

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY – ACADEMIC SENATE

Official Proceedings

April 6, 2011

Members Present: Ronald T. Brown, Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs; Seymour J. Wolfson, President, Academic Senate; George Alangaden; Basim Asmar; Ivan Avrutsky; Ramona Benkert; Veronica Bielat; Abhijit Biswas; Barbara Bosch; Kingsley Browne; Deborah Charbonneau; David Cinabro; Mary Cooney; Victoria Dallas; Nabanita Datta; Donald DeGracia; Cheryl Dove; Jane Fitzgibbon; Andre Furtado; Ewa Golebiowska; Randall Gretebeck; Avril Genene Holt; Renee Hoogland; Michael Horn; Patricia Jarosz; David Kessel; Christian Kreipke; Rita Kumar; Liza Lagman-Sperl; Shawna Lee; Rodger MacArthur; James Martin; Bart Miles; Boris Mordukhovich; Bryan Morrow; James Moseley; Jennifer Sheridan Moss; David Oupicky; Abhilash Pandya; Regina Parnell; Charles Parrish; Susil Putatunda; T. R. Reddy; Aaron Retish; Robert Reynolds; Louis Romano; Michele Ronnick; Heather Sandlin; Alvin Saperstein; Mary Sengstock; James Sondheimer; Timothy Stemmler; David Thomas; Karen Tonso; Anca Vlasopolos; William Volz; Judith Whittum-Hudson; Jeffrey Withey; James Woodyard; Earnestine Young

Members Absent with Notice: Tyrone Austin; Karen Feathers; Judith Fouladbakhsh; Robert Holley; Maik Huttemann; Barbara Jones; Jerry Ku; Janine Lanza; Brian Madigan; Jason Mateika; Michael McIntyre; Elizabeth Puscheck; Brad Roth; Linea Rydstedt; Naida Simon; Jianjun Wang; Mary Width; Derek Wildman

Members Absent: Anthony Cacace; Prahlad Parajuli; Daniel Rappolee; Lee Wurm; Zhe Yang

Others Present: Johnnie Blunt, Academic Senate Office; Monica Brockmeyer, Liberal Arts and Sciences; Darin Ellis, Engineering; Allan Gilmour, President; Robert Guttersohn, *The South End*; Gloria Heppner, Associate Vice President for Research; Alan Jacobson, Budget, Planning and Analysis; Alicia Pendleton, Human Resources; Kelley Skillin, Office of the Provost; Corey Wheeler, *The South End*; Angela Wisniewski, Academic Senate Office

CALL TO ORDER: This regularly scheduled meeting of the Academic Senate was called to order at 1:40 p.m. by Provost Brown. The meeting was held in the Bernath Auditorium in the Undergraduate Library.

I. APPROVAL OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

March 2, 2011

It was MOVED and SECONDED to APPROVE the Proceedings of the Academic Senate meeting of March 2, 2011.

Ms. Benkert asked about the statement in the Provost's Report of March 2 that mentioned an apparent suggestion that the College of Nursing might be closed as a cost-saving measure. While at the March 2 meeting, the Provost had stated that no colleges would be closed. Ms. Benkert sought clarification of the comments. The Provost said that the College of Nursing is very much a part of the core values of the University. The administration is not considering closing it. Someone outside of the administration had the idea as a cost-cutting move. A nursing school is a costly endeavor due to the required ratio of faculty to students but educating health care providers is expensive whether they be doctors, nurses, or physical therapists. Every school and college has been asked to find areas where they can reduce their budgets. The Provost has suggested some changes in the College of Nursing related to research to make that endeavor more efficient and accountable. There is a nursing shortage in the state and the College of Nursing is valuable to the University. The College of Nursing, the Provost stated, would not be closed. In fact, he said, the University would not be well served by closing any schools or colleges.

The Proceedings were APPROVED as SUBMITTED.

II. REPORT FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT

A. Report and Announcements

Mr. Wolfson reported that one aspect of the celebration for the inauguration of President Gilmour is an academic symposium. Robert Sokol of the School of Medicine, Jerry Herron, Dean of the Honors College, and Mr. Wolfson are preparing a program to highlight some of the research and innovative activities taking place at WSU. The symposium will consist of brief presentations by faculty from various disciplines.

B. Proceedings of the Policy Committee

The Academic Senate received the Proceedings of the Policy Committee meetings of February 14, 2011, February 23, 2011, February 28, 2011, March 7, 2011, and March 21, 2011. They are attached to these Senate Proceedings as Appendix A.

III. ELECTION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE PRESIDENT FOR THE 2011-2012 ACADEMIC YEAR

Mr. Woodyard, the Chair of the Elections Committee, described the duties of the Senate President. Prior to the meeting, the Elections Committee received the nomination of Louis Romano, Professor of Chemistry in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Mr. Romano accepted the nomination. No other members accepted nomination.

It was MOVED and SECONDED to CLOSE NOMINATIONS. The vote was taken. PASSED.

Mr. Romano thanked the Senate for its confidence in him. He said that he would try to follow in Mr. Wolfson's footsteps. Mr. Wolfson, he said, did a very good job in what were sometimes very difficult circumstances to make the Senate the consultative body that it is. He has ensured that the administration knows that the Academic Senate's role is to work with the administration. Wayne State University is based on faculty governance and joint responsibility with the administration. Mr. Romano is pleased that the current administration realizes the importance of faculty governance, and he wants to continue that tradition.

The vote to ELECT Mr. Romano the President of the Academic Senate for the 2011-2012 academic year was taken. PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Provost Brown noted that the Senate would miss Mr. Wolfson's leadership, but that it would be in good hands with Mr. Romano as its President.

IV. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Proposal to Transfer the Department of Computer Science from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences to the College of Engineering

Mr. Wolfson is the Associate Chair of the Department of Computer Science, and recused himself from the discussion. Mr. Romano, the Vice Chair of the Senate, took his place.

Mr. Romano told the Senate that the new Dean of the College of Engineering, Farshad Fotouhi, proposed moving the Department of Computer Science, which he

had chaired, from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences to the College of Engineering. The Policy Committee had asked several committees to review the proposal. Ms. Sengstock, the Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, was asked to coordinate the reports of the committees and to report out to the full Senate.

The following was presented from the Policy Committee:

It is recommended that the Academic Senate APPROVE the request to transfer the Department of Computer Science from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences to the College of Engineering effective fall 2011.

Ms. Sengstock reported that in mid-January 2011, the Policy Committee charged the Curriculum and Instruction (C&I), the Faculty Affairs (FAC), the Research (RES), and the Student Affairs (SAC) Committees with reviewing and making a recommendation to the Academic Senate concerning a proposal from the Provost to move the Department of Computer Science (DCS) from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS) to the College of Engineering (COE). The time was short, less than two months, for the committees to collect data and to analyze it. Ms. Sengstock itemized the steps the committees took to gather information.

Ms. Sengstock said that the committees received several drafts of the administration's response to their report in the two weeks prior to the Senate meeting. The committees had limited time to review and comment on the response. The responses dealt with a number of the issues raised by the committees.

In part, however, the administration's response to the report criticized the information collected by the Senate committees. The committees stand by their report, on the grounds that the investigation was the best that could have been done, under the available time frame. Furthermore, some of the data was not collected by the Senate committees, but by other agents. For example, the CLAS survey, with its limited response rate, was conducted by the CLAS Faculty Council, not the Senate.

Based on their investigations, the majority of the committees recommended that the transfer of DCS to COE be allowed to proceed, but all recommended caution in the process, based on several factors. Some committee members (C&I, RES, some FAC) believed the issues were of such importance that the decision should be delayed until the issues could be resolved. Others (SAC and some FAC) believed the issues could be resolved during the transfer process.

The key issues were:

- the inadequate information provided by the proposal;
- the limited amount of time available to the committees for data collection and analysis;
- the number of issues which were still uncertain at the time the report was due;
- some of the surveys (mainly CLAS) had small or possibly biased samples;
- respondents to the surveys may have lacked sufficient information when they responded to the surveys.

There were key concerns to be resolved in four categories: Faculty, Research, Student, and Administrative Issues.

FACULTY ISSUES: Ms. Sengstock identified the faculty issues to be resolved. The possible impact on tenure and promotion and faculty teaching loads were the major issues that appeared to be unresolved at the time of the Senate report. The administration's response indicated that P&T factors would remain the same in the new college, and teaching loads would remain the same. Hence these issues appear to have been resolved. Some committee members expressed the concern that DCS faculty from CLAS might feel "out of place" in an Engineering college; however, computer scientists have worked and studied in both settings and did not believe this would be problematic.

RESEARCH ISSUES: The Research Committee was concerned about the impact of the redistribution of resources for research between the two colleges, both on the P&T impact for DCS faculty, and on the colleges themselves. DCS faculty believed their own research would not be affected. However, the impact on research in the colleges, particularly CLAS, is unknown.

STUDENT ISSUES: Student issues were of concern to both C&I and SAC. They were extremely concerned about the impact of the differential general education requirements in the two colleges for students moving from one college to the other. They were worried about the impact this would have on students, particularly those whose base was in the CLAS tradition rather than Engineering. The administration's response ensures that current students will be protected in the transfer process. However, the effect on transfer students, who have planned on the current system of requirements, is a serious problem. Also, the status of future students who may be more interested in Liberal Arts based applications of computers is still unclear. Will such students find programs that suit their needs? The impact of changes in general education requirements on the service departments also remains problematic; course offerings may change dramatically, and the impact of this process has not been examined. Other

student-related issues were certification problems in the COE; differential graduate tuition in Engineering; and need for extensive re-training of academic services staff. The administration's response deals with the difficulties of current students in the process. The committees are concerned about the impact on future students and future enrollments, which is more difficult to assess.

ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES: Ms. Sengstock next addressed the administrative issues. The lack of clear quantitative data to support the transfer was a major problem that appeared throughout the committees' analysis. The impact on CLAS was not presented at all. Some COE faculty were concerned that needed resources might not follow DCS into COE, impacting on resources of that college. Hence the lack of detail was particularly troublesome. Even outside observers (alumni) were concerned about the lack of specificity in the plan and the limited time for consideration. The administration's response provides data on the personnel budget of the DCS, but other administrative costs are not clear. For example, are there CLAS personnel who will be deprived of computing services as a result of the move? Or are there unforeseen costs that may develop in COE? These are not possible to estimate with the information provided to the committees.

SUMMARY: In summary, Ms. Sengstock said that the Computer Science faculty appears to be highly supportive of the transfer, as were students in the department, although it was unclear whether the votes of either group were based on full knowledge of the possible impact of the plan. The administration's response has dealt with some of the key issues raised by the committees, although a full examination of many of these issues would require more adequate data. As indicated in the committee votes reported earlier, the committees recommend that the move of Computer Science to Engineering be approved, but it should proceed with caution and attention to the critical issues in the report.

Monica Brockmeyer, the Interim Chair of Computer Science, addressed the Senate. She thanked the Senate committees for their careful consideration of the move and for their assistance in fleshing out awareness of the issues. She stated that the faculty in the Computer Science Department strongly endorsed the move. They feel that their research and teaching missions align closely with the mission of the College of Engineering and that the Department's impact will continue to enhance the University's mission. Ms. Brockmeyer commented on the issues that Ms. Sengstock mentioned to the Senate.

Many of the faculty in the DCS have degrees from computer science programs that are in engineering or

they have degrees from a combination of engineering and liberal arts colleges. The faculty have been assured that they will retain their rank, their tenure, and their salaries. The Department's promotion and tenure factors will remain in place. The promotion and tenure factors in the College of Engineering align with the University factors, and the faculty in Computer Science do not see this as a barrier to their success in Engineering. The faculty have been assured that their teaching loads will remain unchanged. The Department currently offers both three-credit and four-credit hour courses. The teaching loads will remain as they are now in terms of the number of courses, which currently is three courses per year for faculty who are research active. They have not been asked to adjust their curriculum to a four-credit hour model and they do not intend to do so.

Regarding student issues, Ms. Brockmeyer said that the students also have endorsed the move, and privately have communicated excitement about it. The plan grandfathered in the current students in CLAS so they will remain eligible to complete the degree in which they are enrolled up to three Bulletins. The plan proposes that the Bachelor of Science degree in Computer Science move to the College of Engineering. This is not a new degree but a realignment of the current degree with the general education requirements in the College of Engineering. It has been proposed that the Bachelor of Arts degree and the Bachelor of Arts in Information Systems Technology (BAIST) degree remain in CLAS.

There is interest in having a computing degree available for liberal arts students. There are three issues in administering such a degree. The first is the offering of the courses. The Computer Science faculty will offer courses to students pursuing the BA in Computer Science and the BAIST in CLAS and the BS in Engineering. The faculty can offer the full range of courses to maintain the three majors. The Computer Science Department proposes that the certifying and managing of the degrees that will remain in CLAS be handled through an approval chain that will involve the undergraduate curriculum committee in the DCS and the CLAS curriculum committee. This is a new model at Wayne State, but there are a number of other universities where the department of computer science or the department of computer science and engineering reside in the engineering school but continue to offer liberal arts computing degrees. There is a general consensus that computing is a rapidly emerging new discipline that has a profound impact on almost all human activities. It is highly relevant in both liberal arts and engineering contexts and is the reason behind leaving the BA and BAIST degrees in Liberal Arts and Sciences.

Regarding budgetary considerations, the Provost has assured the Department that its resources would move

intact. The Department's office will remain in 5057 Woodward.

There were no questions from the floor.

The vote on the motion was taken. PASSED.

The Provost thanked Ms. Sengstock and the Senate committees for all their work.

Mr. Wolfson resumed the position of Senate President.

V. REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

Provost Brown mentioned that the Dean's search in the College of Fine, Performing and Communication Arts continues. He thought the pool of candidates needed to be enlarged before candidates could be brought to campus. The search firm is working toward that goal.

Dean Thomas in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences will step down at the end of the 2011-2012 academic year. The Provost wants to give one year's time for the selection of that Dean because it is such a large college. He hopes to get the search under way in the summer.

The Provost sees the budget as an iterative process. The University does not know exactly how much the cut in the state appropriation will be. It could be a bit higher or a bit lower than what Governor Snyder recommended. In keeping with the concerns raised by the Policy Committee regarding the size of the administration, President Gilmour commissioned the Huron Group, a consulting firm, to look at the administrative side of the University and to advise the administration on improving efficiencies. Faculty have complained about policies related to such things as purchasing, reimbursement, and approval of contracts. The Huron Group will meet with the Policy Committee to identify problems.

Provost Brown said that Deans have been asked to find areas where they could cut their budgets by 10%. The Provost has established a Blue Ribbon Committee to look at budget issues on the academic side. Michael McIntyre chairs the committee and there are a number of other Senate members also serving on it. The Streamlining Task Force is looking at rules to determine which need to be changed or eliminated. The recommendations from these committees will go to President Gilmour and the committee he has formed to look at budget cuts. The President's committee consists of Richard Nork, Vice President for Finance and Business Operations, Hilary Ratner, Vice President for Research, Robert Kohrman, Associate Vice President for Budget, Planning and Analysis, and Provost Brown. The Provost does not expect there to

be definitive information about budget cuts until the end of the summer. He believes that the University, after making the changes, will be a more efficient institution.

President Gilmour arrived at the meeting. In introducing him, Provost Brown said he did not believe the University could have an individual more committed to the academic mission than President Gilmour.

VI. COMMENTS FROM THE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT

The President began his remarks by mentioning that he is interested in filling the endowed chair in urban affairs funded by former Mayor Coleman Young in the mid 1990s. The chair was funded at \$1 million and it now has \$2.3 million. The Coleman A. Young Foundation awards scholarships to college students. President Gilmour would like some of the students who receive the scholarships to attend Wayne State.

President Gilmour and Vice President for Government and Community Affairs Harvey Hollins visited Washington, D.C. recently. They spoke with the Democratic party's science coalition. There are about 50 universities nationwide that engage in scientific research. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the importance of basic research. The members of the coalition said they needed the universities' help to describe to the public the importance of basic research and that universities needed the help of the coalition to describe to the public the importance of basic research and what it produces. President Gilmour and Mr. Hollins visited both senators and four representatives and they met with staff members of the Domestic Policy Council that will visit campus on April 15. The purpose of the visit is to see if there are projects on which the University can work with the administration for the benefit of the city and the metropolitan area.

On March 30, President Gilmour testified before the joint State House of Representatives and Senate subcommittees on higher education appropriations. He made two points. One, that tuition restraint was a bad idea. He did not suggest that tuition should be increased more than 7.1%, but that tuition was a bad political idea because it would set a precedent. The second point the President made was that a 10% cut in the appropriation would be better than a 15% cut, that the University had been preparing for a 10% cut. The President of Western Michigan University, who spoke after President Gilmour, told the subcommittee that his institution had expected a 10% cut, also.

While in Lansing, the President met with the President of Central Michigan University (CMU). CMU has received approval to establish a medical school; they want to focus on family medicine. The President of

CMU wanted to discuss working with WSU so the institutions would not duplicate each other's efforts.

The Executive Committee of the President's Council of the state universities will meet with Governor Snyder on April 12. The President of the University of Michigan, Mary Sue Coleman, is a member of the Executive Committee representing the universities in the research corridor. Both she and President Lou Anna Simon of Michigan State University are unable to attend the meeting. President Gilmour will attend in their place.

President Gilmour commented on the article in the Detroit Free Press about administrative costs. He pointed out that everything except faculty and academic staff were counted as administrative costs. The article caught the attention of the legislature. The President has responded to the legislature explaining why WSU's costs are what they are. Wayne State's administrative costs are the lowest of any public university in Michigan as a percentage of the total budget.

The Huron Group thinks the University has the potential to increase its administrative cost savings. They will not have a definitive report for five or six more weeks.

President Gilmour said that if universities were viewed as businesses everyone would want to keep them strong. They are large enterprises. Some people complain that universities should do what businesses did over the last few years by cutting back. However, the businesses lost customers. Wayne State has not lost students; credit hours are at an all-time high.

Efficiencies can be improved in any part of the University, but, President Gilmour said, as an administrator in the federal Office of Management and Budget said, a budget is much more than a bunch of numbers; it is what an institution wants to be. Now is the time to think about what we want. In making cuts, the low-hanging fruit will be eliminated first. Then there will be tradeoffs. There are high priority initiatives that the administration wants to implement, such as the recommendations to improve retention. President Gilmour's committee that will review possible cuts will begin meeting April 18.

President Gilmour announced that a new retirement assistance plan would be announced soon. People with a given number of points (age plus years of service) would be eligible for various supplements for salary over a period of time and supplements for life insurance and health care.

Newspaper reports have claimed that the University has changed its admissions standards. That, the President said, is not true. A task force is working on admissions but their report will not be ready for six or more weeks. The University may want to change some of its

admissions criteria. We want every student who can succeed and do not want those who cannot. That is a narrow line. Test scores and grade points can predict success but they are not perfect. We have to see who is on the margin and would benefit from attending Wayne State.

President Gilmour thinks that Wayne State needs to do more to attract the good students from community colleges. The President and other administrators have visited four of the six nearby community colleges letting them know how Wayne State is making it easier to deal with it. Wayne State is initiating a new program that will award full scholarships to the five best students at each of the community colleges.

The President said that Chancellor Curtis Ivery of Wayne County Community College suggested a new 2+2+2 program that would intervene at the top high schools in Detroit. WC3, and Wayne State to a lesser degree, would see what courses the top students in the 7th and 8th grades should be taking with their likely being admitted to WC3 for two years and then come to WSU for the final two years.

The President took questions from the floor.

Mr. Parrish asked the President to tell the Senate about the students who spoke to the joint subcommittee on higher education. President Gilmour said that about one week before his scheduled meeting before the subcommittee it was decided to have two students attend. Angelica, who is one of seven children and who lives in Detroit, will graduate this year with majors in business and psychology. She works four jobs to pay for her education. Gary is from Iron Mountain, is majoring in finance and will graduate this year also. They were very clear in expressing their thoughts to the legislators. One legislator asked what they thought about the fact that if the state increases its appropriation, taxes have to be increased. Their response was that what happens in higher education in Michigan would not affect them because they are graduating, but they want higher education available, affordable, and accessible for future students. People who have a college degree will make \$1 million more over their careers than those who do not have a degree. Angelica and Gary indicated that they would be able to pay the increased taxes.

President Gilmour also mentioned the freedom of information act request from the Mackinaw Center for certain e-mail messages. General Counsel Louis Lessem will determine how the University should respond. Mr. Parrish has asked that the AAUP-AFT attorney be involved.

This concluded President Gilmour's remarks.

ADJOURNMENT: It was MOVED and SECONDED to ADJOURN. PASSED. The meeting adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Seymour J. Wolfson
President, Academic Senate