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CALL TO ORDER: Provost Whitfield called this regularly scheduled meeting of the Academic Senate to order at

1:32 p.m. The meeting was held in the Bernath Auditorium in the Undergraduate Library.

I. THE GRADUATE SCHOOL’S ROLE IN PREPARING GRADUATE STUDENTS FOR CAREERS

Dean of the Graduate School Ambika Mathur spoke about the role of the Graduate School in preparing graduate students for careers. The Graduate School works with the schools, colleges, and departments. Faculty are critical in the School’s work. The role of graduate schools is changing. In the past, graduate schools were essentially form processors concerned with recruitment, admissions, progress towards degree, and degree certification and the role of faculty in those processes (through the Graduate Council). In the 21st century, universities must be aware of the job market and prepare graduate students for diverse careers in academics, industry and non-profit organizations. Wayne State’s Graduate School is a leader in prepar-ing students for non-traditional careers and this is shown by the many new functions that the Graduate School has taken on over the last few years compared to the limited role it had before.

There are four major goals of the Graduate School in this expanded role: (1) promoting excellence in a diverse student body; (2) collecting, analyzing, and disseminating data about what our faculty and our graduates are doing; (3) providing students with the highest competency experiences to prepare them for successful careers; and (4) providing support to faculty to increase research productivity and mentoring to best serve the needs of a diverse student body.

At the undergraduate level WSU has a diverse student population, but it does not have as diverse a group at the graduate level. The Graduate School is working to recruit graduate students locally and nationally. It has hired a recruitment specialist. It provides funds to departments and faculty to recruit students. The School is holding open houses and recruitment fairs. It has dedicated scholarships and assistantships to enable Wayne State to compete with other institutions for students. It has built pipeline programs, the biggest one being the $21 million grant from the NIH-funded BUILD (Building Infrastructure Leading to Diversity) program in partnership with the University of Detroit Mercy and some community colleges. One hundred fifty faculty participate in the BUILD program. The BUILD program brings under-represented students straight out of high school, uses high impact practices, involves them in research, and uses learning commun-ities. It is a pipeline to the graduate program. The students in the first cohort are in their senior year. Their four-year graduation rate is 85%. The other 15% are engineering students who, because of the curricu-lum, could not complete their programs in four years, but they will complete their degrees in 4.5 or 5 years. Similarly, the students in the Med-Direct program have an average GPA of 3.99 and they are on track to complete their undergraduate degrees in four years.

Vertical learning communities were formed to provide peer mentoring. A program called post-doctoral faculty transition is preparing women to enter faculty positions.

When Professor Mathur was appointed Interim Dean of the Graduate School she found that, as an institu-tion, Wayne State did not have data about our alumni. We did not know where our graduates were working, the types of work they were doing, and whether we were preparing them adequately for the existing job markets. The School reached out to faculty and graduate directors and used the Internet to locate our Ph.D. alums from 1999 to 2014. We were able to reach 92% or about 3,000 Ph.D. alumni. The data show that the vast majority of the students who graduated with a Ph.D. in the humanities and the arts in that period went into teaching careers. Most of the Ph.D. graduates in the social and behavioral sciences and education are in academia but there is also a large group that are in industry. Graduates in the STEM fields are divided between industry and academia. There is more diversity in biomedical careers. Graduates are in academia, for-profit industry, government, and non-profit industry. Almost 65% of our alumni stay in Michigan, having an impact on the economic and intellectual capital of Michigan and of the country. The alumni were surveyed, and they rated their experiences in research training very high. The only negative rating was for facilities. The Grad School surveyed the employers of our alumni as well, and they had high praise.

There is a dashboard on the Graduate School’s website (at <https://gradschool.wayne.edu/dashboard> -scroll down to “visual representation” and in detail at <https://oira.wayne.edu/dashboard/graduate-school/phd-alumni-survey-report> -scroll to the right to see the breakdown in employment sector or geo-graphic region of employment of Ph.D.s by school or college). The first link shows in visualization wheels the career outcomes for four different groupings of doctoral alumni over the 15-year period: humanities, arts and communication; social and behavioral sciences and education; biomedical; and science, technology, engineering and math (STEM). The second link provides the detailed numerical data from the Ph.D. alumni survey.

Seventy-five percent of our graduates enter careers other than academia. It is important to provide them with the skillset to make informed decisions about career opportunities and to prepare them for the job. Wayne State was one of ten institutions out of about 110 applicants that received the NIH award Broaden-ing Experiences in Scientific Training (BEST). The purpose is to expose students to careers outside academia. The project was open to students across disciplines. In the first phase, students are exposed to explorations, which are panel discussions. The second phase is more in depth. The Graduate School brings alumni and local employers to campus so students can network. The third phase is an internship or experiential learning experience for six to ten weeks at the industry partner’s place to help students decide if they want to work there. About 40 students have taken part in the project with about 15 graduates working for the company where they interned.

To show employers that our graduates have fulfilled certain competencies, the Graduate School created a set of Graduate and Post-Doctoral Professional Development (GPPD) seminars. After students attend the seminars and workshops, they take a quiz that is graded. If they have mastered the skillset, they receive a micro credential (badge).

People have asked if participants in the programs are primarily students with lower GRE scores. The students who participated in the BEST program had a range of scores on the GRE. The cumulative GPA at the time of graduation showed no statistical difference. Participation in the seminars did not negatively impact time to degree. In fact, it appears to help slightly. It is thought that students who know what they are going to do are more interested in completing their degree earlier.

Faculty also need funding and support. The Graduate School has a program of competitive graduate research assistantships that provide support for clusters of faculty for training grants and program project grants. The Graduate School provides funding for up to four graduate research assistants for two years with the expectation that they will apply for an externally-funded grant after two years. There are fellowship writing boot camps so Ph.D. students, masters students, and post docs can learn the basic elements of writing fellowships.

In the last few years the Graduate School covered tuition shortfalls for graduate research assistants. NIH covers 60% of tuition so 40% had to be paid by the department or the faculty mentor. Dean Mathur viewed this as penalizing success and the Grad School is covering what NIH does not.

The transactional activities of the School help in recruiting Ph.D. students and the School is recog-nized for its leadership in graduate education. The Graduate School has received $25 million in external funding. It submitted three new training grant applica-tions, published 15 papers in the national press, and made 45 invited presentations. It has been involved with program reviews and has briefed Congress on health and equity.

The value-added activities of the Graduate School are a significant addition to the processing of graduate student admissions, candidacy and degree completion certification that was its sole focus in the past. The slide at the end of these proceedings illustrates the additional activities undertaken by the Graduate School in this revitalized perspective.

II. Responsibility Centered Management (RCM)

Jeffrey Bolton, Assistant Vice President, Office of University Budget, presented the current proposed RCM flow of funds. Members of the University com-munity have been working on the proposed RCM model since February 2017. The proposal has all the aspects of a traditional RCM model. Mr. Bolton has met with half of the schools and colleges about the model. In the presentations, he used budget data from fiscal year 2017 to show how funds would flow in the proposed model and how the budgets of schools, colleges, and departments would be affected. The plan is to transition to the new model for FY 2021 that begins October 1, 2020. There will be a hold-harmless period as the units make the transition to ensure that no school or college has a deficit when the transition is made. This will be achieved by providing a ‘subvention’ sufficient to bring the unit budget up to the amount that it had for the year prior to the beginning of RCM.

The 11 schools and colleges, excluding the Graduate School and the Honors College, are the revenue generating units (RGUs). The Graduate School, the Honors College, all divisions, all central accounts such as utilities, debt service payments, and deferred maintenance are non-revenue generating units (NGUs).

1. Revenue Allocation

The University has four sources for General Fund money: the State appropriation (about $200 million per year); net tuition and fees (about $400 million per year); facilities and administration cost recovery from grants (about $30 million per year); and the General Fund investment account ($7 million or $8 million per year). Mr. Bolton explained that the General Fund investment account is not related to the University Foundation or individual school and college endow-ments. It is the cash pool portion of the General Fund that is held in fairly liquid and low risk investments.

1. *Allocation of State Appropriation monies*

The recommendation is that $6 - $7 million from the roughly $200 million State appropriation would be given to the Offices of the President and the Provost for discretionary use (e.g., strategic initiatives and other incentive funding projects). About $100 million will be required for subvention of RGUs (funds allocated to schools/colleges that otherwise would be in deficit). The remainder of the State appropriation and funds from other sources minus the amounts taxed through the cost allocation methods to support the NGUs would flow through the RGUs and would be used by those schools/colleges to cover expenses of the units (e.g., salaries and fringe benefits, travel, and supplies). That provides a net result prior to any subvention amount. Subvention is the subsidization of schools/colleges that might not be self-supporting based on revenue and expenses but are critical in the University’s role and mission.

The University’s current budget model is an incre-mental model. Mr. Bolton used data from FY 2017 to explain how funds would flow in the RCM model, illustrated with a pro forma RCM budget for a hypo-thetical School of Architecture with both undergradu-ate and graduate students. The amount of the State appropriation (after removal of the President’s and Provost’s allocation and the reserve for subvention) for each RGU is determined in proportion to the total credit hours produced by the RGU as a percentage of the University’s total credit hour production (without distinguishing between undergraduate, graduate, and professional level courses). If the unit generated 4.57% of the total University credits, it would receive 4.57% of the State appropriation available for allocation.

1. *Allocation of F&A recovery funds (ICR) and miscellaneous other funds generated by each RGU*

All F&A recovery funds and miscellaneous funds collected from a sponsored research project would flow to the RGU employing the principal investigator responsible for the project. Miscellaneous funds are other revenues generated by a school/college/division that are collected centrally.

1. *Allocation of tuition and fee revenue*

For undergraduate base tuition (not including any differential tuition), the current model would allocate 25% of base tuition to the school/college of the major and 75% to the school/college of instruction. The student services fees would be similarly split 25%, 75% per credit hour. The college of the major supports the student with advising, student organiza-tions, and other resources. The college teaching the course bears the expense of the instructor, the space, and the supplies for the course. Differential tuition is the dollar per credit hour that schools/colleges or individual programs charge above the base tuition. The current proposal is that 100% of differential tuition would be returned to the school/college charging that differential tuition. The registration fee would go 100% to the school/college of the major. Some colleges have a support fee, a per head per semester fee: 100% of such fees would go to the school/college of the major. Course materials fees are based on the consumables of the course so 100% would go to the school/college of instruction.

Under the current proposal, all of the tuition and fee revenue from graduate and professional students would flow to the school/college of the major. The vast majority of students at the graduate and profes-sional levels take their courses within the school/

college of their major, and those courses generally have small student/faculty ratios and higher-level faculty instructors. The RCM steering committee may revisit the question of the allocation of the graduate and professional tuition and fees. They may consider a split similar to the one that will be used at the undergraduate level.

1. *Financial aid*.

Most financial aid is a tuition discount, and thus not actual revenue received by the University. At the undergraduate level, the institutional awards are primarily the need-based Board of Governors awards and the Presidential awards that are primarily merit based. Also included are Indian Tuition, Special Programs, and Detroit Compact. The need-based awards are provided through the Office of Student Financial Aid and the merit awards are given through the Office of Undergraduate Admissions, both under AVP Dawn Medley. The current recommendation is to divide the total amount of the awards, which in FY 2017 was about $53 million, by the total undergradu--ate credit hours of 431,000 for a cost for financial aid of $122 per credit hour. The total number of under-graduate hours generated for the year by the RGU would be multiplied by the cost per credit hour to determine the deduction from the tuition amount for the school/college to cover the discount for under-graduate financial aid. That provides a net under-graduate tuition amount that is the actual tuition revenue available to the school and college prior to cost allocations (taxes) for central administration functions.

At the graduate level, graduate assistants are allocated to the school/college by the Graduate School based on an historical formula. On an annual basis the Graduate School allocates about $16 million in GRA/GTA financial aid. The current recommend-ation is that those amounts will not be netted out of the schools/colleges, and each will determine its awards for its graduate assistants from its own revenues. Other schools award tuition discounts to professional or graduate students similar to the financial aid offered to undergraduate students, and those schools are being provided the net tuition figure based on their FY17 allocations.

1. Expenses

In the new budget model, expenses include direct expenses and the indirect costs of central adminis-tration support units. Direct expenses are the costs resulting from the RGUs direct activities, programs or support, such as faculty and staff salaries, fringe benefits, supplies, and travel. They are charged directly to the individual school/college budgets.

1. Cost Allocations

To provide revenues to support the administrative units such as the President’s Office, Provost’s Office, Enrollment Management, Computing and Information Technology, Public Safety, utilities, and deferred maintenance (a total cost of about $94.6 million in FY17), various “cost allocation” drivers will be used to charge each RGU a portion of those costs. All costs of the NGUs have been allocated among three categories, each with one unique cost driver. Various student services will be funded by a cost driver based on credit hours (without distinguishing among levels). Various costs of facilities (space costs) will be funded by a cost driver of square footage (without distinguishing among types). Various other general central administration NGUs (such as the Provost’s Office, the Office of the Vice President for Finance and Business Operations, the Office of the Vice President for Research and others) will be funded by a cost driver of direct expenses (essentially, a percentage determined as the General Fund expenditures of a school/college over the total General Fund direct expenditures of RGUs (about $287 million) times the budget amount that each of those offices are to be allocated, without distinguishing among primary versus secondary users of services). In the hypothetical pro forma example Mr. Bolton used. the School of Architecture would have a cost allocation (expense) equal to 4.57% of the total support for NGUs or 4.3 million dollars of the 94.6 million dollars.

Mr. Bolton noted that space is used in two ways. First, it is used to calculate the “direct expense” for an RGU’s controlled space (e.g., a practice room controlled by the College of Communication, Fine and Performing Arts). That cost has been calculated as an average for the entire University, without distinguishing between costs of specialized-use spaces, as $19.60 per square foot in FY17. The total cost of space on campus is $76.6 million. The “direct expense” of space for a college that controlled 150,000 square feet would therefore be $2.9 million. (This direct expenditure will change after the master plan is finalized, to the extent a school/college changes its controlled space.)

The second way that space is used is to calculate a cost allocation from RGUs to cover the facilities costs of the University. That will also be based on a percentage calculation using the average cost per square foot.

This ended Mr. Bolton’s presentation. He and Mr. Decatur took questions from members.

A member asked why Athletics was classified as an NGU. It is usually thought of as bringing in some revenue. Mr. Bolton said that Athletics only brings in some thousands of dollars. The general fund now is supporting Athletics. Mr. Decatur added that Athletics, being in Division II, is not an auxiliary. It if were, it would be expected to be self-supporting. Most Athletics programs, even those in Division I, are subsidized.

Mr. Bolton was asked what the rationale was for allocating 75% of tuition to the school of instruction and 25% to the school of the major. He responded that a vast majority of universities that use RCM split the funds. Most are split 70/30 or 75/25, with some others split 80/20. Across state institutions the split of 75/25 is the most common.

In the University’s current budget model the units begin with the current year’s budget and incremental adjustments up or down are made. The RCM model provides transparency of the cost and the flow of funds. A member asked how many schools/colleges would need subvention. Based on FY 2017 data, Mr. Bolton said that five schools/colleges would need subvention. Any school/college receiving subvention would submit a multi-year plan with strategies to close the subsidized gap. The plan would be submitted to the Budget Planning Council (BPC) and reviewed by the Provost.

Asked how units would generate new revenue, Provost Whitfield said there are opportunities to generate revenue by creating new programs that will interest students. We can take our current courses and repackage them. The public health program has grown to 500 students. Under RCM the increased tuition would flow to the Department of Family Medicine and Public Health. We have structural deficits from budget cuts. Colleges can try to create efficiencies. Disciplines not bound by accreditation bodies could increase class size.

A member asked if the need-based awards and the merit-based awards would go to the schools/colleges or remain at the university level. Mr. Decatur said they are costs allocated to schools/colleges; it’s an offset against the revenue going to the school/college because the financial aid is a tuition discount. Real cash is not exchanged for undergraduate financial aid. If a unit has many students who have financial need or merit, how will the school cover faculty salaries? The RCM model would allocate undergraduate financial aid across all schools/colleges based on their overall share. We would not look at the individ-ual awards given to students in a school/college. The number of students with financial aid may vary from year to year. We don’t want to have a mechanism that would encourage schools/colleges to reject students who receive need-based financial aid because it might affect their bottom line. By sharing the financial aid across all undergraduate hours we avoid having an incentive or disincentive in that area.

Mr. Bolton replied to a question about the distribution of F&A. In the proposal all F&A would flow to deans of the PI’s school. Whether a percentage would be given to the department and the principal investigator would, under the current model, be a decision that rests with the dean of the school. The deans will also decide if the RCM model will be used generally to allocate funds down to the department level. Some institutions of higher education take it to the depart-ment level but most do not. If it is not taken to the department level, many deans use it as a tool for budgetary discussions within the school/college.

A college’s success using the RCM model requires good management skills and strategy. The deans, Provost Whitfield said, are stepping up to the challenge. In past years they were not given much information to manage their colleges. The deans will submit their plans to the BPC that will assess them. If a school/college has a plan that doesn’t work out, the dean will have to answer to the BPC and the Provost. Provost Whitfield hopes the deans will work with the school/college Budget Advisory Committees to identify strategies they can use to prevent the need for subvention.

A member noted that the RCM model would encour-age colleges to offer even more online courses because the physical space expense is removed. Adjunct faculty often teach remotely. They don’t come to campus or use an office. Mr. Decatur responded that has not happened at two other univer-sities where he worked that adopted the RCM model.

There was concern about the fluctuation of budgets with enrollment changes or expense increases and a question about allocation of tuition for undergraduate students who do not yet have a major. The University will probably use a rolling average of three years so there isn’t significant fluctuation in a college’s budget any single year. If a college experiences a reduction in credit hours, it would have some time to adjust the plan. The RCM Steering Committee will have to consider how to allocate tuition for undecided students admitted on the exploratory track.

Mr. Parrish pointed out that Wayne State has not had a large increase in students. Referring to the public health program, he noted that the University did not get 500 new students. The students were in other programs and transferred to public health. To increase enrollment, schools/colleges will simply steal students from other schools/colleges. What safe-guards would be in place to discourage this?

Provost Whitfield said that theft of students is over-estimated. We have to make sure our programs are good, exciting, high quality programs. We lose students when we don’t have programs they are excited about. Departments cannot create majors that other departments have. If a proposal appears to be encroaching on another program, the Provost’s Office will reject it. The RCM model, the Provost said, should encourage colleges to work together to attract new students. An example is the data analytics program between the School of Business and the College of Engineering. The number of credits students take is fairly evenly split between the two schools. If a dean tries to generate revenue by duplicating courses, that person should not be a dean. The Provost’s Office is trying to promote more collaboration.

Responding to a question about space utilization, Mr. Decatur said that the University is five months into the master planning process. The group has looked at space utilization on campus. There appear to be opportunities to consolidate space. RCM may create an incentive for the schools/colleges to assess if they are utilizing their space well and whether they need all that they have. From the standpoint of deferred maintenance, there are buildings that we perhaps should vacate and tear down. Schools/colleges will be part of the analysis of the space and may be able to turn the space back to the University and reduce their costs. Provost Whitfield said that academic performance solutions software that Mr. Decatur mentioned is a tool to see how effectively units are using their space. Deans and faculty need to look at what they want to do across the next three years. New programs have been established in the last few years, but more will have to be done. It will take faculty leadership. The deans are being encouraged to be as transparent as possible to ensure this discussion takes place.

Mr. Romano commented that he likes the RCM model because it makes deans more accountable and it can generate more revenue. However, there is a problem in the model. Ph.D. students and masters students are treated equally even though it is more costly to teach a Ph.D. student because they are supported by teaching assistantships. The Chemistry Department has about 70 teaching assistants at a cost of about $2 million. Mr. Romano came to Wayne State because it had a good Ph.D. program. That is probably true of all faculty in the STEM fields. None of the Chemistry faculty who are now at Wayne State would be here if we did not have a great Ph.D. program in chemistry. Masters credits will produce the same amount of money and none of the problems. There is no incentive to enhance Ph.D. programs other than good will and the relevant dean believing it is important. There is no financial incentive to have good ratings. Chemistry is highly rated. Mr. Romano wants the Steering Committee to rethink how credits are counted. They are much more important than has been communicated. What is the incentive for deans to support and enhance Ph.D. programs since they are so costly?

Mr. Decatur said the Steering Committee has received similar comments and suggestions of different ways to address the issue. One way would be to change how we allocate the appropriation and take into account differential costs of programs. A number of states have a funding formula at the state level that is cost based down to the discipline level that aggregates data across the state. Michigan doesn’t have anything like that for our internal use. There are other suggestions to use compensation and/or total program cost as a weight to modify the allocation. Another way to approach this is through a specific incentive funding strategy. A task force was asked to look at that. Their recommendation was to run the model for a few years before we add central administration incentives programs. That decision has not been made. The Steering Committee will look at incentive strategies.

Provost Whitfield mentioned that a university does some things because there is a value in doing them. Some things cost more than others. Chairs and deans want the highest achieving faculty. There also is a cost to doing research. For every dollar research brings in it costs about $1.25 when you consider labs and utilities, etc. Research is a winning proposition in ways that are not necessarily a dollar value. Mr. Romano maintains that deans will not allocate money for research. Research needs to be incentivized.

A member asked if faculty would be expected to teach more courses because increased credit hours bring in the money. Mr. Decatur said that would depend on the individual school/college.

Mr. Parrish said that under both the current budget model and the RCM model it’s credit hours that affect the budget. He, too, believes deans and chairs will be more interested in expanding courses than in supporting research. Mr. Decatur does agree with Mr. Romano. The Steering Committee will consider the points made about research and discuss possible modifications to the model. The reason Mr. Bolton and Mr. Decatur are meeting with faculty is to get feedback and criticism.

The need to deal with the deferred maintenance problems in Scott Hall was raised. It is in very poor condition and getting worse every day. It will be extraordinarily expensive to replace the building. Does that fall on the Medical School alone? Mr. Decatur said that it does not. Many strategies will be needed to address the problems in Scott Hall. Provost Whitfield added that Scott Hall affects everyone because it brings in a lot of ICR and affects the reputation of the University. There would be support centrally to replace the building; it would not be the responsibility of one college.

Mr. Ackerman noted that with increased responsibility goes increased independence for the units. In his experience when a college wanted to appoint new faculty the dean needed authorization from the Provost. Under RCM when a dean asks to hire new faculty to replace those who have left the University or retired, will the Provost agree as long as the college could support the faculty? Provost Whitfield said that there are central funds to assist colleges in strategic ways but more of the decision making will be in the schools and colleges. The relationship between the Provost and the deans will be one of collaboration. If a dean requests more faculty the Provost will ask if the college has the budget to hire faculty. The next question would be if the college has investigated whether the program will attract students. Deans have to make strategic decisions where they want to grow and how they will do that. The Provost’s Office will help in certain ways. Some of the strategic funding will be one-time funding. Mr. Ackerman was not asking about hiring new faculty but about replacing faculty who have retired or have left the University. The Provost said that colleges are able to replace faculty now. Whether a dean decides to do it for a particular unit is different than whether they can replace the line. Deans decide if they will invest in a unit that is not performing. The college doesn’t lose the line. Deans move lines to areas they want to support. Colleges are not losing lines if faculty are lost through resignation or retirement.

Provost Whitfield addressed another rumor. Some people believe that unit budgets have been cut. That is not true. No unit budgets have been cut in the last two years. The budgets have been held flat. We have not had money to hire new faculty, but colleges have been able to hire faculty who have been lost.

III. APPROVAL OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

October 3, 2018

It was MOVED and SECONDED to APPROVE the Proceedings of the Academic Senate meeting of October 3, 2018. PASSED.

IV. REPORT FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT

1. Report and Announcements

RCM

Ms. Beale noted that the Budget and Policy Committees have spent two joint sessions reviewing the RCM recommendations, and have raised a number of concerns in that process. She has also taken on her new role on the RCM Steering Committee and observed that the absence of an Academic Senate voice has meant these concerns have not been adequately raised up to this point. There is some worry that the meetings with schools/colleges will not be sufficiently expansive to allow all faculty to understand the model in depth and provide the kinds of criticisms necessary to correct current oversights.

In this regard, Ms. Beale noted several specific concerns regarding transparency and fairness. First, the allocation of the State appropriation among the RGUs does not use a sufficiently sophisticated model. It is determined solely based on the percentage of University credit hours generated by the unit. Professional and graduate education, however, are quite different from undergraduate education and have very different market characteristics, including higher paid faculty and costlier student recruitment/retention. This credit-hour allocation will tend to allocate more funding to schools/colleges with significant undergraduates and will not adequately fund graduate and professional programs. A more sophisticated formula using market drivers such as faculty compensation and competitive market measures (such as the level of tuition discount required by the school/college competition for students or the benchmarked cost of quality PhD compared with undergraduate programs) should be included.

Second, the “direct expense” for space costs charges every school/college an average cost of space. But we know that laboratory, performance or other high-tech specialized space is much more costly than ordinary classroom and office space. The goal of transparency and fairness is not achieved when the formulaic costs are deceptive. Each school/college should be charged a “direct expense” for space that accurately reflects its costs for specialized and non-specialized space.

Third, the cost drivers tend to charge all programs for University services that are predominantly used by only some programs. A more nuanced application of those cost drivers would be more transparent and fairer to the RGUs. For example, Undergraduate Affairs, Enrollment Management, Student Success and Honors College are almost exclusively undergraduate service units. Those should be supported by a cost driver coordinated to undergraduate credit hours, not overall credit hours. The Graduate School should be supported by graduate credit hours.

Fourth, as Professor Romano mentioned earlier, there needs to be fuller consideration of graduate education in the model. It is not clear that the program adequately considers the importance of maintaining quality Ph.D. programs in order to maintain Wayne State’s status as a Research I university. That may mean that the model needs to consider the respective roles of the Vice President for Research and the Graduate School more fully as well. Is it appropriate to leave GTA and GRA support within individual RGUs, or is there a danger that deans will find it more convenient to support masters students than PhDs or hire lecturers with the tuition funding rather than support graduate assistants? Indirect cost recovery funds are going to the schools/colleges of the PIs, but all schools/

colleges are supporting the Office of the Vice President for Research based on a percentage of general expenditures—meaning that STEM disciplines will receive more funding and non-STEM disciplines will pay more to support research support functions. Other models should be considered.

General Education Oversight Committee

Ms. Beale noted that the Policy Committee had realized that the Gen Ed reform statute changes included a change to the General Education Oversight Committee that had apparently not been discussed in either the GEOC itself or in Policy. The number of CLAS representatives was signifi-cantly reduced, and the selection of Academic Senate representatives did not comport with the discussion that had taken place in Policy. After discussion, it was agreed that an amendment would be put forward by Provost Whitfield to raise the number of CLAS representatives to six and to have a faculty co-chair of GEOC, among other things. The Provost will put this before the Board of Governors at the December 7 meeting.

B. Proceedings of the Policy Committee

The Senate received the Proceedings of the Policy Committee meetings of September 24, 2018, October 8, 2018, October 15, 2018, and October 22, 2018 (Appendix A). Ms. Beale pointed out that RCM was a major focus of the Policy Committee during this time.

October 15, 2018

Ms. Beale noted the Policy Committee’s work with respect to an audit that has been conducted of an employee based on an anonymous tip alleging false timesheets (item #6). As a key part of the “investigation” undertaken by the audit office, the University accessed the employee’s use of volun-tarily purchased campus parking and demanded that the employee provide an explanation for every time over more than four years that her timesheet showed her present but she did not swipe into campus parking. The particular employee’s timesheets had been approved by her supervisor for all of these periods of work, and the employee has excellent evaluations throughout. The employee had often been driven to work by her spouse, and had lent her car to her son during an extensive period. Policy has written a memo to the Internal Audit office forcefully objecting to the use of this information against any employee. There has been neither notice nor consent to use of this information, which does not form part of any employee’s personnel file. It is unfair to use this information in this way, because it provides no information other than that the employee did not use the campus parking service on a particular day. It does not provide any evidence whatsoever regarding the employee’s attendance at work: employees can take public transportation or Uber, they can carpool or ride with a spouse or friend, they can park off campus. No one could reasonably be required to produce receipts for other transportation or state for any particular day years earlier how they arrived at campus. For employees that never purchase campus parking, parking information is simply unavailable. The auditor should be interviewing supervisors and reviewing material in the personnel file in response to an anonymous tip, not undertaking a draconian investigation using information about personal uses of voluntarily purchased services. Policy will continue to follow this investigation.

Mr. Parrish commented on the issue of the Office of Internal Audit questioning employees about inconsistencies between their use of parking facilities and their timesheets. He advised Senate members that if the Auditor’s Office calls them to a meeting, they should immediately contact the AAUP-AFT so a union representative can accompany them to the meeting.

V. REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

Provost Whitfield mentioned that the inaugural issue of the newsletter *Faculty Impact* was e-mailed to faculty. The publication will highlight faculty research, teaching and service accomplishments. It is one way for faculty to learn what their colleagues across campus are doing. This first issue focuses on faculty who are doing Big Data work.

The Student Success Summit will be held on November 29. Faculty are at the heart of student success. He urged faculty to attend. The Summit will highlight faculty’s contributions to student success and what needs to be done in the future to increase student success.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Linda M. Beale

President, Academic Senate

Appendix: Depiction of the Value-Added Activities of the Graduate School

