

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY – ACADEMIC SENATE
Official Proceedings
September 8, 2010

Members Present: Ronald T. Brown, Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, Chair; Seymour J. Wolfson, President, Academic Senate; George Alangaden; Basim Asmar; Tyrone Austin; Ivan Avrutsky; Ramona Benkert; Veronica Bielat; Abhijit Biswas; Barbara Bosch; Kingsley Browne; Deborah Charbonneau; David Cinabro; Victoria Dallas; Donald DeGracia; Cheryl Dove; Karen Feathers; Maria Ferreira; Judith Fouladbakhsh; Andre Furtado; Ewa Golebiowska; Robert Holley; Avriil Genee Holt; Renee Hoogland; Michael Horn; Maik Hutteman; Patricia Jarosz; Barbara Jones; David Kessel; Winston Koo; Jerry Ku; Rita Kumar; Janine Lanza; Rodger MacArthur; James Martin; Lisa Maruca; Michael McIntyre; Bart Miles; Boris Mordukhovich; Bryan Morrow; James Moseley; Jennifer Sheridan Moss; David Oupicky; Abhilash Pandya; Prahlad Parajuli; Regina Parnell; Charles Parrish; Debra Patterson; Susil Putatunda; T.R. Reddy; Robert Reynolds; Louis Romano; Michele Ronnick; Brad Roth; Linea Rydstedt; Heather Sandlin; Alvin Saperstein; Mary Sengstock; Naida Simon; James Sondheimer; Timothy Stemmler; David Thomas; Harley Tse; Anca Vlasopolos; William Volz; Jianjun Wang; Judith Whittum-Hudson; Derek Wildman; James Woodyard; Lee Wurum; Zhe Yang

Members Absent with Notice: Elizabeth Puscheck; Aaron Retish; Karen Tonso; Mary Width; Jeffrey Withey; Earnesting Young

Members Absent: Liza Lagman-Sperl; Brian Madigan; Jason Mateika; Daniel Rappolee

Others Present: Johnnie Blunt, Academic Senate Office; Allan Gilmour, President; Gloria Heppner, Associate Vice President for Research; Robert Guttersohn, *The South End*, Kelley Skillin, Office of the Provost; Angela Wisniewski, Academic Senate Office

CALL TO ORDER: Provost Brown called this first meeting of the 2010-2011 academic year to order at 1:35 p.m. The meeting was held in the Bernath Auditorium in the Undergraduate Library.

Provost Brown said that he is very proud to be at Wayne State University. He praised the faculty, and thanked everyone for welcoming him to campus. He looks forward to working with the Academic Senate on several initiatives over the next months.

I. INTRODUCTION OF NEW MEMBERS

Mr. Wolfson introduced the members of the faculty and the academic staff who were newly elected to the

Senate and those who were re-elected to new terms. The membership roster is attached to these Proceedings as Appendix A.

II. ELECTION OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE

Ms. Sengstock, a member of the Elections Committee, conducted the election of Policy Committee members. She was replacing Mr. Woodyard, who chairs the Committee, 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: Victoria Dallas Communication, Fine, Performing and Communication Arts; David Kessel, Pharmacology, Medicine; Rodger MacArthur, Internal Medicine, Medicine; Robert Reynolds, Computer Science, Liberal Arts and Sciences; Anca Vlasopolos, English, Liberal Arts and Sciences; James Woodyard, Electrical and Computer Engineering, Engineering.

Ms. Sengstock called 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.

Ms. Sengstock reported that the Senate office had received a ballot by e-mail. Because the Senate's Bylaws do not allow voting via e-mail, the Elections Committee declared the ballot invalid.

Ms. Sengstock announced the results of the vote. David Kessel was elected to the three-year term. Victoria Dallas, Rodger MacArthur, Anca Vlasopolos, and James Woodyard were elected to one-year terms.

III. COMMENTS FROM THE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT

Provost Brown introduced Interim President Allan Gilmour. President Gilmour began by thanking the Senate for inviting him to the meeting. He is interested in working with the Academic Senate for the benefit of the University and, to the extent possible, for each individual.

The President has spent his time at the University learning about the academic side. He met with a variety of people, including Deans and faculty. When he is familiar with the academic side, Mr. Gilmour will look at the financial and operations side of the University. He did not want to focus on that part first

because the value of those activities support the academic mission.

People ask whether teaching or research is more important at a University. The best organizations, the President said, are able to handle more than one objective simultaneously.

Higher education, he said, is a place of excitement with new students and faculty revitalizing the institution each term. Wayne State, Mr. Gilmour noted, has substantial assets with which to work. The faculty are at the front line of those assets. Students come to the University for what the faculty provide. They want their professors to be on the leading edge, which means research. Some faculty do more teaching than research and other faculty do more research than teaching, and it is all valuable. Research, he noted, is done in all disciplines.

A faculty member had told the President that people at the University are too negative, and the President pointed out some of Wayne State's problems. The country is in a recession. The state led the nation into the recession. The City of Detroit is in decline and has been declining for a long time. The appropriation from the state will not increase. We would like to have low tuition, more grants and research support, and a larger endowment. Wayne State is large and complex, but it does not do everything equally well. Difficult choices will have to be made as the University decides what kind of organization it is and what it wants to be.

President Gilmour acknowledged that the retention rate of undergraduate students is awful and that it will be fixed. The focus has been on undergraduate students, but the retention of graduate students will be looked at as well. Provost Brown has read the last two retention studies and has formed a group to determine by the end of the year which recommendations from those studies can be implemented. The President and the Provost talked about two steps they will undertake. Not only will the University have excellent programs, but they will introduce the processes to carry out the programs and to measure how the programs are working.

President Gilmour sees a disconnect between the admissions standards and the academic standards. That has to be discussed later. The Provost wants to see how much Wayne State can improve the status of its current students to help them graduate. The University has to figure out how to position itself to attract students and it has to pay attention to the competition.

The President noted that Wayne State has a reputation of providing poor service to students and faculty. This is unacceptable. If an institution is to be successful it

cannot have weak spots. There will be an overhaul of some of the processes that people find cumbersome.

In closing, Mr. Gilmour said that the University would maintain academic standards. He will work hard to make Wayne State everything it can be.

President Gilmour took questions from the members.

Ms. Simon pointed out that the Academic Senate is composed of members of academic staff as well as faculty. She asked that they be recognized as Senate members.

Ms. Bielat mentioned that there were several committees formed under the previous administration that were duplicates of Academic Senate committees. She asked if the committees had been disbanded or if they would continue to function. President Gilmour said that he was given a list of the committees, although he had not looked at the list to determine if some could be merged. However, he thought the structure should be simplified and committees should be productive and reach conclusions.

Mr. Woodyard asked how Mr. Gilmour's experience in industry would cross over into an academic institution and increase efficiencies and improve processes. Mr. Gilmour said that in many ways it is harder to participate at a university than at a for-profit company because the for-profit company has a bottom line. However, a company that manages only to the bottom line cannot stay in business. There must be a subset and a supporting set of objectives, whether they are marketing, customer satisfaction, employee turnover, or research and development, if you are going to have the so-called bottom line. The principles of participating in any large organization are the same, which means you involve everyone you can because of their abilities and their views. Business does not do that well and it is moving towards the academic or non-profit model. The participants narrow the list of opportunities or decisions and reach a conclusion. For-profit companies probably have more experience with processes in part because the entire business is a set of processes. Teaching and research are far removed from the industrial or commercial processes. Mr. Gilmour thinks there are things the two types of organizations can learn from each other.

President Gilmour is pleased to be partnering with the Provost with his background because the Provost will spend much more of his time on the academic side and the President will spend more time on financing and advocating for the University in Lansing.

Mr. McIntyre described the recent history of the role of the Provost at Wayne State. Under an earlier administration the Provost had a rather minor role and

the title of Provost was removed. That person had the title of vice president as did a number of other executives. Then the role of the Provost was increased and the Provost had control of the budget. A diminution of the role followed and the Provost lost control of the budget. Mr. McIntyre asked the President if he had thought about the proper role of the Provost and what level of budget control the Provost's Office might have as well as when he might reach these decisions.

Mr. Gilmour said that he and the Provost have not reached a conclusion about these issues. The Provost is the chief academic officer and there will be a chief financial officer. As of now, the President does not see a reason to change the location of the budget. He does not anticipate changing the traditional way in which a major university is organized where the Provost is the second in command and the person who spends more of his time on the academic mission of the University. While there may be changes later, the President did not think they would be radical changes. In response to a follow-up question from Mr. McIntyre, President Gilmour said that he would consult with the Academic Senate on such issues.

Ms. Vlasopolos does not think Wayne State has been well represented in Lansing during her time at the University and she asked how Mr. Gilmour would handle that aspect of the presidency. President Gilmour said that while his job is to represent Wayne State he thinks the focus ought to be on the need for more funding for all of higher education.

Mr. Saperstein commented on the President's use of the word "customer." The usual implication of the word was that the customer is always right. In that sense, students are not customers. Mr. Gilmour realizes that students do not have a real customer relationship with the University. The student does not know what the content of a course should be. However, he thinks the University needs to improve the service it provides to the student or "customer."

In his 25 years at the University, Mr. Putatunda has seen a decline in the quality of the students. The University seems to be spending a lot of money on remedial instruction. He believes the University should recruit students who are better prepared. President Gilmour said that Provost Brown's committee is looking at steps to improve retention and it will take that suggestion into consideration. Admitting students who cannot succeed wastes the students' time and the faculty's time and takes money under false pretenses.

Ms. Sheridan Moss addressed issues related to the quality of campus life that add to the negativity on campus, such as large holes in parking lots, temperature extremes in classrooms, and dirty

buildings. She believes that small changes could improve the attitude of everyone at the University. She hoped Mr. Gilmour would address some of these issues during his time as President. He agreed that such conditions are not acceptable. A poorly maintained environment will not attract students and it gives the impression that you do not know what you are doing.

Mr. Gilmour said the University would conduct longitudinal surveys of students to find out why they came to Wayne State and would also survey those who were admitted but did not register to learn why they did not register. The University needs to have the facts to determine what is needed.

Mr. Holley was impressed with Wayne State's mission when he joined the faculty 22 years ago. The President at that time said that Wayne State was here to help the students who had the required intelligence but who did not necessarily have the money to go away to school. Mr. Holley hopes the University can focus on recruiting highly qualified students who have great potential for success but do not have the money to attend other universities. Mr. Gilmour is in full agreement with Mr. Holley's comments. Part of Provost Brown's work will be to address that issue.

Mr. DeGracia noted that the biggest flow of money at the University is through the Medical School and the practice plan. He asked President Gilmour for his thoughts on the sale of the Detroit Medical Center to a for-profit hospital system and how he thinks the University should react to that sale. Mr. Gilmour said that a private investor may be able to succeed under the new health insurance system signed into law. In general, for-profit health care systems have no research record. It is uncertain how the new owners will handle the community's health care needs. However, the DMC had a cash flow problem and could not keep up with the technology. The University, he believes, has to work with the DMC to keep it successful. If the DMC fails, the area does not have sufficient health care facilities to meet the needs of the people. Mr. DeGracia suggested that Mr. Gilmour's business acumen might be helpful in tackling the issues.

IV. APPRVAL OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

May 12, 2010

It was MOVED and SECONDED to APPROVE the Proceedings of the Academic Senate meeting of May 12, 2010. PASSED.

V. REPORT FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT

A. Report and Announcements

Mr. Wolfson read the following statement:

On behalf of the Academic Senate, we express our gratitude to Phyllis Vroom for her extraordinary service as Acting Provost and Acting President. In both positions she brought a spirit of cooperation and dynamism that was just what the University needed during this period of transition of leadership in both positions. She made promises to move the University forward in its support of undergraduate education and has done her utmost to redeem those promises. She worked closely and respectfully with the Academic Senate and the Policy Committee, and in her short time in these positions, in reach of her goals, she was successful in bringing about meaningful changes.

In the past few weeks Mr. Wolfson met individually with Interim President Gilmour and Provost Brown. In addition, the Board of Governors held a meeting to introduce President Gilmour to the Policy Committee before he officially assumed the presidency. Mr. Wolfson thinks the current leadership is serious about making Wayne State a better place. Both President Gilmour and Provost Brown have expressed the desire to work with the faculty and academic staff cooperatively to bring about positive change to the University. Both have indicated their respect for faculty governance and will work with the Academic Senate as we proceed through the years. Mr. Wolfson anticipates this will be a new beginning for Wayne State University. He expects there will be changes with which the Senate will be involved and which the faculty and academic staff can embrace. The Academic Senate offered President Gilmour and Provost Brown good luck and offered its sincere desire to work with them when called upon.

Mr. Wolfson reported that the Board of Governors is beginning the search process for a permanent President and asked Mr. Wolfson for nominees for the Presidential Search Advisory Committee. He e-mailed the Senate members asking for the names of faculty and academic staff who might serve on the Committee. On September 13, the Policy Committee will pare the list and submit the names to the Board of Governors.

B. Proceedings of the Policy Committee

The Academic Senate received the Proceedings of the Policy Committee meetings of May 3, 2010, May

12, 2010, May 24, 2010, June 7, 2010, June 21, 2010, June 28, 2010, July 12, 2010, July 26, 2010, August 2, 2010, and August 23, 2010. They are attached to these Senate Proceedings as Appendix B.

VI. REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

Provost Brown said that he is looking at the issues related to retention. Wayne State has voluminous literature about retention. There were a sufficient number of recommendations in those reports with which to work. The Retention Committee Report of May 2008 was very well done. It has very clear evidence based on extant literature and experience data from WSU. The Provost assembled a task force of Deans, faculty, and advisors that is deciding which recommendations can be implemented expeditiously. They are determining how to assess the recommendations and the cost of implementing them.

While admission standards will be looked at, Provost Brown first wanted to address how to serve the students that are currently at Wayne State, such as how to address cultural differences in learning styles. The Provost would like to expand the assistance that the Office of Teaching and Learning provides to faculty to help in retention.

Provost Brown said that he would be making bi-weekly addresses to the faculty about initiatives.

Provost Brown mentioned that a portion of the tuition money in the current academic year would be used to fund 22 new faculty positions. The focus of the faculty recruited will be mainly on undergraduate teaching although they would also teach graduate courses and do research. There are a number of other faculty lines for which Deans are recruiting faculty to replace those who have retired or left the University. The Provost has impressed upon the Deans that the most important thing for them to do this year is to hire excellent faculty.

VII. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Annual Reports for the 2009-2010 Academic Year

1. Budget Committee

Mr. McIntyre, the Chair of the Budget Committee, reported on the Committee's activities for the past year. Although the previous administration consulted with the Committee, the process would break down before a conclusion was reached, and work would begin again. The Budget Committee met 12 times during the last year. In addition, subcommittees held meetings, and Mr. McIntyre,

as Chair of the Committee, met with individuals in the administration.

The Committee worked on the issue of position control. The administration had a proposal in the Budget for fiscal year 2010 that would have captured, for the President's discretionary use, the money from open faculty positions in the schools and colleges. Many departments use the money from the open slots to cover their expenses. The Budget Committee wrote a proposal for more transparent budgets. Everyone approved the proposal pretty much as it was written originally but it was rejected by the administration. Work began again. In the end, the proposal was accepted almost as it was written originally. Mr. McIntyre views the result as a major success. Budgets will be more transparent and the budgeting process in the schools and colleges should improve.

The Budget Committee spent a lot of time on undergraduate education. Most of the members of the Committee are researchers and are not heavily involved in undergraduate education, but they recognized over the past several years that the University had a problem that needed to be addressed. The Committee was uniform in its recommendation that a certain number of open positions be filled with faculty who would focus on undergraduate education. The Committee had strong support from Acting Provost Vroom and from Provost Brown. Mr. McIntyre considers the acceptance of this plan to be the major achievement of the Provost's first few weeks at WSU.

The Budget Committee is involved in parking. Mr. Woodyard studied the issue and the Senate tried to stop the Board of Governors from making any more capital investments in the parking structures until the underlying problem of poor maintenance was resolved. The compromise was that a task force would work this fall to develop a concrete plan.

The Committee was involved in the debate over the Code of Ethics, which ostensibly was to ensure that money was spent in an upright and honest way, but which became a code covering speech. Many members of the Senate contributed to the demise of the code, but the Budget Committee played a large role in that activity.

The Committee had a role in L.E.A.D.S. (Linked Employee Assessment and Development System), an industrial management style that was to be imposed on academic deans. Some academics thought the program was not suitable

for the academic side, that a process more in line with the way academics were evaluated was appropriate. Former Provost Nancy Barrett played a key role in getting the plan modified.

Mr. McIntyre said that the Committee sees all of the documents that are on the agendas of the Board of Governors Budget and Finance Committee meetings. Sometimes the Committee does not comment on the information or proposals, but often it does comment.

2. Curriculum and Instruction Committee

Karen Feathers, the Chair of the Curriculum and Instruction Committee, told the Senate about the issues with which the Committee dealt last year. The first issue raised was the withdrawal policy and the time frame for late registration. The Policy Committee was already working with Howard Shapiro on this issue so the C&I Committee did not pursue the question. The second issue was the computer competency exam. The exam given to students was based on *Office 2003* but the students' computers and the University's computers had a more recent version of *Office*. The Committee recommended that the test be updated and that was done.

The third issue involved the student evaluation of teaching. Policy Committee charged C&I with looking into the question of potential bias related to student motivation. Are students taking the course because it is required or because they are interested in the subject? However, when the Committee looked at the SET, it decided that the entire evaluation needed to be reconsidered and revised. The current SET form was developed 15 years ago and there have been many changes in teaching since then. There are more on-line courses and more hybrid courses. There are new techniques used in face-to-face courses. Another concern was the students' response rate. The response rate for on-line courses is so low it is invalid. The response rate is not very good when the SET is given in a classroom; students return blank forms. The C&I Committee recommended that an ad hoc committee be developed to look at the SET form, and if the University continues to ask students to evaluate classes, the committee should decide what the form should contain. If a form were not to be used, the ad hoc committee should consider an alternative form of evaluation. Mr. Saperstein asked when the University would revise the policy governing the time period in which students are able to withdraw from classes. Last year the C&I Committee was told that the change would be made, but it has not happened. Several members of the Senate responded. They

believed that the change had been made, that students could no longer drop classes after the tenth week without the signature of the instructor. [Note: After the meeting it was learned that the policy had not been changed. The Registration Calendar for the 2010-2011 academic year lists the day to withdraw from classes as the Study Day.]

Mr. Wolfson said that the faculty also wanted to change the time period when students may add classes from the end of the second week of classes to the end of the first week of classes. Mr. Wolfson will check into the implementation of this policy.

Ms. Feathers noted that with classes in the fall term beginning on Wednesday and the Labor Day holiday, classes that are held on Monday do not begin until almost two weeks into the term.

The Annual Report of the Curriculum and Instruction Committee for the 2009-2010 academic year is attached to these Proceedings as Appendix C.

3. Faculty Affairs Committee

The Annual Report of the Faculty Affairs Committee for the 2009-2010 academic year is attached to these Proceedings as Appendix D.

4. Research Committee

Mr. Cinabro, the Chair of the Research Committee, reported on the work the Committee accomplished last year. The Annual Report of the Research Committee for the 2009-2010 academic year is attached to these Proceedings as Appendix E.

Mr. Cinabro made a presentation to the Senate at the May 12 Senate meeting about the Committee's work on a report *How the University Supports Research* so he reported on the other activities in which the Committee was engaged last year. The Committee helped to move the research misconduct policy to completion. It investigated areas where people had problems, such as the new electronic tools in Sponsored Program Administration. The Committee got clarification on disbursement policies, on the budgetary involvement of the University in TechTown, on how the University's research ranking is calculated, and on the post-approval monitoring system for animal research. The Committee provided feedback on the new *Grant Life Cycle* website that helps researchers put together a grant.

This year Mr. Cinabro would like the Committee to follow up with Associate Dean for Research Joseph Dunbar on the progress of the committee he chairs that is looking at ways to provide incentives to increase research. He would also like the Committee to address concerns that researchers have raised about the responses they've had from Facilities, Planning and Management. Better communication about research has always led to long discussions in the Committee, and he expects the Committee to address that issue, as well.

5. Student Affairs Committee

Ms. Simon, the Chair of the Student Affairs Committee, reported that the Committee met six times during the 2009-2010 academic year. It conducted two surveys. The first one was the smoking survey done in conjunction with the Elections Committee and the Faculty Affairs Committee. The second was the calendar survey done in conjunction with the Elections Committee. Five thousand nine hundred students, faculty, staff, and administrators completed the smoking survey and almost 5500 people completed the calendar survey.

Timothy Michael, the Director of Housing, informed the Committee about the changes in housing. An issue was brought to Ms. Simon's attention just prior to the Senate meeting, which is that the Student Center is closed on holiday weekends. The students who live on campus have nowhere to eat or to spend their free time.

The Committee will invite the Director of University Advising, the Director of Student Disability Services, and the Director of Counseling and Psychological Services to meetings to learn about the work of their offices.

The Annual Report of the Student Affairs Committee for the 2009-2010 academic year is attached to these Proceedings as Appendix F.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Seymour J. Wolfson
President, Academic Senate