

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY  
ACADEMIC SENATE  
Official Proceedings  
October 12, 2022

**Members Present:** Mark Kornbluh, Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs; Linda Beale, President, Academic Senate; Nicole Audritsh; Michael J. Barnes; Joan Beaudoin; Juliann Binienda; Pynthia Caffee; Stephen Calkins; Stephanie Chastain; Wei Chen; Stephen Chrisomalis; Erin Comartin; Alan Dombkowski; Damecia Donahue; Paul Dubinsky; Brian Edwards; Erica Edwards; Jane Fitzgibbon; Ewa Golebiowska; Daniel Golodner; Haidong Gu; Robert Harr; Lance Heilbrun; Marisa Henderson; reneé c. hoogland; Michael Horn; Christine Jackson; Anand Jha; Barbara Jones; Satinder Kaur; Pramod Khosla; Christine Knapp; Shelly Jo Kraft; Abhijit Majumder; Neena Marupudi; Cynthia Merritt; Georgia Michalopoulou; Carol Miller; Lisa O'Donnell; Rachel Pawlowski; Sean Peters; Richard Pineau; Tamme Quinn-Grzebyk; Shauna Reeves; Robert Reynolds; Joseph Roche; Ali Salamey; Debra Schutte; Bo Shen; Gina Shreve; Naida Simon; Cheryl Somers; Jennifer Stockdill; Elizabeth Stoycheff; Ellen Tisdale; Stephanie Tong; Ricardo Villarosa; Jeffery Withey; Hossein Yarandi

**Members Absent with Notice:** Heather Abraham; Suresh Balasubramanian; Chris Collins; Arun Iyer; Jennifer Lewis; Noreen Rossi; Brad Roth

**Members Absent:** Leela Arava; Nancy Chi Cantalupo; David Edelman; Nasser Lakkis; Amy Latawiec; Bharati Mitra; Ramzi Mohammad; Shane Perrine; Wassim Tarraf; William Volz; Le Yi Wang

**Guests:** Mark Gaffney; David Kessel; Garrett McManaway; Laura Lynch; Mary Paquette-Abt; Sarah Schrag; Karin Tarpenning; Rob Thompson

I. APPROVAL OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

It was MOVED and SECONDED to APPROVE the Proceedings of the Academic Senate plenary session of September 14, 2022. PASSED.

II. INTRODUCTION OF THE SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE CHAIRS

Provost Kornbluh introduced the Senate standing

committee chairs. (Lewis, chair of the Curriculum and

Instruction Committee, and Rossi, chair of the Research Committee, could not attend.)

Fitzgibbon (CFPCA), chair of the Budget Committee, reported that the committee will focus on issues the university faces financially over the next nine months. Barnes (CFPCA), chair of the Facilities, Support Services, and Technology (FSST) Committee, reported that the committee will examine the impact of our facilities and university technology on curriculum and teaching, as well as other university issues, including parking and classroom computers. Henderson (Mathematics) and Khosla (CLAS), co-chairs of the Diversity Equity and Inclusion (DEI) ad hoc committee, reported that the committee's goals were to understand DEI initiatives and actions recommended at the university level and to fill in any gaps.

III. CONFIRMATION OF VICE CHAIR AND PARLIAMENTARIAN

Senate President Beale announced the Policy Committee's selections for the vice chair and parliamentarian and asked for a vote to confirm hoogland (CLAS) as vice chair and Caulkins (Law) as parliamentarian. The Senate unanimously approved the selection of the vice chair and parliamentarian.

IV. CAMPUS DATA AND IT SECURITY UPDATE

Rob Thompson (AVP & CIO C&IT) and Garrett McManaway (Sr. Dir. Information Security & Compliance) discussed plans for security at the university over the next five years and shared a calendar of 2022-2027 events.

October is Cybersecurity Awareness Month, and McManaway shared the plans for security training and phishing testing with the Senate. Security awareness training has been going on for several years. Over the pandemic it was difficult to get the training and messaging across. Messaging will soon be going out to help deans and directors give guidance on the mandatory training. They will also be doing phishing exercises as learning activities: two fake phishing emails (one pre-training and the other post-training) will be sent to most of the university to help set a baseline of understanding regarding what kind of training is needed.

Thompson discussed the 5 Year IT Security Roadmap and explained the rationale: there is a rapidly evolving

security landscape threat throughout the world. Ransomware, especially against universities, is growing quickly and is something that has been detected (but stopped) on our campus. This requires action and forethought from our security team. The GLBA (Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act) and the CMMC (Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification) compliance are federal requirements being put in place by the Department of Defense mandating certain security policies and procedures on campus to continue to receive and retain federal grants. EDUCAUSE, the IT board for all universities and education space, predicts that CMMC will be adopted as the standard minimum requirement in other federal agencies. The university must be compliant with CMMC by October 2025. These actions are being taken not only to strengthen our security posture but also to comply with these requirements.

Pineau (CLAS) questioned the role of the Security Operations Center (SOC). McManaway explained that a key component of cyber security is what happens *after* a ransomware attack. In the case of the campus ransomware attack that occurred, triggers in place warned C&IT personnel of the attempted ransomware attack, allowing them to respond quickly and prevent significant damage. The SOC oversees those triggers and takes action when they are tripped. Today the SOC consists of a small team that operates during normal business hours. To satisfy the new requirements will require a 24/7 SOC presence. Pineau asked whether reports of a phishing email go to the SOC, and McManaway confirmed they do, although the university currently leverages helpdesk assistance because it is staffed beyond the SOC's normal business hours. Some SOC team members come in for after-hours support, but we don't yet have 24/7 capability. The requirements are vague so one of the biggest challenges is interpreting that language.

Kornbluh pointed to the broader story: ransomware attackers are well-organized, well-financed criminal groups targeting non-governmental organizations, universities, schools, cities—places that are known for the openness of their computer networks. There are several Michigan universities that have been hit (including Michigan State) and some can no longer get cyber threat insurance coverage. A computer in our engineering lab was not monitored, allowing attackers into our systems; but the security team's alarm system allowed it to be stopped before there was much damage.

McManaway highlighted a few policies expected to take effect in February 2023. One is a Managed Device Security Policy that will require any Wayne State computer to be managed for security reasons with encryption at the base level allowing C&IT to turn it off and wipe the data remotely if necessary. Also taking effect will be an Assigned Device Policy that provides support for a primary machine for people who need other machines for research. That policy will help to manage machines that need to be updated and maintained on a regular basis. Beale asked McManaway to explain how this will impact faculty members who use their Wayne State laptop in their offices and at home. McManaway responded that such devices will be refreshed every four years. The focus will be on reducing the number of machines and investing in docking stations and monitors that will permit assigned machines to be used at multiple work and home locations. There will be exceptions to accommodate specific needs. Beale also asked about the communication process around remote wiping of data on such machines: it will be important that faculty are clearly informed and aware of the process and timeline for replacements. McManaway explained that the typical situation that requires removing data occurs when a machine has been lost or stolen, so wiping the machine remotely is a protective action. The data itself will not be lost, because there are secure backups so that files can be restored: the laptop user will receive a new piece of hardware that has the same settings and data that was on the lost machine.

hoogland asked what "privileged access" means on the chart. Thompson explained that university systems such as STARS, Banner and Cognos contain controlled unclassified information (CUI), as defined by the CMMC: anyone with access to those systems will be required to complete security training to be compliant with these regulations.

Barnes raised the question about mobile devices and how those will be maintained. Thompson described the university as having a "bring your own device" culture: he does not anticipate that changing in the next five years. What will be restricted are the Wayne State managed devices issued to users that will have a certificate on them that will only allow certain users to access systems with CUI. Kornbluh added that individuals will be able to use their mobile phones for email or website exploration, but they will not be able to use it to access STARS or Banner. McManaway further explained that mobile devices pose a risk because they

are not encrypted. Microsoft, Apple and Google do force a secure methodology of storing information on those devices which help protect data, but Android does not currently comply with Microsoft's methodology for accessing email. Beale asked how that difference affects people who have Android phones. McManaway explained that it requires Android owners to use Outlook rather than the built-in mail client on the phone. Thompson added that the Outlook applications that work with Wayne State's email system will likely continue to work on any phone through the end of the five-year roadmap. That is not being restricted right now. From the privacy perspective, McManaway said his purview is to stay away from having control over a personal mobile device. There are options available to allow the use of personal devices to access sensitive pieces of information.

Calkins asked what the proper response is for emails that might be legitimate or might be phishing. Thompson explained there is a phishing report button in the Outlook web application (a pull down at the top of the page that says "report") that will go straight to McManaway's team. If you are using an application that doesn't have access to that button, the email should be forwarded to [abuse@wayne.edu](mailto:abuse@wayne.edu). Even if you are not sure if the email is phishing or not, you are encouraged to report it. Individuals are also encouraged not to click on links or open attachments of any suspicious emails. While there are still links to malicious websites, scams have become more common these days. These email scams appear to be from someone with authority requesting you to purchase gift cards for them. McManaway encourages asking the person whether the email is real before responding to it. Gmail is free and you can have an infinite number of aliases which are used as an attack mechanism, so using the Wayne State email instead is recommended. Since C&IT enabled multi-factor authentication on email, phishing has declined from hundreds of thousands to tens. The anti-spam systems block 97% of all inbound connections to send spam messages. In July 2023 there will be more advanced security with another layer of spam and phishing filtering that will allow for more advanced detections such as being warned about a deceptive link.

Edwards (Education) asked whether policies are in place to prevent the university or the state from accessing faculty or academic staff data in the event that laptops are wiped remotely. Thompson confirmed there are policies in place as well as the responsibility agreements

signed by employees to make sure C&IT staff respect the privacy of faculty and staff and research data on campus. Kornbluh pointed out that all computers managed by C&IT are automatically backed up and protected from data loss. Thompson explained if a machine is lost, C&IT is able to secure the data on that machine or delete it and restore all the files. Individuals need not worry about losing data.

Thompson addressed faculty concerns about research computer needs that are different than personal computer needs (i.e., large amount of storage, access to high performance computing grid, required to be attached to another piece of hardware). The Assigned Device Policy does not apply to research machines, but they will need to be secured with device encryption to ensure all the protections are in place to allow C&IT to detect any abnormal activity. McManaway pointed out that these machines need to be secured at a level *greater* than the individually assigned devices. He is working with Sponsored Program Administration within the Division of Research to review contract agreements and advise on compliance because every grant and contract has an information security requirement. As mentioned earlier, the CMMC started with the Department of Defense, but has moved to other government organizations such as the Department of Education and Department of Health.

When asked what campus card access in December 2026 entails (an item on the displayed chart), Thompson said eventually all card access in the main buildings on campus will be replaced with near-field communication (RFID) devices. New One Cards are wireless and can be placed by a reader to open doors (like most hotel key cards). This is a big project with large public safety and finance components. We are moving toward a standard where our phones will be able to identify us: certificates will allow individuals to authenticate with university systems to allow them to use their phones to unlock doors. The security component will allow access if the person is scheduled to be in the room. Technology in classrooms has gone from \$10,000 worth of equipment to upwards of \$80,000, so the physical spaces on campus must be secure.

Beale raised concerns about technology and privacy issues. Several years ago, a member of the academic staff was called in to the internal audit office about the number of times that she had used her campus parking permit in the last four and a half years—that raised a real privacy concern for members of the Academic Senate.

Thompson said there is a committee currently being formed: having other faculty on it would help in addressing privacy issues.

Majumder (CLAS) raised a question about access to key enterprise systems. He currently accesses the Wayne State grid through an automatic system on his laptop and with a multi-factor authentication on his phone and questioned if that will change. McManaway explained that personal, identifiable and sensitive information should not be in the grid system and all research data should be de-identified. A decision has not yet been made, but there will likely be more guidelines and restrictions because of the research component. He welcomed individual discussions to determine the best way to handle the particulars of one's work. He pointed out the research oversight group led by James Wurm (Sr Dir, Academic Research Technology): those are great concerns to bring to that type of committee. Beale added those issues should also be brought to the attention of the Academic Senate Research Committee.

V. PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH PLAN AND Q&A

Board of Governors Chair Mark Gaffney thanked the Senate for inviting him to provide an update on the presidential search. He considered it an honor to have been on the Board for nearly six years; and he has been the chair for nearly one year. Prior to his retirement, he worked more than 30 years for the Michigan labor movement: 12 years as the president of the AFLCIO and the rest of the time he worked for the Teamsters Union.

The Board has been speaking with academic-based professional search firms. There were 14 respondents to the RFP, four are being interviewed and one will be chosen early next week. Gaffney has the difficult job of putting together the search committee who will work with the chosen search firm. The BOG anticipates at least a dozen respondents to be interviewed in person, narrowed down between four and six to be interviewed by the BOG who will make the final decision. The whole process takes about a year and May 1st, 2023, is the target date to have a candidate chosen.

The search committee will be comprised of an Academic Senate representative, an AAUP-AFT representative, four members of the Board of Governors (Mark Gaffney, Marilyn Kelly, Shirley Stancato and Michael Busuito), someone from the Alumni Association and the

Foundation, a Student Senate representative, and probably some deans, administrators, and maybe a few other faculty. The committee must be chosen this month. The goal is for the search committee to begin meeting in October. Discussions and interviews resulting from the preliminary work (process details, the presidential selection criteria, etc.) between the search firm and the search committee, as well as university officials, BOG and search firm will be held in November/December. Advertising will begin in December and the interviewing will take place January through March. The search committee will likely interview up to 12 candidates and choose four to six as finalists to be interviewed by the Board. Gaffney anticipates inviting one or two of the top finalists to campus to meet with various groups of people.

To give voice to the entire campus, four listening events are planned: 1) October 13, co-hosted by the Academic Senate, 2) October 25, co-hosted by the Office for Diversity and Inclusion, the Office for Multicultural Student Engagement, and Wayne State Faculty and Staff Engagement groups, 3) November 10<sup>th</sup>, co-hosted by the Student Senate, and 4) November 15<sup>th</sup>, co-hosted by the Foundation and the Alumni Association (this session may be held via Zoom to allow members of the greater campus community, including donors and alumni, to attend). The listening sessions will help the Board understand what characteristics are desired for the next president. The recorded sessions will also be shared with the search firm.

Dubinsky (Law) voiced his concern about making the listening sessions available to the candidates, pointing out that listening session participants could be restrained knowing one of the candidates will become president. Beale said there will be a form on the Board's search committee website to submit comments anonymously. hoogland was concerned comments submitted through the form could be recognized by the email address. Beale confirmed the forms can maintain anonymity: comments can be submitted under your name or anonymously.

Edwards (Education) asked if there will be an opportunity for the campus community to hear from the candidates. Gaffney said it is possible but will be determined by the candidates' needs and requests for confidentiality in this process.

Calkins raised the concern about how long Wayne State can maintain its R1 university rankings with the current



challenges and recommended the next president understand how important that is and have the ability to maintain that ranking. Gaffney agreed—it's important to the Board, too. They have to know their way around faculty and appreciate the provost and CFO. They must understand how a medical school runs and the problems that can arise there. The Board has been examining the campus enrollments and would like it to be increased to 30,000 over time. It will be a challenge to find someone with the entire skillset: if they're lacking in an area, the Board must be convinced that they know how to go about getting the information and appreciating the people who can help them. Candidates are more complicated than they used to be because we put more expectations on college presidents.

Regarding enrollment, Harr (CLAS) suggested someone who can analyze the marginal return on investing in recruiting that next student beyond our three-county area. Gaffney agreed: three counties comprise 80% of enrollment. Do we spread out regionally? Is Chicago, Toledo or Cleveland fertile ground? We don't know the answers yet, but that is the kind of question the university must consider. Based on the demographics in this country, there will be competition for high school graduates. Our major competitors seem to be Oakland University and Grand Valley. The value of college is different than it used to be, and the Board understands that marketing for new students must be done differently than in the past.

Binienda (Medicine) shared a few suggestions for important characteristics: faculty friendly—in terms of union-friendly and understanding our culture of the union here at Wayne State and in the city of Detroit, and of the importance of community engagement.

Edwards (Medicine) suggested evaluating the candidate's ability to successfully conclude confrontational negotiations without being personal about it. That's something that they've been trying to evaluate, to prove that these people can navigate controversial issues without getting upset about it. The medical school has had multiple confrontations and multiple groups depart. Gaffney spent 37 years working through that sort of thing and suggested it was a personality trait as much as knowledge and experience.

Donahue (Univ. Libraries) stated it is important is to consider somebody who has a proven track record in DEI initiatives. The university is working on some of

these, and most initiatives are specifically geared toward faculty: it would be good to see someone who considers academic staff and non-represented staff. There are many issues related to race on this campus that are not discussed, and it would be awesome to have somebody who is interested in taking on this issue to move it forward in a positive way. Gaffney explained it was no coincidence that one of the listening events is being hosted by Marquita Chamblee (Chief Diversity Officer and Assoc. Provost for Diversity/Inclusion). The Board will be emphasizing DEI from the very beginning of the search. Wayne State has done a lot of good planning and strategizing in DEI and the plan over the next couple of years was laid out by the social justice committee after almost a year of work. More staff is needed to get a DEI plan for each individual school and campus written, completed and implemented. That's a different level of work, and it requires more people and more emphasis.

Salamey (Honors) pointed out that we've never had a woman as president of the university and questioned if any special efforts will be made to reach out to women. Gaffney said the search firms have been finding positions for more women than men in the last couple of years.

Shen (Education) said he was hopeful the next president has a stronger global vision. Often, national ranking is biased but it did hurt us when we tried to recruit students abroad: they do check the ranking of the school and currently our ranking is behind Western Michigan University. Hopefully our next president will increase Wayne State's national ranking and make all of the students and the faculty proud of us again. Gaffney responded that we are working with international students to come here. We might not be able to hit our enrollment goals without emphasizing it.

Barnes was concerned about the format of the listening sessions focused entirely on people being on campus and questioned if the Board is really trying to make them accessible to everyone—we are still in the middle of a pandemic and some people don't feel comfortable being on campus and there is nothing reaching out to those people who are not on campus. There should be a hybrid option, and that is not the case for any of the listening sessions. He agreed completely with Shen's comment on addressing the national rankings. He was also concerned by the comment Gaffney made on enrollment: it sounded like we only compete with smaller universities that aren't R1. Finally, we are seeing more and more technological

fields recognizing the importance of creativity and the arts and humanities being part of the process. While he does feel it's important to look at the research and STEM crisis, we need to remember that we are a university and not a training program: how we can find someone who views the liberal arts as a part of the university and not simply being something like trade school? Gaffney agreed we should be good enough and big enough to be able to do that.

Fitzgibbon asked if the search firms recruit overseas. We've talked about globalization—there's a whole world out there. Gaffney pointed out U of M's search went to Canada: he will check with the search firm.

Lewis (CLAS) was concerned about the ongoing problem with faculty retention. We tend to be a good place to be a junior faculty—at least in the sciences, you get mentored and supported. As soon as you want a little more support or your lab equipment starts dying and you try and get money to replace things, you are told if you want more money, you need to get an external offer. This is a bad strategy for a place that does a good job with junior faculty, because by the time you've got your offer in hand, you're already halfway out the door. Wayne State doesn't have a pool of resources with which to make counteroffers. It would be easier to spend a small amount of money to keep somebody happy before they start looking. There's a major attitude shift needed because without excellent faculty doing outstanding research, we're not going to be an R1 university. She did not think students can be drawn in by claiming to be a competitor of MSU: our chemistry graduate program *is* better than MSU's. We definitely don't want to lower expectations of ourselves. We need to treat people with the respect they deserve and keep good people here. Gaffney said he believes we all recognize the special student body here and the fact that the university serves as the doorway to opportunity for so many people. The Board appreciates that and is seeking a president who appreciates what is special about Wayne State.

## VI. REPORT FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT

Senate President Beale referred to the Policy Committee proceedings, highlighting issues discussed in recent meetings. She apologized to the Senate about the first plenary session this year and how much time was wasted on the logistics of the election. Policy is looking into more efficient ways to conduct future elections.

The Senate's attention was brought to an issue previously discussed. Bartleby Learn is a cheating system promoted by the Barnes and Noble bookstore to our students. This has become a for-profit area for people to invent software systems that can help students cheat to produce assignments. The newest software, EssayPro, allows you to tell the software what field you need an essay written in and the specifics of the assignment, the deadline, and provides a list of potential writers of the essay and you pick the person you want to write the essay. Obviously, our students won't learn when they simply hire somebody to write their assignments for them. It is important for the Senate to encourage faculty to bring this to the attention of students as something they do not want to do because they're essentially paying a high price to cheat themselves out of an education. The Faculty Affairs Committee and Curriculum and Instruction Committee have been charged with creating a brief statement for the Senate to approve and share with all the faculty and academic staff to explain how these kinds of ventures interfere with learning on campus.

There was an extensive discussion about the DFW (Ds, Fs, and Withdrawals) hurdles that students face and our consideration of test-optional and test-informed admittances. Most universities are going to test-optional. We will likely want to do that here, but we must consider what kinds of supports, factual matters, and types of data are needed to create a good process that doesn't bring students in to fail. Beale welcomed commentary on any of that material in the proceedings.

Beale pointed out the fiscal year '23 budget book has been posted to the Office of University Budget's website for those interested in budgetary matters. It provides a look at how our different schools and units are budgeted and the planned expenses. There weren't any major cuts this year because there was anticipation for a certain amount of declining enrollment in the budget that was planned accordingly. But next year, we must do a superb job of recruiting. We need to be responsive in whatever ways we can. It needs to be easy for potential students to get financial aid information, get to offices, talk to faculty, and think about whether this is the place for them.

Lewis shared that she had heard from a colleague in Physics who had been discouraged from efforts they had been making to reach out to local high schools to

improve enrollment because the Admissions Office felt that they were interfering with their efforts. If we're going to help, we need a clear vision on where faculty's input, opinions, and time are wanted and where they are not and what is the actual plan from the relevant administrator—whether it's the dean of the college, the provost's office or admissions—whoever is leading this effort. We don't want to spend time thinking of ideas just to be told that we're interfering with what they're trying to do.

VII. REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

Kornbluh apologized for the discouragement that Lewis mentioned—that's certainly not what we're trying to do. There is work being done to build stronger connections between the central admissions office, which is responsible for recruiting and college-based recruitment. CLAS will have a recruiter embedded in the admissions office to increase communication and try to prevent that kind of thing from happening. There are changes being made in Admissions and Financial Aid that can be reported on at the next Senate meeting.

The transformation of lecturers into assistant, associate, and full professors of teaching is the most important advance of this university that came out of the contract negotiations last year. Professionalization of the teaching faculty is really important for these people's lives and for the success of our students. After the contract negotiation, a 2N committee was formed between the AAUP-AFT Union and the administration to set up the factors to put in place a promotion system for teaching faculty. That 2N committee provided the provost a report, and that report was shared with the Policy Committee for suggestions. Some changes were made, and an agreement was reached. The provost's office has now issued the university factors, so schools/colleges and large departments have been charged to develop their own factors by the end of this year. Next year, for the first time, teaching faculty will be able to go up for promotion from assistant to associate or associate to full. That is in process in each of the units that has promotion factors.

Edwards (Medicine) questioned if this route to promotion applied to people who are more or less trapped at the research associate professor level and are not progressing in their research but instead are doing more teaching—more than average within their department. Will those folks eventually be promoted to

professors based on the quality and extent of teaching? They are very helpful in the sense that it spares the time for the research-active faculty to focus on their research and renew NIH grants.

While these changes only apply to the former lecturers who are now faculty of teaching, Kornbluh explained some of the other pieces around the promotion and tenure process. A 3N committee with administrative, Senate and Union appointees will look broadly at university promotion factors across the different ranks. The provost has two major expectations of that group: 1) we have not uniformly allowed the clinical and research faculty to be promoted, an unfair result that he expects this committee to address by ensuring a promotion process that works as well as it does for tenure-track faculty; and 2) the university is not very well served by people getting stopped at the associate level, especially when they are productive scholars/artists, so he hopes this committee will look at expectations for tenure-track promotions at the university level and how to build a culture by which productive people can continue to move forward to full professor. The Senate president will share the names of this body's representatives on the committee who may be interested in feedback.

There is a major change that will affect undergraduate admissions: the administration plans to move to block tuition next year. Students would pay a fixed amount that covers between 12 and 18 credits. This has been a common move across higher education: Michigan State made this move several years ago and Oakland University did so recently. The move is designed to encourage students to take more credits each year and graduate sooner. It's a core student success strategy: the longer a student takes, the less likely they are to graduate. This saves them money and makes them more likely to graduate. Our current per credit system has perverse financial disincentives to take a full schedule. Far too many students take 10-12 credits per semester, and it takes too long, and eventually life intervenes. He anticipated the BOG Executive Committee will approve this on October 26 and it will go through the Board in December. The part-time rate will go up: the challenge is what to charge part-time students. There cannot be a large price gap between a full block and 11 credits—that will create a perverse incentive not to get a full block. Encouraging students to take more credits that get them to graduation sooner is the goal. We have a number of students who are just taking one class. If tuition is paid by an employer, it doesn't matter if the part-time rate

goes up, since the employer will pay the rate. A system of financial aid has been worked out to help those part-time students who continue to need to take fewer credits. Students who take 15 to 18 credits will be paying less than they would have paid under the old system.

There are many implications for the fall schedule: students will be taking more credits and there will be more bodies in the seats but no more money. It removes the disincentive to add credits to a particular class. For example, everywhere in the country, calculus is taught at four or five credits: we teach it at three credits because our math department didn't want to charge students more to take it. This will make it possible for difficult gateway courses to have a discussion section to add more time and provide more help to students. This requires departments to consider the curriculum—a major should not exceed 120 credits. Moving to block tuition will significantly simplify financial aid and the amount of tuition paid. Financial aid is based upon cost of attendance: if you are registered to take 15 credits you are awarded a financial aid package for 15 credits: if you drop one of those credits, you lose the financial aid money. It's impossible for students to understand their financial aid and for parents to plan under that system. This move will bring us in line with other universities.

Somers (Education) asked if the price point will be set at the 12-credit mark. She explained her personal experience where her son needs five years for an engineering major, spread over 12 or 13 credits a semester. At MSU taking 12-18 credits costs what 15 credits would otherwise have cost. Kornbluh responded that block tuition here will cost out at 14. The goal is to create an incentive to take a full-time schedule. The literature on student success says if you take 15 credits a semester, you're much more likely to graduate and you're much more likely to succeed in college.

Pineau asked when this will be rolled out and if it is only for the incoming freshmen or if could current students choose to participate in this initiative. How will this be communicated so that parents and students understand the process, and will advisors be kept in the loop? Kornbluh confirmed *everyone* will be switched to block tuition in September 2023. There will be many modes of communication: the public presentation will roll out in December, demonstrating how much (more or less) a student pays than they would have paid under this system. Most students will pay less.

Chrisomalis (CLAS) was concerned about an obvious risk: the incentive to take too many credits. A student who may be working 30 or 40 hours should probably not be taking 18 credit hours, but the incentive is cost effective. How are we going to make sure we don't just expect advisers to sort it out? How do we make sure we advise students appropriately so that our students (which work quite a bit more than students at UofM) do not take more than they can handle, impacting our DFW rate?

There will be significant communication to help this work. Kornbluh suggested the research is clear: if we can help students with financial aid, they're better off taking 15 credits than taking 11 credits. The odds of them graduating when they're taking 10 or 11 a semester is poor, and the cost is much more. We're not going to encourage all students to take 18 credits, but this will allow some students to take more credits.

Reevers (EACPHS) pointed out that the mortuary sciences program in the College of Pharmacy and Health Science has a robust part-time student enrollment. This is obviously going to affect them, but the part-time students are in a lock-step program and are guaranteed to take their next class in the next semester through graduation. Will there be any exceptions or help for those types of students in these types of programs? Kornbluh said that has not been raised before, so he will look into that: there is the possibility of credits for programs.

hoogland found it worrisome to force students to take more credits and believed the incentive is having options. She agreed if students could afford to be full-time and not work 40 hours a week, they probably would. It is in their best interest to be a full-time student and dedicate all their time to actual studies, but some students are not in that position. She questioned how the provost will accommodate students who simply can't afford not to work 40 hours a week, and if this will this apply to the graduate level. At this point, Kornbluh said this only being done at the undergraduate level. The discussion on students' best interests will continue.

Harr has seen many students take core courses at Wayne State and Gen Ed courses at a community college. Has anybody determined how that may be affected? Would it encourage them to take all these courses at Wayne State? Do we know if this will actually work or are we just hoping? It wasn't clear this totally removes the incentive. Students are rather clever, sometimes taking



two classes at a community college and two at Wayne State. Kornbluh responded this will remove the incentive to take the three credits at a community college to save money: if they're full-time students here they would basically get that extra course for free.

Henderson questioned if lower-level classes sizes are being increased, is there funding to hire the right people for these discussion classes because they're not inherently built in. This is concerning because current class sizes are big, especially for those lower developmental classes: there may not be enough support to help them pass these classes. Kornbluh thought the departments need to talk to the deans and the provost's office about adding additional support to these important gateway courses: that's part of our strategy moving forward. In general, we are teaching 5% fewer student credit hours this fall than we taught last fall, and we taught 7% fewer credit hours last fall than the fall before. There is room because we've lost students, we've lost student credit hours, but we haven't lost proportionate numbers of faculty so we should have the capacity to teach the extra student credit hours. Many of our classes should have some more students in the classes than currently.

Lewis asked if there was consideration to open up GTA lines to help support those gateway classes with grad students outside of that department (a chemistry or physics grad student could help with a foundational math class). That might be a way to help support some of these departments that bring in research dollars when so much indirect costs go to the medical school instead of back to their home college. It would be a way to increase GTA opportunities while not having to spend as much on hiring math lecturers. Maybe there are creative ways to address those specific course challenges. This is a strategy that CLAS should be talking about.

Kornbluh said faculty will hear much more about this going forward: he thinks students will welcome block tuition. The university has made amazing strides to go from a 26% to 60% graduation rate and this will help us go from a 60% to a 70% graduation rate. The students will graduate sooner but there will be lost revenue, so in some sense it will put more pressure on our core

admissions because students won't be around as long. They'll get the same credits paid for four years that they would have paid for five and six years. It's complicated economically to make that work but he believes this is the best thing for students. This will be discussed further once it's formally approved.

hoogland received an invitation to participate in first-year interest groups (FIGs) from the provost's office and wondered if there is flex-time or compensation attached to that. Faculty is already doing a lot of work that is not paid and she suggested it would be an incentive to offer faculty members some kind of compensation. Kornbluh pointed out FIGs are run by Darryl Gardner (Sr Dir. Academic Student Affairs), but at this point there will be no additional compensation.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

Beale encouraged Senate members to use this time being set aside on the agenda to bring up new business. She pointed out hoogland's comment being a new business issue, bringing up something the Senate hadn't discussed. Let her know if there's something that you've heard concerns about or that you yourself are concerned about that has come up within your unit that you think the Senate as a whole should be thinking about or that one of the committees should be thinking about. This is a good time to use to raise those issues. Many send an email when they have an issue, and that's a good way to do it, too. New business is another place where that kind of thing can be raised if you feel comfortable doing so more publicly. If you help us focus on things that we should be focusing on in the Policy Committee and making sure they get to the standing committees, that would be a big help.

The meeting adjourned at 3:27

Respectfully Submitted,



Linda M. Beale  
President, Academic Senate