

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
ACADEMIC SENATE

PROCEEDINGS OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE
January 9, 2023

Present: D. Aubert; L. Beale; r. hoogland; P. Khosla; J. Lewis; N. Rossi; B. Roth; S. Schrag; N. Simon

Absent with Notice: M. Kornbluh

Guest: Boris Baltes (AVP)

I. APPROVAL OF PC PROCEEDINGS

The proceedings of the December 12, 2022 Policy Committee meeting were approved with revisions.

Pramod Khosla noted he wasn't here for the December 12th Policy meeting, but was at the 3N P&T Factors Committee meeting the next day. He reported that the 3N committee decided not to include the ethics statement and would incorporate the suggestions made by Policy. The next committee meeting will be held on January 20th and will determine the next plan of action for this semester.

II. REPORT FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT

Presidential Leadership Profile: Linda Beale shared what is likely the final draft of the presidential search booklet the Presidential Search Committee hopes to post next week (admittedly rather late for a presidential search). The first draft was worrisome for its limited coverage of academic issues: only three schools were mentioned (Medicine, Pharmacy and Nursing) and it did not even indicate a preference for a Ph.D. and tenure-eligible candidate. The Board accepted most of Beale's suggested edits. If there is anything factual that anyone notices that should be changed, Beale suggested members let her or Danielle Aubert know.

Remote Operations Policy: The announcement that went out to employees on December 13th had odd language in it:

After a decision is announced, faculty will receive follow-up communications from C&IT and the Office for Teaching and Learning (OTL) with detailed instructions and resources for the transition to remote teaching and learning.

The idea that an announcement by 6 pm would allow C&IT and OTL to instruct faculty on how to teach remotely shows a lack of insight into what teaching is all about.

Two-factor Authentication Change: The two-factor authentication update scheduled for January 3rd has been postponed to January 14th because of issues in the roll-out.

Academic Integrity Module Announcement: Beale had requested the announcement be sent out mid-December to the faculty listserv, but it has not yet been sent out through the Office of the Provost. She will follow up on the status of the announcement.

Vice President for Development and Alumni Affairs Announcement: An announcement was made on December 19th that David Ripple will begin a three-year contract as Vice President for

Development and Alumni Affairs on February 1st, in spite of Policy's recommendation for an interim appointment.

Code of Business Ethics and Conduct: The Code of Business Ethics and Conduct (10.14) has been posted on the Administrative Policy and Procedures Manual website. The Policy Committee's edits were included.

Sponsored Program Administration (SPA) Deadline: Tim Stemmler (VPR) plans to send out an announcement about enforcing the SPA deadline because they simply do not have the staff to handle last minute submissions. He is working with the deans to inform faculty that they must satisfy the deadline of three days before the grant due date or their grant proposal may not go forward.

Learning Community (LC) Proposal Process: New learning community proposals are due on January 20th. The LC website provides detailed instructions and LC Pitch meetings will be hosted in late January and early February.

Life Insurance Imputed Income Correction: Human Resources sent out an announcement about an error in the taxable life insurance posted incorrectly as a payroll deduction instead of a federal tax benefit. Adjustments will be made on the January 18th paycheck.

Aubert noted the salary report normally available in the fall has still not been received. The Union put in the request for the report before September 2nd and received an email yesterday stating HR is re-running the numbers.

ChatGPT: ChatGPT is an advanced AI chatbot that functions to mimic a human conversationalist. This is a part of the academic integrity issue. Beale asked if Policy should make a statement to share with faculty to put on their syllabi. renee hoogland presumed students will use it if they want to, regardless of what faculty say about it. Faculty members can point out that students are not learning anything if they use this, but any statement will likely be meaningless. It is not that different from a student buying an essay online. Aubert noted, however, that failure of faculty to comment on the new chatbot function would perhaps mean that students would not recognize this as plagiarism. Beale agreed: silence condones. She thinks there should be a statement that the use of ChatGPT to create responses to assignments is inappropriate. Jennifer Lewis noted that such software systems will continue to proliferate, so Policy cannot respond to each new program that shows up on the market. A statement could be made about the value of creating your own work and an argument for why that matters.

Khosla noted several articles in the *New York Times* suggesting education simply must adapt to these functions with alternate ways of testing, evaluating and assessment. Beale disagreed, noting that students learn to recognize what they know and do not know by attempting to write articulately about a matter: if they let a robot do the work, they will not learn. We need to determine how to say that to students in a way that helps them understand the harm they do to themselves by taking these shortcuts. Brad Roth believes there's more to rationality than cost benefit calculation and emphasizes with his students that integrity and maintenance of trust are the most important things. Students set themselves up for future failure when they take these kinds of shortcuts: eventually, they will be consistent fraudsters like George Santos. Roth considers himself to be in a relationship with each of his students and makes it clear to them that lying (and plagiarizing) crosses the line.

Khosla recalled an experiment a few years ago to help students realize how they suffer if somebody else cheats. For example, they elect three people in the class at the beginning of the semester, and any cheating is reported to those students who decide the punishment. Beale pointed out that most universities in the past used student judicial boards to hold hearings on student misconduct (academic and non-academic) issues, but those were phased out as people raised due process concerns. They tended to work well because it was student peers making the decisions. She suggested putting this topic on the agenda for a later meeting and inviting the Student Senate leaders to Policy to talk about it.

III. CENTER FOR GENDER AND SEXUALITY CHARTER DISCUSSION

Baltes joined Policy for a preliminary discussion of the draft proposal for a Center for Gender and Sexuality (CGS). He noted that the idea was to expand the Gender, Sexuality, and Women's Studies program within CLAS by adding a related center, parallel to CLLAS (Center for Latino/a and Latin American Studies). He has been working with Simone Chess (Director, Women's Study Program) to gather letters of support and other materials in preparation for the CIAC-I committee review. Chess drafted the proposal and has discussed it with the provost. Hoogland has been part of an advisory group that worked on the proposal over the Christmas break. The provost hopes to get the Center onto the Senate's agenda quickly in order to start the center in the fall.

The academic program is in CLAS, with the program director under the dean and the curriculum and funding going through the dean. The center expands the program. Beale noted her strong support for expansion to a center and the importance of bringing cross-disciplinary faculty into research and engagement activities. Nonetheless, she noted a concern regarding how curriculum is developed in the university. The proposal states that the center will develop a curriculum and offer courses, including development of a graduate certificate to be offered by the center. She asked for clarification on that issue, since normally we consider curricular issues to be under a school/college and its faculty (e.g., in CLAS the faculty assembly and the faculty council have to vote in favor of curricular issues in order to put them in place). It seems problematic if establishment of a center shortchanges that process and allows development of curriculum and degree programs outside the normal channels of faculty oversight. There is also some lack of clarity about the director: the dean of CLAS appoints the director of the program, but the director of the center is appointed by the provost and reports to the provost. It seems that the materials should make clear that the provost and CLAS dean co-appoint a director who serves both the program and the center.

Hoogland suggested the procedure is not dissimilar from cross listing courses, and there can be joint appointments. Naida Simon pointed out that Latino Studies is a center under the provost and offers a minor. Beale reiterated that her concern is with a 'center' offering a minor that doesn't go through a regular school/college faculty review process. It is clear that there has been this kind of function for Latino studies, but it is not clear whether that is an appropriate way for curricular issues to develop. How is there assurance that the academic program and the center are working appropriately when it comes to courses, certificates and GTAs? Where is the policy authority that permits curricular development and courses and certificate or other academic programming for credit to be offered within a center rather than under a school?

Lewis concurred that having a center such as this seems a positive development. It would strengthen the work of the program with more time and fund more positions. Beale's concern is a process concern. She agrees that there should be a clear statement that curriculum decisions ultimately reside in the Gender, Sexual and Women's Studies program under CLAS.

hoogland assumed it to be a center that actually expands, solidifies and strengthens what the program is already doing. The different structure requires formalizing how these things are done. The center is different than a school/college unit, institutionally speaking, but it is not expected that this center would operate differently from the program. Beale believes the way it is stated is unclear and could be a process issue with concerns about faculty authority over curriculum the way the proposal is currently stated.

hoogland agreed the proposal should be specific and formalized in such a way that future conflicts might be avoided. She has worked in the Institute for Gender and Sexuality Studies for 15 years, where all the faculty are full-time employees and appointed within their disciplines, but every school and unit approved their participation in the center so people would develop their own courses from a feminist perspective, within the School of Medicine or the history department, and they would be teaching those classes anyway. There are ways of doing this without necessarily turning this into an institutional concern. Beale explained the reason this is being discussed now is to catch those kinds of issues before they are settled and hard to change. The former provost just made CLLAS a center without any consultation whatsoever, so there was no chance to raise these issues or even, for most of us, any awareness that the issues existed.

The proposal states the center will be managed by a director appointed by the provost, and unless otherwise designated, the director will also direct the academic programs in Gender, Sexuality and Women's Study through CLAS and will report to the Dean of CLAS on that. Beale thought it would be clearer if it said a director of the program and the center would be jointly appointed by the provost and the dean of CLAS.

The budget is problematic because it only gives the bottom line for the personnel and a bottom line for other items, and is unclear how much money is being committed long term. It should be more specific. If the proposal comes back to Policy from CIAC-I, Beale would expect it to indicate the number of faculty fellows and GTAs that are expected to be supported annually during each of the first five charter years.

Lewis noted the university's current resource scarcity problem and commented that this proposal appears to include a significant number of new personnel that is somewhat surprising for an academic program that already has active affiliated faculty. hoogland responded that this was deliberately ambitious: the program has lingered in a corner and Chess worked to make it more visible. Too often, the university treats DEI as relevant only to race and does not include gender and sexuality. This center would put a central focus on other forms of differentiation, identity and multiplicity.

Beale followed up on the budget concern. If the center starts out its first year (when it will not have been able to hire all the expected new personnel) at \$315,000, it will likely be at \$1.5M or more within five years because of hiring faculty, increasing the number of fellowships and doing more conferences. The question is how do we afford that increase for this program? This will be a reallocation from somewhere else. With enrollment declines continuing and expected 5% budget cuts for the next fiscal year (if needed cuts taken across the board) and President Wilson arguing for a new School of Public Health that would also cost millions more, can we actually afford the commitment that this entails?

Lewis thought it would be helpful to emphasize in the proposal that this is part of the university's DEI commitment. Beale agreed, but that comment brought to mind another concern she noted in reviewing the proposal. The proposal suggests that the center create yet another "coordinating

council” with representatives from key university groups that do DEI work (the university-wide DEI Council, as well as the various student, college and department DEI councils—but strangely with no mention of the Senate DEI committee). It includes a policy and advocacy committee to track and respond to current events and legislative changes related to gender and sexuality—that’s what the Senate DEI Committee and the university DEI Council are supposed to do. This duplication of functions creates the work that we say is overwhelming faculty: having so many meetings to go to on the same topics and coordinating among them. It is important to coordinate, and yet we’re asking people to serve on multiple groups with overlapping membership and overlapping charges. It seems we should find a better way to do that, which should be the function of the two university wide groups—the DEI Council (with more than 40 members) and the Academic Senate’s DEI Committee (with representation from across the university’s faculty and academic staff).

IV. ARTICLE XXX REPLACEMENT: FACULTY PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE SELECTION

Policy members selected a new representative from CFPCA for the Faculty Promotion and Tenure Committee to replace the current CFPCA representative who is no longer able to serve.

V. ACADEMIC SENATE PLENARY AGENDA DRAFT FOR 2/1/23

Beale requested Policy members’ help with planning the next plenary agenda. She is considering inviting BOG member Marilyn Kelly to speak to further the tradition of having a BOG member at least four of the eight plenary sessions. It would also provide an opportunity for Senate members to comment to Kelly about the importance of stressing the understanding of the academic enterprise in the presidential search process.

Beale will also invite Hasan Elahi (Dean, CFPCA). She will try to arrange a time for him to meet with Policy and also invite him to speak at the plenary. The goal is to have a dean speak at each plenary session, rotating through the full list of deans.

Roth suggested inviting General Counsel Michael Poterala to introduce himself to the Senate.

Khosla recommended inviting Tommy Martin (Assoc. Dir., EOO) to talk about what the Equal Opportunity Office does. A lot of faculty, if they’ve been suddenly called up they’ll obviously want an AAUP rep, don’t know the process and it will be good because it will put them at ease in advance. Martin gave a presentation at the Student Affairs Committee that was very helpful.

VI. COMMENCEMENT CONCERNS

Beale shared an email from Steve Chrisomalis (CLAS) about the December commencement ceremony. Apparently CLAS did ask for at least one faculty rep from each department to participate in the ceremony, but they were sitting somewhere out of view. The provost indicated to Beale that he wants to establish a commencement committee with Senate representation.

Beale is concerned when watching graduates in stiletto heels stumble on those steep stairs. At the most recent ceremony, there was a student in a wheelchair who had to be helped up and then down again. They need to have ramps. Noreen Rossi pointed out that the ramps should not have perforations. Lewis noted that she had a student who is disabled and would not attend because it would be humiliating.

Aubert was glad to see this email because it's a self-reinforcing thing. She used to go in the past but was so far away from her students that they didn't even know she was there. Rossi thinks it's sad when doctoral students' advisors don't show up.

hoogland commented that she did not want to head into a crowd on a Saturday morning and did not understand why she would be expected to do that on a weekend day. Because it is a part of their job, why can't they organize these things on a day faculty actually do work?

Beale noted all the information on the Board of Governors and a picture of the president with a full-page statement, but they never show even a bio of the faculty speakers. Lewis believes the comments ought to be more about the students and less about the faculty. Students don't feel honored in the way they are treated. This year her students didn't get clear directions about where to get an honors stole.

Beale will follow up with the provost about a commencement committee comprised of faculty (one from each of the schools) and students.

VII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEE LIAISONS

Rossi reported that the Research Committee will be meeting with the General Counsel on February 15.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

Roth provided an update on what has been happening with the Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program (UROP) subcommittee that reviews UROP applications. The committee became dysfunctional this year, in part because some of the people who were members of the Senate that were on the committee are no longer members of the Senate. Matt Orr (Program Coord-UG Research, Acad. College Enrich. Servs.) is the key person and is eager to work with faculty on vetting the applications for UROP grants. Patricia McCormick (CFPCA), who was the chair of the subcommittee, found herself with no help because either members of the subcommittee were no longer on the Senate or they did not respond to Doodle polls, so they ended up reaching out to other faculty members.

Beale thought it would make sense to appoint a committee each year when Policy does the other committees (Article XXX, GEOC, etc.). Members do not have to be Senate representatives, though it would be ideal if most were. At least six members should be chosen from different areas for staggered two-year terms. We should discuss with Darin Ellis and Kelly Dormer how to set up a functioning committee for the next applications, the deadline for which is usually in March.