easily articulable and that which is not. Easily articulable are the new operating systems such as the parking system and the new travel reimbursement system. It is not so easy to talk about building the quality of a Department of Emergency Medicine or a Department of Sociology. The essence of what the University does are its academic programs, the quality of the instruction and the scholarship. It is the heart of the institution. While it is hard to show improvement in academic programs, they are what the University is about. They have to be a clear priority in future budget decisions.

Mr. Volz believes that with thoughtful planning the University does not need to have budget cuts. If the University must move through a comparable sequence of budget cuts next year, we have done this year badly. The University, he said, needs aggressive initiatives to increase its revenue. If revenue can be increased by offering new programs and by moving into new markets and away from our tradition of relying so heavily on the State appropriation, Wayne State can be a financially healthy institution.

Eleven months of the year, the State of Michigan deposits a check in the University's account at Comerica Bank. Ten years ago that check was \$22 million a month. This year the check from the State will be \$18 million a month. Ten years ago the State appropriation was about \$250 million; this year it is \$195 million.

The University, Mr. Volz said, has to find new resources of revenue. It has to be entrepreneurial.

Mr. Volz called the members' attention to the fact that the cuts deeply affected the 50-year old clerical worker and the 40-year technical person in a computer-based entity. There is a temptation to say

that the faculty were not hit by this reduction in the Wayne State University work force, but that is very incorrect. The clerical and technical personnel are critical support for our academic programs of instruction and scholarship. Losing those employees makes the University a weaker institution. In conclusion, Mr. Volz said, our budget challenges should not be solved by cutting expenses but by enhancing revenues.

Mr. Parrish congratulated the Blue Ribbon Committee on its perseverance and the fact that the members' remained committed to their original ideals. The Committee's persistence was responsible for retaining the 40 faculty positions. However, overall, Mr. Parrish thought the process failed because there was no consultation with the Deans. He thinks there needs to be a change and that the President must realize what was done last year would not be effective this year. There must be greater consultation. There is a learning process, but in industry, where both the President and the Chief Financial Officer spent their previous careers, there is a top-down view. At a Budget meeting where the Senate representatives talked with Vice President Nork about having a parking committee with representation from the Senate Budget Committee, Mr. Nork basically said that he did not need a committee to tell him how to do his job. That, Mr. Parrish said, is a problem. In any university the central administration has to have a group of faculty telling them how to do their job. They don't have to listen. It is through the faculty governance process that Wayne State will become a stronger institution. Mr. Parrish hopes the faculty and academic staff will be more successful in their efforts this year. He congratulated the Committee for representing the concept of consultation in faculty governance.

Mr. MacArthur said that he, too, is confident about the future and he thinks that President Gilmour is committed to working with the faculty and that he recognized the limitations of not doing so this past year.

B. Annual Reports for the 2010-2011 Academic Year

1. Curriculum and Instruction Committee

The Academic Senate received the Annual Report of the 2010-2011 Curriculum and Instruction Committee (Appendix C).

2. Student Affairs Committee

The Academic Senate received the Annual Report of the 2010-2011 Student Affairs Committee (Appendix D).

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

Ms. Bielat asked about the Student Service Center that President Gilmour mentioned would be opening on October 3. Ms. Jones said that whereas telephone calls to Financial Aid had been outsourced for the past few years, that function was being brought back to campus. Fourteen people will be working in a one-stop shop in the Welcome Center to assist students with Admissions, Financial Aid, the Registrar, and Accounts Receivable.

ADJOURNMENT: It was **MOVED** and **SECONDED** to **ADJOURN** the meeting. **PASSED**. The meeting adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



LOUIS J. ROMANO
President, Academic Senate