

## Faculty Affairs

Minutes April 11, 2019

Present: renée c. hoogland, Ewa Golebiowska, Daniel Golodner, Marisa Henderson, Kypros Markou, Karin Tarpenning, Annmarie Cano, Jocelyn Ang, Poonam Arya, Linda Beale, Ellen Tisdale, Amanda Levitt (GEOC)

Absent with notice: Jinping Xu, Patricia McCormick

Absent: Ekrem Murat Hussein Bazzi (Student Senate)

Guests: Marquita Chamblee, Loreleigh Keashly, Monica Brockmeyer, Brad Roth

### **1. The meeting was called to order at 12:08pm**

### **2. Climate Survey**

MC explains that she and LK are discussing the results of the survey with a many groups, requesting feedback, so that the data can be worked with effectively.

rch suggests discussing the findings on faculty well-being and micro-aggressions in relation to gender and race first.

LK observes that full-time female faculty experience and witness more micro-aggressions than men. Gender was not found to be connected to bullying for full-time faculty. African American and multiracial faculty experience as well as witness bullying more often than whites. African American staff experience and witness more bullying, and African Americans generally experience more micro-aggressions.

rch asks what we can learn from these data.

LK says that both bullying and micro-aggressions are related to gender and race, not to rank. A larger number of tenured faculty reported witnessing and experiencing bullying, and more often than tenure-track and non-tenure track. Tenured faculty are often seen as the problem. Empirical data suggest otherwise.

AC mentions that the majority of participants in her bullying seminars are associate professors.

LK asks if the non-rep. staff (primarily in the medical school) are included in the senate.

LB does not think so.

MC comments that the staff response was high on certain issues, and that especially the large proportion of them seriously considering leaving WSU was somewhat remarkable. Info on race and rank of all employees can be found on the Institution Research website. The dashboard suggests that African Americans are at the lowest level of staff appointments.

LK notes one highly problematic thing is that people often do not know where to go with "issues." Faculty and staff are also worried about repercussions.

rch asks about people's happiness with the effectiveness of reporting—in her experience, the biggest problem is that "nothing happened."

LK confirms that people often feel that they were listened to when they reported incidents, but a large proportion also said that no action was taken as a result.

MC adds that people who did not report, did not think that doing so would help.

LB asks if there was a question: do you feel that you have an organization that gives you a voice on campus? It would be interesting to see if everyone felt that they have a voice, and also know where to take things. Why issues were not handled right is different from not knowing where to go with them.

LK can answer the question where people did go: faculty take incidents to chairs and the union; staff go to supervisors and HR; students take them to their academic adviser and up the chain. rch posits that faculty and staff need to be better informed about what resources are available. KM asks how people interpret the terms bullying and micro-aggressions. There should be something in writing.

LK asks if KM means a policy.

rch refers to the Biden discussion around his kissing a woman “affectionately” on the back of her head at the end of a meeting. Men simply do not realize how belittling and humiliating this *feels*. Gender and racial backgrounds make us experience things differently. Adds that education is necessary to explain to people how their behavior affects so-called others (e.g., women, non-whites).

AL is interested to learn how disability came up in relation to bullying and micro-aggressions.

LK says that people who identify as individuals with disabilities very much spoke out. Adds that she can pull detailed data on this and will do so.

LK acknowledges that the form of any question shapes the answers.

MC mentions that the Town Hall meeting scheduled for the following week will be live-streamed and recorded. Adds that she and LK are meeting with senior leadership teams and are doing focus groups around specific issues as well. Everybody can get involved through the website.

## **2. UROP/McNair Integration**

MB begins by saying that she wants to hear how we can collaborate. She explains the proposed change to the UROP program—but admits that it is actually already under implementation. Recounts the history leading up to the current changes (see the UPDATES document) and that the disappointing effects of moving the program to the Provost’s office has led to the development of a pre-research pipeline that is similar to the pre-McNair program.

rch explains the concerns expressed by the Policy cttee.: no consultation, poor communication, and the distribution and loss of funds.

MB agrees.

BR adds that MB’s portfolio does not really extend to what UROP has been able to accomplish in terms of supporting successful students. WSU stands out against other R1 universities because of its strong faculty—comparable to U-M—who are actually available to undergraduate students. Further, many students who do not belong to under-represented minorities are nonetheless of diverse backgrounds. They may travel to their “home” countries but nowhere else. UROP allows students to do projects in a variety of foreign countries. This is not a criticism: yet, UROP needs to be a *distinctive* support for successful students.

AC asks after the qualifying criteria for the McNair program.

MB explains that students need to be either low-income, 1st generation, or persons with disabilities. A certain percentage actually need to fulfill both no. 1 and no. 2. The integration of the two programs aims at offering a broader appeal by requiring students to fulfill either one or the other requirement.

rch ask what the award entails.

MB states that students and faculty get some money through McNair. There is a weekly seminar/community. Pre-research activities help students by introducing them to research methods and development. The communities and the pre-research program serve the purpose of confidence-building and embracing the challenge of learning. The integrated program will

support graduate student retainment more broadly. The McNair only supports pre-PhD students.

PA wonders what will happen to the middle group. UROP would support those students.

MB claims that there is much more overlap among the various groups of students. UROP offers about 60 awards annually.

AC sees the difference between McNair and UROP in the former getting all kinds of programmed support. They have bonded and been inspired.

BR submits that the distinctive aspect of MB's portfolio is to prevent students from failing.

McNair is limited because of the exclusive focus on PhDs.

MB pushes back against the idea that she is merely there to prevent students from failing. Very few students at WSU are *not* at risk. Students especially sense a lack of "belonging." Lacking educational and cultural capital is a main source of stress.

LB asks if there are statistics on UROP students over the past 5 years who would not be eligible for McNair.

MB says no.

LB continues by pointing out that the new program has already been started while there is nothing to replace UROP. Adds that UROP is not restricted to certain disciplines.

rch requests numbers (participants before/after integration) and wants to know if the new program will be supported with additional funds.

MB says that there is another program that is "floating" and that may be integrated into this. The entirely new structure should function as a hub.

LB infers that schools and colleges will now be forced to raise the money that has been taken away.

MB has offered Deans to collaborate on this.

LB asks why the focus is not also on the group that is currently, but will no longer benefit from UROP.

### **3. Minutes March 7**

KM points to an error in the section on AA. Amended minutes are approved.

**The meeting was adjourned at 1:35pm.**

Respectfully submitted,

renée c. hoogland, Chair .