

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY – ACADEMIC SENATE
Official Proceedings
November 6, 2013

Members Present: Margaret E. Winters, Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs; Louis J. Romano, President, Academic Senate; Robert Ackerman; Joseph Artiss; Poonam Arya; Ivan Avrutsky; Michael Barnes; Linda Beale; Paul Beavers; David Cinabro; Victoria Dallas; Nabanita Datta; Donald DeGracia; Karen Feathers; Maria Ferreira; Jane Fitzgibbon; Moira Fracassa; Andrew Fribley; Judith Fry-McComish; Nancy George; Ewa Golebiowska; Ellen Holmes; renee hoogland; Michael Horn; Zhengqing Hu; Maik Huttemann; David Kessel; Kafi Kumasi; Liza Lagman-Sperl; Lawrence Lemke; Stephen Lerner; Rodger MacArthur; Fayetta Martin; James Martin; Jason Mateika; Boris Mordukhovich; Bryan Morrow; Patrick Mueller; Joshua Neds-Fox; Victoria Pardo; Alexey Petrov; Robert Reynolds; Marsha Richmond; Michele Ronnick; Brad Roth; Linea Rydstedt; Heather Sandlin; Andrea Sankar; Mary Sengstock; William Slater; Richard Smith; Beena Sood; Ronald Thomas; Ellen Tisdale; Harley Tse; Ricardo Villarosa; Deborah Walker; Jianjun Wang; Jeffrey Withey; James Woodyard; King-Hay Yang

Members Absent with Notice: Abhijit Biswas; Cheryl Dove; Jeffrey Grynawski; Bryan Madigan; Kypros Markou; James Moseley; Jeffrey Poff; Elizabeth Puscheck; Lobdelia Samavati; Naida Simon; Thomas Simpson; William Volz

Members Absent: Jennifer Beebe-Dimmer; Frances Brockington; Randall Commissaris; Heather Dillaway; Avril Genee Holt; Willane Krell; Richard Marback; Howard Matthew; Charles Parrish; Philip Pellett; T. R. Reddy; Tamra Watt; Derek Wildman

Others Present: Gloria Heppner, Associate Vice President for Research; Alan Jacobson, Office for Budget, Planning and Analysis; Tahrira Khanom, Office of the Academic Senate; James Sears, Associate Vice President for Facilities, Planning and Management, Angela Wisniewski, Office of the Academic Senate

CALL TO ORDER: Provost Winters called this regularly scheduled meeting of the Academic Senate to order at 1:35 p.m. The meeting was held in the Bernath Auditorium in the Undergraduate Library.

I. REPORT FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT

A. Report and Announcements

Search for the Vice President for Research

Mr. Romano reported that the administration has hired the search firm Harris & Associates to aid in the search for the Vice President for Research. A subgroup of the search committee interviewed the firms that applied for the job. The entire search committee held its first meeting on November 5. It is hoped that the finalists will visit campus in March to meet with various groups. This search is not a totally secret one as is the search for a President.

Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Mr. Romano spoke about two issues with which the University is dealing. First was the evaluation of teaching. Using only the student evaluation of teaching to assess a faculty member's effectiveness is not believed to be the best method. Many studies show that the SET can measure only certain things. The purpose of evaluating teaching methods is to enhance student learning and improve teaching effectiveness.

The language in the 2013-2021 Agreement between the University and the AAUP-AFT gives units the responsibility for determining a process for peer evaluation of teaching. The Article was introduced by the administration and embraced wholeheartedly by the union. The individual units are to determine the process they will use because the different disciplines use different criteria in the evaluations. Within the last month the administration provided materials to schools and colleges; some Deans forwarded them to departments. The materials list practices that are common to some universities.

The Policy Committee looked at the document sent to the colleges and believes that more guidance is needed and that the administration should develop an outline of what should be done. Policy Committee thought the evaluations should be specific to Wayne State's student body and faculty. Closely allied disciplines should have some similarities. For example,

physics, chemistry, and engineering should probably not have totally different processes.

Policy Committee thinks there should be guidelines to handle a situation where a unit decides it should not perform peer evaluations. The contract says that the units' guidelines should be in place six months after the contract was ratified. That deadline has passed and there is no reason to rush development of the evaluation process. A deliberative effort should result in better processes.

Provost Winters said that her office has corresponded with the AAUP-AFT about the issue. They agreed there was no barrier to the administration's providing more specific guidelines. They plan to form a small committee to look at the best practices at other universities and develop guidelines for Wayne State. A message about the change was sent to the colleges earlier in the week.

Provost Winters and Mr. Romano responded to questions.

Ms. Pardo asked what would happen if a unit had already developed its guidelines. Would it have to rewrite them when the committee completed its work? Provost Winters said that if a college already has developed its guidelines, they would be accepted as long as they do not contradict what the committee develops.

Mr. Lemke believes that the only way to disconnect the peer evaluations from merit increases would be to have evaluators from outside the unit of the faculty being evaluated. Was there discussion about a mechanism by which departments could share observation responsibilities or having a pool of evaluators from which departments could assign observers? Mr. Romano understood that units would perform the evaluations internally. If other units are required to evaluate faculty it will be a lot of work and will require organization. Every faculty member will probably have to be observed multiple times. Provost Winters implied that nothing prohibits departments from using faculty from outside their own department to be involved in the peer evaluation.

Mr. MacArthur suggested that the guidelines include how many observers should evaluate each instructor and, if the faculty member teaches different types of classes, each should be evaluated. The guidelines ought to state

whom should evaluate faculty. He also asked who would cover the additional salary for the evaluators. Mr. Romano did not think there would be extra money for the evaluators. Mr. MacArthur said that a lot of teaching in the School of Medicine is informal. There is an emphasis for clinical faculty to bring in more revenue. If they were pressured into volunteering to evaluate their peers, the revenue they generate would drop and they would be at risk of being reprimanded for not bringing in enough money.

Mr. Lemke believes that, for the process to work, a mechanism was needed to train the observers. The Provost replied that the Office for Teaching and Learning (OTL) could provide the training. Mathew Ouellett, the Associate Provost and Director of the OTL, has a lot of experience and many ideas how his Office can support the process.

In the fine arts, Mr. Barnes said, there are so many specialists in different areas that effectively analyzing their teaching is different than effectively analyzing how they teach in their area. This is especially true in music where one-half of the faculty's time is spent working one-on-one with students. That, Provost Winters said, is why units should develop their own guidelines. There are disciplinary programmatic differences.

Several members expressed concern about the distribution of the evaluator's report. Mr. Romano said that he understood that the evaluator's report would not be collected centrally but given only to the faculty member. Presumably the result of the evaluation would be better teaching that would engage students more and lead to better retention and graduation rates. Provost Winters added that the report is not to be used when considering merit pay or when making promotion and tenure decisions. It is solely for the faculty member's personal use.

Mr. Woodyard asked how the effectiveness of the program would be measured. Mr. Romano said that better retention and graduation rates would indicate that the evaluations are effective.

The Provost said that the move to peer evaluations is being made because SET scores alone do not give enough information about teaching effectiveness. There is a value in getting multiple kinds of feedback on teaching. Only certain questions will be used for anything but the person's own information.

Ms. Fitzgibbon believes that the teaching of online classes needs to be evaluated. Teaching online is different than teaching in the classroom. Mr. Romano mentioned that for years the Policy Committee has asked the administration to evaluate the online classes. They appear interested in doing that but nothing has happened.

Mr. Neds-Fox said that units should contact Mr. Ouellett to tailor the evaluations to specific units and for online classes, they should contact Ahmad Ezzeddine, Associate Vice President for Educational Outreach and Online Programs.

Provost Winters will inform John Vander Weg, the Interim Associate Provost for Academic Personnel, of the issues raised by Senate members. She wants to balance the right of units to develop appropriate processes with flexibility.

Retention

The second issue on which Mr. Romano focused was that of student retention. He covered why faculty should be concerned about retention, which efforts are succeeding, how Wayne State compares with its peer institutions, and how we can improve our efforts.

Retention affects the budget directly. As retention improves, the amount of money going to the schools and colleges increases. A one or two point increase in retention can result in millions of dollars over the six years that students are here. Retention affects the appropriation from the state. It is one of the metrics the state uses to determine how much money to allocate to the public universities.

Wayne State's retention rate for African American students is among the worst in the country when comparing their retention rate with the retention rate of white students. Only 10% of Wayne State's African American students graduate in ten years. A poor retention rate hurts Wayne State's reputation among potential students and their parents which affects our recruitment efforts. Students who fail to graduate build up a large debt without getting a large salary increase and their failure can lead to low self-esteem.

Between 2002 and 2013, the highest six-year graduation rate overall was 35% in 2006. The overall graduation rate for white and black

students was higher in 2013 than in 2012. In 2013 the advisors were told to get all students who could graduate to complete their requirements that year. Mr. Romano was concerned that this might mean that students who would have graduated in their sixth year graduated in their fifth year and students who might have graduated in their seventh year graduated in their sixth year. The increase might not continue because no fundamental changes were made to improve the graduation rate.

Mr. Romano spoke about WSU's peer institutions. He sees Wayne State as a unique institution. What makes it unique are its mission as a university of opportunity in an urban area, its very high research ranking, and its student population that is diverse and older with many students attending part-time. Of the institutions that the Office for Institutional Research identifies on its website as our peers, some have a similar size and student population but none are exactly like Wayne State. However, one not on the list, Georgia State University (GSU), compares very well with Wayne except that it does not have a medical school. The two schools' student population is very similar. GSU and WSU had the same graduation rate in 2003 but GSU's has risen consistently since then and its graduation rate is now 26 points higher than Wayne State's. At GSU the African American and Latino students have the same or higher graduation rates as white students. Mr. Romano thinks Wayne State should learn what Georgia State is doing to improve its graduation rate by sending people from WSU to GSU or inviting them to come to here.

From GSU's website Mr. Romano learned that freshmen have mandatory advising and that students must declare a major after their freshman year. Faculty are required to give an early alert to advising for every freshman who is having difficulty in class and those students must meet with an advisor. Students having academic problems can request an academic coach, who is a student who acts as a mentor. The mentor receives a salary. Freshmen at GSU have to attend either a one- or two-day orientation in the summer prior to attending or they must take an introductory course that also introduces them to the University and teaches them how to study and take notes. GSU has freshmen learning communities that are different than ours. Blocks of 25 students take every class in their freshman year together; they form a community and help each other. Wayne

State's learning communities revolve around a course or around specific disciplines. Freshmen at GSU read the same book; it is discussed in one or more classes. GSU has a lot of faculty involved in undergraduate education. It has a Success Academy that is similar to our APEX Program. Comparing students in our APEX Program with a control group showed that the Program did not improve learning.

Mr. Romano took questions and comments from the floor.

Some members questioned whether the comparisons with other universities were accurate, but Ms. Dallas pointed out that no matter which school was compared with Wayne State, we have a lower rate of retention whether the schools are in the high research category or are other Michigan universities. She commented on one of Mr. Romano's remarks. Whereas Mr. Romano is skeptical that the graduation rate this past year will continue to increase, she believes it will because the University is targeting the first-year-in-any-college student. Financial aid was used strategically so students could complete their degrees.

Mr. Horn informed the Senate that Athletics has a survival class that all freshmen must take. For a number of years, Athletics has used a lot of the strategies GSU is using. The program involves 400 students and it has been very successful. Their graduation rate is 30% higher than the campus as a whole. Mr. Horn believes that Monica Brockmeyer, Interim Associate Provost for Student Success, is aware of the program.

Mr. Roth has found that transfer students who have academic difficulties are not served by the strategies used for FTIACS. Some impediments to graduation are not within the ability of the University to address. They are the result of life circumstances, such as financial and family situations.

The discussion about retention will continue at the December meeting. At that time, Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences Wayne Raskind and Associate Dean Robert Aguirre will talk with the Senate about what that College is doing to improve retention.

II. FACILITIES, PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

James Sears, the Associate Vice President for Facilities, Planning and Management (FPM) updated the Senate on the steps his unit has taken regarding the cost of construction services, key performance indicators, and progress toward the renovation of the Student Center Building.

The Cost of Construction Services

Last academic year, Mr. Sears and members of his staff met with the Facilities, Support Services and Technology (FSST) Committee at which members expressed concerns about the cost of construction projects. The Committee challenged FPM to look for opportunities to reduce costs.

FPM uses a variety of methods for construction projects. For many years, companies have been under contract with the University to work on many small projects. Mr. Sears explained that by state law, the University is required to pay construction mechanics of every classification a minimum of the preferred wage dictated by the state. The hourly wage and fringe benefits paid to each classification of construction mechanics are high. A study Mr. Sears did a few years ago showed that by comparison to an open shop that was market driven and not dictated by union wages or the Prevailing Wage Act, the cost of labor was 15% higher on a \$5 million or \$6 million project. The Prevailing Wage Act requires an electrician to be paid \$56.51 per hour for wages and fringe benefits. The mechanical contractors wage and fringe benefits costs range from nearly \$62.00 to \$63.33 per hour. The average tradesperson employed at the University makes \$110,000 per year including benefits.

When FPM competitively bid the contracts currently in place, it accepted the hourly rate the contractor proposed and awarded the contracts to the lowest bidder. After this was reported to the FSST Committee, Vice President for Finance and Business Operations Rick Nork had FPM rebid the contracts on a target-pricing scenario where, after evaluating the overhead structure of all of the proposals previously given, FPM specified the maximum hourly rate that the University would pay in the future. The decreases ranged from 1% to a high of nearly 19%. Mr. Sears expects to have an overall savings of almost 6% or \$120,000. Mr. Sears thanked the FSST Committee for challenging the methodology of the pricing structure.

FPM competitively bids all design professionals. Some firms are better at smaller projects; others at larger projects. The University pays a negotiated percentage of final construction costs. Depending on whether it is a renovation or new construction, the

magnitude of the project and the type of building or facility with which the project is associated, the fee that is bid is a percentage of the final construction costs, resulting in savings. This methodology was put in play about five years ago and helps to expedite the design phase once approval is given for the work. This procedure results in a fee for the services that is reasonable and fair.

Mr. Sears continues to look for ways to keep the cost of projects as low as possible. Nationally when compared to Washington, D.C., which is baseline 100, the cost of construction in Detroit is 16.7% higher. Cities on the west side of Michigan have a ratio of 73%. Detroit's ratio is 116% of the baseline average. Detroit is among the 30 most expensive cities in which to construct.

Key Performance Indicators

FPM is using key performance indicators (KPI) to make better data-driven decisions. KPIs are used to communicate performance based on data relative to services. FPM needs to be held accountable and Mr. Sears wants the results to be transparent. Service calls are assigned one of four priorities. It is Facilities goal to address emergencies within 24 hours. The second assignment is the high priority that is to be completed within three days. The medium priority orders are to be completed within two weeks, and the low priority orders are to be addressed within one month. The goal is to be 90% on time in any given month. The key to being that responsive is managing the backlog effectively to keep it at a minimum.

Mr. Sears presented information about the tracking of work orders for the building engineers and preventive maintenance orders. The volume of work is seasonally predictable. When the academic year begins there is a lot of work increasing the backlog. Mr. Sears admitted that when his shop started data acquisition, the performance results were extremely low. Now being consistently in the range of 80% and in some areas in the 90s is a great improvement.

Mr. Sears is upset with the speed with which plant fund accounts are closed and the balances returned to the customer. He explained his expectations for the closing of the accounts and the completion of the work. He wants business services to complete the transactions within 90 days.

FPM sends surveys to customers asking them to comment on the time frame in which the work was done, whether they were satisfied with the quality of the work, whether the technicians and staff were professional and courteous, and whether they were

kept informed of the status of the work order. Usually, when a customer expresses dissatisfaction, a staff member contacts the customer to find out what was wrong so they can correct the problem.

Student Center Building

At the November 22 meeting of the Board of Governors, Mr. Nork and Mr. Sears will request approval to appropriate \$26.5 million for the renovation of the basement, first, second, and third floors of the Student Center Building. Floors four through seven are not included in the proposal. The work will be done in phases. It is now in the design phase. The food court and the campus store will be overhauled. Mr. Sears expects that the building's footprint will be expanded south toward the Undergraduate Library and that a new atrium will be created. The basement will have a small food service operation and recreational space for students. On the second floor a vaulted ballroom will be created and the Hilberry rooms will be renovated. Additional conference rooms will be created on the south side of the building. On the third floor the Dean of Students office and the offices of the student organizations will be renovated. The date to begin construction has not been determined. Mr. Sears wants to begin immediately after the end of classes in April with a completion date of August 2015.

Mr. Sears thanked the Senate for the opportunity to speak about these issues.

Mr. MacArthur questioned setting the performance standard at 90%. Maybe, he said, it should be higher or should be adjusted seasonally. Mr. Sears agreed that perhaps the standard should be different, but Facilities currently is trying to reduce the backlog. There are many projects that cannot begin because materials are needed. Some lead times can be long and the performance of some vendors can be undesirable.

Mr. Romano noticed that the cost of the job was not included on the customer survey. He considers many estimates he has been given to be very high. Mr. Sears will consider his suggestion to add it. He said that the cost-estimating performance is not good. Sometimes there are large gaps between the estimate and the actual cost.

Mr. Artiss asked if FPM had staff that could provide quotes. Mr. Sears said that the paint shop frequently is offered the opportunity and does a lot of the reimbursable work. They, he said, do outstanding work at a reasonable price. Several years ago when faced with a budget reduction, Mr. Sears eliminated the self-performed crew and completely outsourced

that work. He is now considering whether it might be better from cost performance and responsiveness to recreate that service model.

Provost Winters thanked Mr. Sears for his presentation.

III. APPROVAL OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

October 2, 2013

It was MOVED and SECONDED to APPROVE the Proceedings of the Academic Senate meeting of October 2, 2013. PASSED.

IV. PROCEEDINGS OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE

The Academic Senate received the Proceedings of the Policy Committee meetings of September 23, 2013, September 30, 2013, October 7, 2013, and October 21, 2013 (Appendix A).

September 23, 2013

At the September 23 meeting, Mr. Romano had asked if additional money was given to Presidential Scholars to cover increases in tuition. Mr. Lemke asked if that was the case. Ms. Lagman-Sperl, who in an Academic Advisor in the Honors College, said that originally the Presidential Scholarship was paid based on credit and then went to a flat rate of \$10,000 per year. When tuition is increased, typically the amount is not increased. Students maintain their Scholarship as long as they maintain the required grade point average and the minimum number of credits to be full time. There is a line in the Scholarship agreement that states that in the event of a tuition increase the amount would be reviewed but it is not guaranteed.

V. REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

The University is increasing its links with community colleges. Last week Provost Winters and Interim Dean of Nursing Nancy Artinian visited Oakland Community College. They signed an articulation agreement that linked OCC's R.N. program to our Bachelor of Science in Nursing.

On November 7, Schoolcraft Community College will officially announce that it has created a new university center where Wayne State and the University of Toledo will offer programs. Initially, WSU will offer programs in business and engineering technology, with computer science to be added later. The University of Toledo appears to be offering most

of its courses online for undergraduates. Wayne State will have courses supporting the Masters in Business Administration as well as undergraduate courses.

Wayne State also is talking with Wayne County Community College about the possibility of articulation.

Two weeks ago, Provost Winters and Vice President for Research Hilary Ratner met with representatives of the Kresge Foundation. The following week President Wilson met with the President of the Foundation. There was a great deal of interest expressed by the Kresge Foundation to support efforts at Wayne State in the crucial area of time to graduation.

The Provost reported on the status of searches for Deans. The advertisement for the Dean of the Law School has been published. Provost Winters met with the search committee for the Graduate School. An announcement seeking nominees for the Dean of the Graduate School will be sent out soon. Next week Provost Winters will meet with the committee and the firm that is assisting with the search for the Dean of Business Administration. There already has been a lot of communication between the search committee and Dean of Engineering Farshad Fotouhi, who chairs the committee. The Provost is waiting to hear from the College of Nursing to learn whom they have elected to serve on their search committee.

Provost Winters reported that last week there was a vigil for Tiane Brown, the day that she her body was found. There is no indication that Wayne State was the location of her murder or that it fell down in any way in its duties of public safety. However President Wilson has asked the Chief of Public Safety Tony Holt to carry out a full audit of safety measures on campus including the residence halls and the area around campus.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

ADJOURNMENT: It was MOVED and SECONDED to ADJOURN the meeting. PASSED. The meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Louis J. Romano

President, Academic Senate