WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY – ACADEMIC SENATE
Official Proceedings
February 8, 2012

Members Present: Ronald T. Brown, Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, Chair; Louis J. Romano, President, Academic Senate; Lisa Alexander; Ivan Avrutsky; Linda Beale; Paul Beavers; Ramona Benkert; Veronica Bielat; Abhijit Biswas; Tamara Bray; Kingsley Browne; Anthony Cacace; David Cinabro; Chardin Claybourne; Victoria Dallas; Nabanita Datta; Cheryl Dove; Karen Feathers; Maria Ferreira; Jane Fitzgibbon; Moira Fracassa; Judith Fry-McComish; Andre Furtado; Ewa Golebiowska; Michael Horn; Maik Huttemann; Barbara Jones; David Kessel; Kafi Kumasi; Liza Lagman-Sperl; Shawna Lee; Lawrence Lemke; Rodger MacArthur; Brian Madigan; Richard Marback; James Martin; Jason Mateika; Michael McIntyre; Boris Mordukhovich; Bryan Morrow; Jennifer Sheridan Moss; Patrick Mueller; David Oupicky; Charles Parrish; Debra Patterson; Jeffrey Potoff; T. R. Reddy; Robert Reynolds; Brad Roth; Linea Rydstedt; Heather Sandlin; Naida Simon; William Slater; James Sondheimer; Timothy Stemmler; Senthil Sundaram; Ronald Thomas; Ellen Tisdale; Karen Tonso; Harley Tse; Anca Vlasopolos; William Volz; Judith Whittum-Hudson; Mary Width; Jeffrey Withey; Seymour Wolfson; James Woodyard; Lee Wurm

Members Absent with Notice: George Alangaden; Jennifer Beebe-Dimmer; Mary Cooney; Donald DeGracia; Jerry Ku; Janine Lanza; James Moseley; Abhilash Pandya; Victoria Pardo; Elizabeth Puscheck; Michele Ronnick; Mary Sengstock

Members Absent: Basim Asmar; Barbara Bosch; Avril Genene Holt; Rita Kumar; Daniel Rappolee; Aaron Retish; Derek Wildman; Zhe Yang

Others Present: Kenneth Doherty, Procurement and Strategic Sourcing; Mary Gallagher; Michael Gleason, Procurement and Strategic Sourcing; Gloria Heppner, Associate Vice President for Research; Alan Jacobson, Office of Budget, Planning and Analysis; Geraldine Johnson, Academic Pathways for Excellence; Tahrima Khanom, Academic Senate Office; Angela Wisniewski, Academic Senate Office

CALL TO ORDER: Mr. MacArthur, the Vice Chair, called this regularly scheduled meeting of the Academic Senate to order at 1:33 P.M. The meeting was held in the Bernath Auditorium in the Undergraduate Library. Mr. MacArthur introduced James Sears, Associate Vice President for Facilities Planning and Management (FPM). Provost Brown assumed the chair when he arrived shortly after the meeting began.

I. FACILITIES PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT INITIATIVES

Mr. Sears began by mentioning the issues he would discuss: several key performance indicators to monitor and better control performance, service responsiveness, quality of service, and costs. He also provided an update on the initiatives in which the Huron Consulting Group is involved and other major goals FPM intends to accomplish in 2012.

Mr. Sears thanked the Senate members who are working with Frances Ahern on the redesigning of the fourth floor of State Hall.

Every unit that is part of the Division of Finance and Business Operations is developing key performance indicators by which to evaluate whether they are meeting their goals.

According to FPM's mission statement its purpose is to support students and faculty and provide a safe, well-maintained, functional campus. The statement does not speak to the speed with which those goals should be accomplished, and FPM is now addressing the need to respond rapidly to the faculty and students.

TMA is the computerized maintenance software used in FPM. Each work order and requisition is tracked within the TMA software. A customer service survey will be sent to the person who submitted the requisition to rate the speed, quality, professionalism, and courtesy with which the work was done as well as whether they were kept informed about the status of the work. Because the survey is work order specific, FPM will be able to follow up if there were concerns.

Mr. Sears said that four priority levels are assigned to work orders: emergency, which should be completed within 24 hours of initiation; high priority, which should be completed within 3 days; medium priority, which should be completed within 2 weeks; and low priority, which should be completed within one month. FPM is developing the guidelines that dictate which priority is to be assigned to each work order.

FPM is trying to increase the rates at which employees complete the work orders in the various areas of custodial, engineering, grounds, and trades. Whether an order is completed on time will have significant weight in employees' performance reviews.

The area of quality of service that is most evident to people is the cleanliness of buildings. The Association of Physical Plant Administrators has five quality levels

ranging from spotlessness, i.e., essentially perfect, to unkempt and neglected, which would be awful and disgusting. Mr. Sears is not sure how FPM will gather data to quantify the quality of the services they deliver. Measurements need to be consistent and objective. What might be acceptable to one observer may not be acceptable to another. Observers have rated Wayne State at level 4, which is moderate dinginess. Mr. Sears wants the University to be at level 1 or 2. A similar measurement has to be developed for the grounds crew.

Mr. Sears next updated the Senate on the Huron Consulting Group's initiatives within FPM. HCG made recommendations for the full deployment of TMA. The biggest challenge FPM faces is with preventive maintenance services. Most operational units have three key responsibilities. In the morning employees perform standard operating procedures, such as checking if the boilers are performing properly. Second are service calls. Third is the maintenance of major mechanical and electrical equipment to keep them operating efficiently and in good repair. FPM has a long way to go to get its preventive maintenance program into shape. The Law, Cohn, and Engineering buildings are the first ones where the preventive maintenance systems are being re-engineered.

The Design and Construction Services group uses a number of different delivery methods. One method is the traditional design it, bid it, build it method. On large new construction and renovation projects they typically use the construction management and design build method. For smaller projects they have used the time and material method, where you are billed for the actual quantity of labor and the actual cost of the materials plus a mark-up that has been competitively established. The University has never used the job order contracting construction and delivery method, which uses pre-established unit pricing. This allows the University to avoid design and bidding because the prices have already been competitively established, and allows the University to advance projects to construction more quickly than has been the case historically. The complaint Mr. Sears has heard most often about construction projects is the speed of delivery. He expects the job order contracting method to produce more positive outcomes on projects whose characteristics are suited to that method.

Companion to that is the updating of the design and construction standards. For years, FPM has had a manual of standards that architects and engineers have to specify to or that construction companies have to build to. That document is being updated. When FPM competitively bids its own unit price book for job order contracting has to be properly informed by an updated set of design and construction standards.

Performance contracting is a major need for FPM. The University's utility budget is approximately $25 million. That budget was cut by $2 million for fiscal year 2012. The University has partnered with Siemens Building Automation for performance contracting. In the first phase of the initiative, seven buildings that use the most energy on campus are being audited to find opportunities for energy conservation projects that will produce an annual savings that exceeds the debt structure that the University would incur to pay for and implement those projects. The goal is to aggregate energy conservation projects that have an average payback of 5 to 7 years where the annual savings exceeds 125% of the principal and interest that the University will have to pay servicing the debt structure, i.e., creating a project outcome that has a positive cash flow from day one. This is needed to contribute to the cost reductions that have already been implemented into the budgeting structure. It is hoped that the pilot utility project will transfer in whole or in part the utility budgets to the schools, colleges, and divisions. Presently that responsibility lies within the general fund in FPM within the Division of Finance and Business Operations. The objective of the initiative is to offer incentives to units so that if they do not use all of their utility budget the unit would receive the savings. The problem that arises is how to handle a situation where a unit's utility usage exceeds its budget. A preliminary set of guidelines was drafted and the steering committee that is reviewing specific proposals on each of the Huron initiatives gave feedback on them. Mr. Sears will meet with the Deans of Nursing, Law, and Engineering later in February to discuss some of the possible aspects of that budget model. There are a variety of issues that must be resolved. The University is trying to develop a budgeting process that involves everyone in reducing energy consumption and the corresponding costs as well as reducing the environmental impact related to the use of fossil fuels.

Another issue Mr. Sears mentioned to the Senate was the confusion people have about how to initiate service from FPM. FPM is finalizing a guide to service, which will include how it provides services, how to request service, and what to expect for performance.

FPM is involved in other major projects, including the multi-disciplinary biomedical research building. On November 3, 2011, the University submitted information to the state, maintaining its eligibility for $30 million in capital outlay funds for the building. The goal is to have the design documents to the state by May. It is hoped that the state will formally notify the University that it has appropriated the $30 million that it committed to the University one and one-half years ago. Mr. Sears would like the construction to begin by November 2012 with a completion date of December 2014.

A variety of energy conservation measures were funded a year ago. Implementation of one of the 15 projects should begin within the next month. The $1,200,000 of funding that the University has received for energy conservation measures will produce an annual savings of over $600,000.

The University has a number of deferred maintenance projects that are funded and implemented annually. FPM is establishing schedule goals for each project. The project managers will be evaluated on their performance and will be held accountable for the executing of the projects. There is a shift in the culture in FPM, Mr. Sears said, to accountability for performance.

Provost Brown asked Mr. Sears how FPM's budget compared with budgets for facilities units at other universities. Mr. Sears said that FPM has been monitoring funding for its operations for over ten years. WSU is at about the 30th percentile compared to the universities that are generously funded. When compared with universities in the same Carnegie classification, WSU is a bit lower.

II. ePROCUREMENT

Kenneth Doherty, Assistant Vice President for Purchasing, made some remarks and introduced Mr. Gleason, Associate Director of Purchasing. Mr. Doherty noted that the organizational structure of Purchasing and its initiatives have changed in the last year. Procurement is one of the major initiatives on which the Huron Consulting Group is working. Mr. Doherty and Mr. Gleason attended the meeting to talk about the tool Procurement will use to purchase merchandise and services.

Mr. Doherty explained that when the University purchased Banner as its financial system, the student system, the human resources system, and the procurement system were included with it. Procurement with the Banner system is not user friendly for people who do not use it daily. The Huron Consulting Group helped the University find a new procurement system that the Purchasing Office is calling Wayne Buy.

Mr. Gleason explained that Wayne Buy is an electronic procure to pay solution. The requisitioner will shop, order, and receive products within the system and invoices will be cued up to pay within the system. Wayne Buy is a customer-oriented purchasing system that includes strategic sourcing so the purchaser can see the types of discounts and contract prices available without having to search each vendor's website.

Wayne Buy will take the requisitioner through each step of the purchasing process. With Banner after the requisition was submitted, the buyer in Purchasing might have to ask for additional information. With Wayne Buy, all of the needed information, such as attachments, is requested upfront. There are fewer manual components to the system. There will be a select group of vendors to whom orders can be sent electronically, and the vendor will be able to submit invoices electronically.

Wayne Buy was purchased from SciQuest, a company that works with many other universities including the University of Michigan, Notre Dame University, and Northwestern University. The company has a good performance record. The system is designed to make the purchasing process easy and efficient.

The University is moving to eProcurement to improve service to faculty and staff. Strategic sourcing will help departments stretch their budgets. The Purchasing Office identifies cost savings, makes contracts with vendors, and provides a tool to access the information quickly. Most times strategic sourcing will have better prices than an individual could find elsewhere. When purchases are consolidated, the Purchasing Office will have a better idea of the volume that is being bought in general and how much the University is spending on a particular item. Having that information helps Purchasing negotiate the best prices for commodities. Purchasing is trying to create an on-line shopping cart experience where there are multiple vendors in one place.

Mr. Doherty gave an overview of strategic sourcing. Procurement is looking at the supplies and services routinely used by large populations on campus. In the past, purchases were treated as individual transactions. His Office wants to aggregate the purchases to leverage better prices.

Mr. Gleason continued the presentation. He mentioned the features of Wayne Buy that will be beneficial to the requisitioner: on-line shopping, single point of access to vendors' catalogs; simpler screens; expanded features; visibility to track the request. A selection of vendors in the eProcurement solution will be included in strategic sourcing. Once the requisitioner identifies the best price for a product, Procurement removes itself from the process. When making a purchase through eProcurement, a buyer does not approve the purchase and issue a purchase order. After the requisitioner receives their departmental approval, the order goes to the supplier. The invoice goes directly from the supplier to Accounts Payable for processing.

Mr. Gleason said that his office is in phase I, the design and building phase, of eProcurement. They will hold focus groups to get feedback on the plans and town

halls to inform people about eProcurement. The plan is to have eProcurement operating by the end of June.

Mr. Gleason stressed the importance of getting feedback from faculty, from users of the Banner system, and from Pro Card holders who use the cards frequently. The initial focus group provided a good understanding of internal business processes, but they need feedback from the faculty and academic staff. The focus groups are day long, and Mr. Gleason understands that that amount of time can be difficult for many people. If faculty cannot participate in a focus group and have specific scenarios in the procurement process that are always difficult, they can send and e-mail to Mr. Gleason. He wants to know what never works and what people do to make the process work. The Power Point presentation from this Senate meeting and additional information will be posted at purchasing.wayne.edu/waynebuy.

Mr. Wolfson thanked Mr. Gleason and Mr. Doherty for their efforts. However, he thought the best procurement system would be one where the requisitioner could put in product information and the system would locate the best price. Mr. Gleason suggested that Mr. Wolfson might attend one of the focus groups. Seeing how the system functions might change his opinion. There will always be companies that have a cheaper price, that have loss leaders. The contracts in strategic sourcing will be living contracts. When Purchasing finds a disparity in prices, it will work with the supplier to fix the disparity.

Mr. Romano asked if he would be able to purchase a product from a company that was not in the strategic sourcing system but had a much lower price than a company in the system. Mr. Doherty said that where the University has a contract with a vendor the goal will be to drive the University's spending to that contractor as opposed to maverick spending.

It appeared to Ms. Whittum-Hudson that the system required duplicative work, but Mr. Doherty said that the system would result in less work and would be more efficient for the faculty and staff. Instead of going on-line and printing screens to give to their business office, faculty will be able to fill a shopping cart and have the business manager approve the shopping cart.

Mr. MacArthur recognized the advantages to an institution of steering all business to specific vendors if they have good prices but he saw many complexities to the system. There had to be, he said, a mechanism in the system to go to a vendor other than the default and there must be an easy way to work around a preferred vendor whether through a link or a rapid approval process. Mr. Gleason said that his job is to identify the

products people have been purchasing and the vendors they have been using to negotiate price discounts.

eProcurement is not entirely warehoused within the Wayne State solution. Requisitioners will be able to "punch out" and interact with the vendor's full catalog. If an individual needs a product outside of what the University typically buys, he/she will be able to "punch out" of the system and the purchase will route through the Wayne buy approval process. Mr. Gleason's job is to get a good representation of what the University uses. They are looking at the different mechanisms (purchase orders, Pro Cards, etc.) people have used to make purchases over the past ten years to identify what the University spends and uses. They take this information to the vendors when negotiating a better price.

Mr. Romano orders supplies through the Science Store and he asked if he would be able to use that same method when the new system is in place. Mr. Doherty said that there is an impression that the 3,000 to 5,000 vendors from which the University purchases products every year would shrink to a few. That is not the case. Purchasing Is leveraging their spending, but research supplies and equipment will be available. Purchasing is creating an oversight committee to get input about the equipment and the supplies that researchers need. The Science Stores system will not be impacted negatively by strategic sourcing, and it may be positively impacted. If Science Stores uses vendors that are not in the eProcurement system, they could ask that the vendors be included and they would not have to use a Pro Card. Mr. Gleason is using the data from the purchases made by Science Stores in setting up the system.

Mr. Woodyard asked for the cost of the software, the cost of the training that will be conducted, and the cost of maintenance of the system after it is implemented. Mr. Doherty said that they did not have that information at the meeting, but would give it to Mr. Romano.

This ended the presentation and discussion.

III. APPROVAL OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

December 14, 2011

It was MOVED and SECONDED to APPROVE the Proceedings of the Academic Senate meeting of December 14, 2012.

Ms. Benkert provided information about the Nursing Practice Corporation (NPC), which is referenced in the December 14 Proceedings. The NPC has seven faculty, the Director, who is the Dean of Nursing, and the Assistant Director, who is the Associate Dean.

None of the NPC's funds are used for faculty salaries. No money goes to the College or the Dean. The funds are used wholly for service delivery. The NPC has been good stewards of the fees collected, returning to the University money they did not spend. The nurses provide a significant amount of uncompensated care (about 40% of the budget) because students do not have insurance.

Mr. Romano said the request of the Budget Committee was to find out how the budget is spent, who works there, and how many students are seen. The Committee recognizes that the nurses are providing a good service. Dean Redman refuses to provide the information so the Committee sought and received some information from the Provost and Vice President Nork.

The Proceedings of December 14, 2011, were APPROVED AS SUBMITTED.

IV. REPORT FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT

A. Report and Announcements

1. Mr. Romano learned from Ambika Mathur, the Associate Dean of the Graduate School, that a compromise on the policy for graduate faculty status has been worked out. If the Dean of the Graduate School and the Dean of a college disagree about what constitutes scholarship for graduate faculty status, the Provost will decide the criteria. The Academic Standards Committee of the Graduate Council and the Dean of the Graduate School Hilary Ratner have approved the policy. It will be submitted to the Graduate Council for a vote on February 21.

2. Mr. Romano serves on the search committee for the Associate Provost and Director of the Office for Teaching and Learning. Candidates visited campus recently. Some of them will return for additional interviews. The Provost has indicated that there would be open forums where the candidates will address the faculty. Mr. Romano urged the faculty to attend the forums.

3. Two years ago the administration sought a 2% increase in tuition effective for the summer term. In seeking the increase, the Board of Governors was told that tenure and tenure-track faculty increase student learning and student retention and are responsible for research and curriculum development. The Board approved the increase with the stipulation that the revenue from that increase would fund about 25 tenured and tenure-track faculty positions. In addition, there was a Deans enhancement fund for hiring another 25

tenured and tenure track faculty. Lines for graduate assistants were authorized also. The positions were to be tracked separately by the Office of Budget, Planning and Analysis. The Budget Committee received the information and found that there has been an increase of only 7 or 8 tenure-track faculty over the past two years. Mr. Romano hopes that the new resources provided to a new Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences will lead to increased faculty members. He also hopes that the Provost will continue to encourage the Deans to hire faculty and that the unfilled positions will be filled. There are, he said, 26 unfilled lines from this program university-wide that could be filled.

The Academic Senate has been trying to increase the number of tenured and tenure-track positions for a long time. They believe that WSU has fewer full-time tenure-track than other universities of its size.

Mr. McIntyre said that if the Deans did not fill a line within one year that position was to return to the pool and it was available for another unit to use. For many years the pattern had been that Deans would not fill positions and use the money for other purposes. To keep that from happening, a mechanism was built in so the Deans would not have a line for more than one year.

The Provost commented. Because the University will have a new Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences soon, he asked the College to suspend faculty searches unless they were absolutely necessary. Twenty-six positions have been filled. The enhancement lines are not given to the Deans. The funds are held centrally and are given to the Dean when the faculty member is hired. Provost Brown has pushed the Deans to hire faculty, but he does want them to hire faculty who will be eligible for tenure at a level one institution.

Mr. Romano noted that the number of tenured and tenure-track faculty never increases dramatically. New hires are offset by retirements and resignations.

B. Proceedings of the Policy Committee

The Academic Senate received the Proceedings of the Policy Committee meetings of December 5, 2011, December 19, 2011, and January 9, 2012. They are attached to these Senate Proceedings as Appendix A.

<u>December 19, 2011</u>

Item 9 in the Proceedings of December 19, 2011, states that $14.5 million in this year's budget would be used to fund projects in the schools and colleges. Ms. Tonso asked for information about the projects. Mr. Romano has not received the information from Associate Vice President Kohrman. He will follow up on the request.

V. <u>MATTERS SUBMITTED BY THE POLICY COMMITTEE</u>

There were no matters from the Policy Committee.

VI. <u>REPORT FROM THE CHAIR</u>

A. Provost Brown said that the Senate would receive the Student Success Report, which deals with the issue of student retention. Over the years, the University has accepted some students who are not prepared for college-level work. At the request of the administration, the Board of Governors revised the Statute on Undergraduate Admission to ensure that students who are accepted can be successful. The University's six-year graduation rate is 26%. Its one-year retention rate has increased to 77%. The Provost has asked the Senate to comment on the Student Success Report and to provide revisions if it wishes.

B. The Provost updated the Senate on the progress in the searches for the Dean of Social Work and the Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences. The Provost is recruiting an Associate Provost of Enrollment Management to work with Admissions and Financial Aid.

C. On February 7, the Provost sent a message to the entire University about restructuring the Budget. The budgeting process has not changed in the last 20 years. If a college's enrollment decreased by one-half or if its research portfolio suffered, its budget remains the same as it was 20 years ago. Funding to the non-academic side of the University is based on tradition. Provost Brown believes that the academic side should drive the budget. This is known as a resource centered management (RCM) budget. A portion of the revenue generated by tuition and research should be allocated to non-academic units such as the physical plant, purchasing, etc.

Associate Vice President Kohrman and the Provost chair a committee that is developing a new budget model in consultation with the Huron Consulting Group. Professors Parrish and Volz from the Senate, a Dean, and the Vice President for Research serve on the committee. The Provost said no changes would be made to the budget model until he is certain that the academic side is protected. The faculty generate research funds and the students generate tuition. The University needs to be student-centered and faculty-centered. That is both Provost Brown's and President Gilmour's agenda. They both want the budget to be transparent. Such a change in the budget model would not be implemented for two years.

Mr. McIntyre noted that the Senate had been involved in recommendations to modify the budget model near the end of David Adamany's term as President. President Adamany's budget model was closely linked to enrollment, too closely linked in the opinion of most of the faculty. In 1999 the Senate and the administration wrote a joint report "Formula Funding Working Group Final Report (New Budget Model, November 30, 1999)" that is available on the Budget Committee's website. The Working Group recommended an historical budget with a dynamic component. Mr. McIntyre thought the report was a good starting point when considering revisions to the budget model. He agreed that significant changes in enrollment require significant changes in the budget. However, he believes, the University could not have a strict RCM model because a university is very different from a business. Building a business model into the budgeting system must be done with a great deal of care.

Provost Brown thinks the new budget model would be a hybrid. The University has a teaching mission, a research mission, and a service mission. The budget needs to represent those areas. The Provost sees an enormous opportunity for academics to drive the rest of the University.

VII. <u>NEW BUSINESS</u>

There was no new business.

<u>ADJOURNMENT</u>; The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Louis J. Romano
President, Academic Senate