

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY – ACADEMIC SENATE
Official Proceedings
September 10, 2008

Members Present: Nancy S. Barrett, Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, Chair; William H. Volz, Vice Chair, Academic Senate; Terrence Allen; Joseph Artiss; Basim Asmar; Tyrone Austin; Ivan Avrutsky; Sarah Bassett; Veronica Bielat; Tamara Bray; Kingsley Browne; Timothy Butler; David Cinabro; Christopher Collins; Rick Cummins; William Crossland; Gina DeBlase; Donald DeGracia; Marcus Dickson; Cheryl Dove; Brian Edwrds; Karen Feathers; Judy Field; Andre Furtado; Hans Hummer; Patricia Jarosz; Barbara Jones; Loreleigh Keashly; Poco Kernsmith; Thomas Killion; Jerry Ku; Gloria Kuhn; Lisa Maruca; Tej Mattoo; Michael McIntyre; James Moseley; Prahlad Parajuli; Regina Parnell; Charles Parrish; Frederic Pearson; Sean Peters; Aleksander Popadic; Elizabeth Puscheck; Susil Putatunda; T. R. Reddy; Louis Romano; Michele Ronnick; Brad Roth; Anthony Sacco; Mary Sengstock; Bo Shen; Naida Simon; Antoinette Somers; Lothar Spang; Harley Tse; Renee Van Stavern; Anca Vlasopolos; JianJun Wang; Olivia Washington; Barrett Watten; Linda Weglicki; Judith Whittum-Hudson; Derek Wildman; James Woodyard; Antoinette Wozniak; Russell Yamazaki; Earnestine Young

Members Absent with Notice: Muhammad Amjad; Anthony Cacace; Victoria Dallas; Ravi Dhar; Doreen Head; Linea Rydstedt; Assia Shisheva; Mary Width; Seymour Wolfson

Members Absent: Monica Brockmeyer; Winston Koo; Daniel Rappolee; Arun Wakade

Others Present: Johnnie Blunt, Office of the Academic Senate; Gloria Heppner, Associate Vice President for Research; Alan Jacobson, Office of Budget, Planning and Analysis; Jay Noren, President; Howard Shapiro, Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Programs and General Education; Angela Wisniewski, Office of the Academic Senate

In the absence of Mr. Wolfson, Mr. Volz, the Vice Chair, assumed the duties of the Senate President.

CALL TO ORDER: The first meeting of the Academic Senate for the 2008-2009 academic year was called to order by Provost Barrett at 1:35 p.m. The meeting was held in the Kresge Auditorium in the Purdy-Kresge Library.

I. INTRODUCTION OF NEW MEMBERS

Mr. Volz introduced the members of the faculty and academic staff who were newly elected to the Senate and those who were re-elected to new terms. The membership roster is attached to these Proceedings as Appendix A.

II. ELECTION OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE

Ms. Somers, a member of the Elections Committee, conducted the election of the Policy Committee. Five people had to be elected: one to a three-year term and four to one-year terms. Nominated prior to the meeting were: Victoria Dallas, Communication, Fine, Performing and Communication Arts; Donald DeGracia, Physiology, Medicine; Louis Romano, Chemistry, Liberal Arts and Sciences; Lothar Spang, Library Information Services, University Libraries; William Volz, Accounting, Business Administration; Judith Whittum-Hudson, Immunology and Microbiology, Medicine; and James Woodyard, Electrical and Computer Engineering, Engineering.

Ms. Somers opened the floor for nominations. There were no additional nominations. It was **MOVED** and **SECONDED** to **CLOSE NOMINATIONS**. **PASSED**. The candidates identified themselves and stated their reasons for seeking election.

Louis Romano was elected to the three-year term. Victoria Dallas, William Volz, Judith Whittum-Hudson, and James Woodyard were elected to one-year terms.

III. APPROVAL OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

It was **MOVED** and **SECONDED** to **APPROVE** the Proceedings of the Academic Senate meeting of May 7, 2008. **PASSED**.

IV. REPORT FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT

A. Report and Announcements

Ms. Wisniewski mentioned that the forms on which members are asked to note their availability for committee meetings have been mailed. Members should return them to the Senate Office. Mr. Volz pointed out that the substantive work of the Senate is done in the committees. Returning the forms will help the committee Chairs schedule meetings.

B. Proceedings of the Policy Committee

The Academic Senate received the Proceedings of the Policy Committee meetings of April 28, 2008, May 5, 2008, May 19, 2008, June 2, 2008, June 9, 2008, June 16, 2008, June 30, 2008, July 14, 2008, and July 28, 2008 (Appendix B).

V. REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

Provost Barrett updated the Senate on expansion of Wayne State's presence in Macomb County. Different areas of the county are targeted for different programs. Courses in technology, computer science, engineering, and business supply chain management will be offered at Macomb Community College's south campus in Warren. Within the next several weeks, Macomb Community College is expected to announce that it will construct a building for Wayne State at its south campus where WSU will offer the full program for a Bachelor's degree in Computer Science and in supply chain management, a range of executive education programs, and short courses. The Provost noted that this is an economic development initiative as well as an educational initiative.

The Provost reported that Macomb County has asked Wayne State to take over a library now operated by the county. The University is assessing the building for classroom and office space. Wayne State would continue to provide the library's adaptive services and an electronic resource reference service. In this building, the University would not be constrained in the types of courses it offers.

Provost Barrett said that the University is working to develop health education and health services programs in the Mt. Clemens area. In the FY 2009 Budget, three full-time faculty positions were authorized to support programs in Engineering Technology, Computer Science, and Business Administration.

Mr. Butler asked if programs could be developed in conjunction with Oakland Community College that would use the University's Oakland Center facility during the day. There is an OCC campus across from the Oakland Center and, while the Center is heavily used in the evening, it is almost empty during the day. The Provost thought the suggestion was good and welcomed more such suggestions.

VI. COMMENTS BY THE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT

Provost Barrett introduced Jay Noren, the University's tenth President, who assumed the presidency on August 1, 2008.

President Noren focused his comments on four areas that he believes are important for increasing emphases. First is access to higher education, not only in providing the opportunity for students to attend college, but in terms of the University's missions of education, outreach, and research on access to higher education. The objectives of being a university of opportunity and a selective university are in competition and balancing those objectives is a challenge. It

is critically important, the President said, to study the question of being a university of opportunity as a research question, to study what approaches or methods enhance retention and graduation rates for those students who benefit from a university of opportunity. The retention report, he noted, is well-researched with sensible recommendations.

President Noren believes Wayne State is more strategically located to address critical issues of urban stress than any other university in the country. Many cities, in addition to Detroit, can benefit from research on urban issues. The University has told Detroit's new leadership that it is available for consultation and advice.

The third area of focus is that of providing WSU students with experiences that will engage them in community activities and in the political process. President Noren mentioned two examples of community involvement: the Honors College and the engagement of graduates of the Chicano-Boricua Studies Program in the community.

The fourth area is the economic development and revitalization of Detroit and southeast Michigan. The President wants to expand the University's research and the development activities that have led to growth in Detroit.

Dr. Noren opened the floor for questions and comments.

Mr. Pearson asked how the discussions between the University and the Detroit Medical Center (DMC) were progressing. President Noren said that he had decided not to participate in the negotiations, that it was better if his role was one of oversight. Two issues are being negotiated. One issue is revenues and payments to Medical School physicians for providing health care to uninsured and under-insured patients. This is where progress has been made. An analysis of the fair market value of the services provided by the Medical School physicians is ongoing, but so far it has been in the Medical School's favor, and some of the payment for indigent care has been restored. The other issue is the residency programs. Dr. Noren sees the following as key elements that have to be accomplished in the medical clinical programs in relationship with the DMC and with other institutions. For some time, Medical School students have had experiences in various institutions in the metropolitan area. Residencies have been more localized in the DMC hospitals until recently. The DMC suspended funding for some residencies in the last year or so. The School of Medicine and the University are committed to providing clinical services to the uninsured and uninsured citizens of Detroit. All of the clinical

departments must be fully staffed by faculty physicians and faculty non-physicians and they must be chaired by a tenured faculty member appointed by the Dean through the normal appointment processes. There must be residencies in all principal clinical departments and the residencies must be controlled either unilaterally or jointly by the School of Medicine. The agreements with the DMC or any other clinical delivery system must be long term and they must be renewed regularly. If they are not to be renewed, there must be a long-term notice period, which means more than five years, more like ten years. Residency programs need that kind of stability.

In response to a question, President Noren said that the DMC stopped funding four residency programs (orthopedic surgery, urology, family medicine, and dermatology), but the University runs the residency programs in affiliation with other hospitals and maintains the departments in the Medical School. The Provost added that these residency programs need to be accredited with the new hospital partner.

Ms. Vlasopolos asked the President how he thought the seemingly divergent goals of being a first-rate research university and a university of opportunity could be accomplished. He responded that metropolitan universities are typically universities of opportunity and those that are also research universities have a complicated mission. It is important nationally to increase the number of people who are college-educated. The most important way to do that is to include students who might not otherwise have access to higher education, and those students might need special support. Every urban institution has lower retention and graduation rates than universities that do not have that challenge. It is important to be innovative and to document the challenge as a research question.

Ms. Van Stavern heard that the DMC proposed that it control the residency programs and offered an incentive. If the DMC controls the programs it would not cut funding for them. Ms. Van Stavern said if the DMC cut funding for the residency program in Neurology, that Department would lose \$400,000. If Wayne State cannot have sole control or joint control of the residency programs with the DMC, how will the University maintain the programs? President Noren said that the residency programs have to be Medical School residency programs. Because Wayne State does not have its own hospital, the programs have to be joint programs. There can be sole programs on either side that have an agreement and allow for collaboration, but they have to be Medical School programs in terms of control. The DMC has proposed a variety of things that the University finds unworkable. In addition to academic control of the residency

programs, President Noren said that there has to be enough patient volume to sustain the educational and research enterprise. If the needs of the Medical School can be accomplished at the DMC, the University will continue that relationship. If they cannot, partnerships with other hospitals will have to be added.

Mr. Watten asked the President to comment on having a residential campus and transportation alternatives. The University, President Noren said, supports mass transit. Mass transit proposals have been formulated with a stop at the University. The administration is looking at offering more courses at off-campus locations to provide access without diminishing the programs on the main campus. Dormitories have had a positive impact on campus life but they have to be filled. Related to this, Dr. Noren expressed his pleasure with the radio and television advertisements promoting the University and informing the public of its accomplishments.

V. REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

Provost Barrett completed her report. She gave preliminary enrollment figures for the fall term as of September 8. Enrollment ends at midnight September 15. At the present time, enrollment is down and that will affect the budget for fiscal year 2009.

Last year the administration underestimated tuition revenue, and this year it overestimated tuition revenue. With a budget from tuition of \$275 million, to be off by \$5 million to \$10 million is not bad estimating when you have a volatile student body. The Provost would like to establish base funding for tuition. Tuition revenue over the base due to an upswing in enrollment could be used for non-recurring expenditures. You cannot give a new faculty position to a college one year because you have additional tuition revenue and take that position away the next year because revenue has dropped. The Provost is hopeful that enrollments can be brought up next year to where they were one year ago.

Mr. McIntyre noted that the Budget Committee and the Senate were particularly critical of the budget estimates in September 2007 when the enrollment figures were known. They were not critical about enrollment predictions made in July, but after the fact when the administration was still coming in with estimates that were way off. It seemed to Mr. McIntyre that the schools and colleges were being asked to take significant cuts when there was money available.

VII. COMMITTEE REPORTS

The Chairs of last year's committees were asked to give brief reports about their committees' work. The

Annual Reports of the Budget Committee, the Curriculum and Instruction Committee, the Facilities, Support Services and Technology Committee, the Research Committee, and the Student Affairs Committee are attached to these Proceedings as Appendix C. The Annual Report of the Faculty Affairs Committee is included with the Proceedings of the May 7, 2008, Senate meeting.

A. Budget Committee

Mr. McIntyre chaired the Budget for a number of years. He commented on changes over the years. When he first chaired the Committee, David Adamany was President and the Committee had no opportunity to affect the budgetary process. The situation was discouraging to Senate members and attendance at meetings was poor. During Irvin Reid's presidency and with Provost Barrett's attending the meetings and consulting with the Budget Committee, the administration and the Board of Governors have listened to the Committee. Meetings are very well attended. In addition to the Provost, Assistant Vice President for Budget, Planning and Analysis Robert Kohrman, and Vice President for Finance and Facilities Management John Davis attend the meetings.

The Budget Committee has integrated itself in ways it had not done in the past. It has an active inter-relationship with the Policy Committee. Mr. McIntyre has attended some of their meetings and has had a lot of consultation with the President of the Senate. And the Budget Committee has sought the agreement of the Senate. Last year, the administration made estimates that the Budget Committee thought were inaccurate when the schools and colleges had taken very serious cuts. The Committee developed a plan for spending the available money and the Senate unanimously endorsed the plan. The administration then worked with the Senate to accommodate its concerns.

Mr. McIntyre said that another change has been that the Budget and Finance Committee of the Board of Governors has met in working sessions separate from the rest of the Board. This has allowed the Senate Budget Committee to have input at an earlier stage, and sometimes the administration has changed its proposals based on the meetings.

Mr. McIntyre thanked the members of the Budget Committee for their hard work.

B. Curriculum and Instruction Committee

Mr. Hummer, the Chair of the C&I Committee, had to leave the meeting to teach a class and Mr.

Watten, a member of the Committee made the report. The C&I Committee worked on three major issues during the 2007-2008 academic year. One issue was the establishment of the Honors College. The C&I Committee met with Jerry Herron, the Director of the Honors Program, and discussed the proposal for the Honors College. The Committee outlined a number of areas for clarification: The pedagogical and intellectual vision for the college, the mechanics of the program/college and how it would coordinate its curriculum with departments, programs to enrich the experience of the students, enhancement of requirements for admission, clarification of the curriculum, and the elaboration of the processes by which issues of curriculum and instruction are raised, vetted, and approved.

The Committee worked with Howard Shapiro, the Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Programs and General Education, on two reforms for general education. One was the change in the written communication competency requirement. The previous system required a passing grade of D minus in introductory and intermediate composition courses and a passing grade on the English Proficiency Examination. The English Proficiency Exam was eliminated. The new system requires a passing grade of C in basic and intermediate composition courses, and made the intermediate composition course a prerequisite for writing-intensive courses.

The second area of focus was the reform of the policy for Bulletins in Force for Graduation and Continuous Enrollment for Undergraduates. This affects the way advisors approve degree programs for students who take a long time to get their degrees or for those whose degree program has been interrupted. Bulletins should be published on a two-year cycle, and curriculum revisions need to be aligned with this cycle as well. Students are to follow the bulletin in force at the time of their first matriculation to the University, but they can migrate at any time to a later bulletin if they choose. A given bulletin will remain in force for six years.

All students will have an expected term of graduation in their records that will be updated if necessary. The expected term of graduation and the bulletin that the student is following will be used to generate the appropriate Degree Audit for the student to use in advising and planning.

If a student's period of enrollment exceeds the six-year time frame, she/he will need to decide which bulletin then in force for that student is the best choice and, working with an advisor, will migrate to that bulletin. Decisions will be made at that time regarding the currency of coursework and the need

to make adjustments based on changes in the curriculum.

Because all students will have expected terms of graduation in their records, they will be required to review their degree audits with their advisors the term before they expect to graduate. That review will confirm the bulletin to be followed, the applicability of the coursework completed to the degree sought, and the remaining courses that must be completed.

If any student fails to enroll for three successive terms (excluding Spring/Summer) or more, she/he will be required to file a re-entry form in order to register. The student will be required to see an advisor in order to review the status of his/her coursework and to make necessary adjustments.

C. Facilities, Support Services and Technology Committee

Judy Field, the Chair of the Facilities, Support Services and Technology Committee, made the report. The Committee, she said, deals with physical facilities, security, parking, computer infrastructure, and other issues related to staff support. Joseph Sawasky, the Chief Information Officer, is the administrative liaison to the FSST Committee. Ms. Field urged members to notify Committee members if they have problems with the computing infrastructure because Mr. Sawasky is very proactive in resolving problems.

The other issue the Committee worked on was the general purpose classrooms, i.e., what should be in the general purpose classrooms, how are they maintained, etc. The Committee works with James Sears, the Associate Vice President for Facilities, Planning and Management, on these issues. He invited a Committee member to work with him on the upgrade of State Hall. The Committee worked with the Information Technology Office about the type of smart carts that should be installed in classrooms.

Again, Ms. Field asked members to notify the Committee if they have problems in the areas that FSST oversees.

D. Faculty Affairs Committee

William Crossland, the Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, made the report. The Committee worked on four issues in 2007-2008: The revision of the faculty tab; the retirement forum; the expansion of the electronic student evaluation of teaching; and

the Respect Campaign of the Dean of Students Office.

Revisions to the Faculty Tab in Pipeline were finalized this year and were put into effect in February. One issue related to this project is ongoing, i.e., compiling a list of web-based mail servers on campus. An Academic Technology Advisory Group under the direction of Joseph Sawasky and Sandra Yee, Dean of the Libraries, is working on this issue.

The forum on retirement was very successful with about 80 people attending. Three faculty retirees spoke about their experiences and staff members from the Office of Total Compensation and Wellness and the AAUP-AFT provided information about retirement. The program might be expanded in the future. At the forum it was learned that retirees do not have access to all of the University's electronic facilities. Working with the Academic Technology Advisory Group, Mr. Crossland hopes that will be changed.

The Faculty Affairs Committee, along with the Student Affairs Committee, considered whether the Student Evaluation of Teaching data should be submitted electronically. The FAC conducted a survey of faculty to learn if they would use electronic SET, and received over 500 responses. Thirty-five percent said they would use it, 35% said they preferred paper, and 20% said they would use either format. There are many questions about what type of software should be used and whether the University has the infrastructure to support it. The Committee recommended that any move toward electronic SET use should be approached gradually.

The Committee met with Dean of Students David Strauss regarding the Respect Campaign to learn how it might affect the faculty. The Committee learned that many behavioral problems occur between faculty and students, and a lot of them result from not addressing situations as they arise. Dean Strauss is interested in speaking to the Senate about this campaign as well as other issues. The FAC may look further into where problems are occurring between students and faculty and what could be done about them.

E. Research Committee

Harley Tse, Chair of the Research Committee, said that the Committee undertook two major projects and reviewed applications from undergraduate students for the summer research stipend program. Early in the year, while addressing issues between faculty in the College of Education and the Human Investigation Committee, the Research Committee became interested in doing a broader study about

the research environment at Wayne State. The Committee developed a survey of 71 questions divided into six sections. The questions ranged from issues at the department level to university-wide issues. More than 400 researchers responded. The Research Committee will analyze the data this year and will try to develop recommendations to improve conditions for research.

Policy Committee also charged the Research Committee with trying to find out why the national research standing of the University has declined over the past several years. The National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation track and rank total expenditures by institutions to which they give research funding. There are two sources of institutional research expenditures. One comes from income and the expenditure of grants and contracts. The other source is research-related university or institutional expenses on these issues. In 2002 Wayne State's standing stood at 61 among all universities and 41 among public universities. By 2006, it dropped to 75 among all universities and 52 among public universities. The Committee has been trying to understand the reason for the decline. It has worked closely with the Office of the Vice President for Research, and learned that the amount of grants and contracts has remained level over the past several years, but other institutions have out spent WSU. The Committee developed recommendations, but decided to wait until it had the results of the faculty survey because that information might affect the response. The Committee wants to change the culture of the University toward research. It wants to look at incentives for faculty to do research and recognition of those who have been active researchers.

The third project for the Committee last year was the review of the applications for the Undergraduate Summer Stipend Awards. Ninety applications were reviewed and 26 were submitted to the Provost's Office for funding.

F. Student Affairs Committee

Karen Feathers, the Chair of the 2007-2008 Student Affairs Committee, began by thanking the Committee members for their hard work. The Committee had three major tasks assigned by the Policy Committee: The Honors College; electronic SET; and the grading policy. In reviewing the initial proposal for the Honors College, the Committee compared the proposal with honors programs and colleges at other universities and made its recommendations.

The Student Affairs Committee also looked into the possibility of expanding the use of electronic student evaluation of teaching. Electronic SET has been used at WSU primarily for on-line courses. The Committee learned that other institutions have had an extremely low response rate with electronic SET, as low as 35%. The SET is used in faculty evaluations. Such evaluations should be based on the responses of more than 35% of students who take a class. The Committee did an informal survey of students about using electronic SET. The students said they would respond electronically, but said that their fellow students would not. Other universities have offered incentives, such as iPods, for completing the SET, but that did not improve the response rate. Students were opposed to coercion such as withholding grades or not being able to register unless they completed the SET. The University does not have the infrastructure to handle the electronic responses. The Student Affairs Committee agreed with the Faculty Affairs Committee that more study and work needed to be done on the question. Student Affairs recommended that a small pilot study be done to compare the use of electronic SET against the use of paper SET.

The Committee was asked to find out if the change in the policy that eliminated the mark of X so students who do not attend a class receive an F has had an impact on enrollment. The Committee looked at the available data, but it needs information from the second semester after students receive the F. Students will have registered for the next semester by the time they receive the grade. If students are not allowed to register because they received an F, that restriction will not go into effect until the second semester.

The Committee also looked at the degree audit in considering issues related to retention. The members had questions about the policy. A major question was who would handle the plan of work and how would changes in licensure requirements be handled.

ADJOURNMENT: It was MOVED and SECONDED to ADJOURN the meeting. The meeting ended at 3:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

William H. Volz
Vice Chair, Academic Senate