

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
ACADEMIC SENATE
PROCEEDINGS OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE

January 11, 2021

Present: L. Beale; P. Beavers; L. Lauzon Clabo; J. Fitzgibbon; r. hoogland; C. Parrish;
B. Roth; N. Simon; R. Villarosa; Rohan E.V. Kumar

Guests: Dawn Medley, Associate Vice Provost for Enrollment Management; Cathy Kay, Director of Financial Aid; Tonya Matthews, Associate Provost for Workforce Development

1. FAFSA Changes:

Provost Clabo welcomed Dawn Medley and Cathy Kay to the meeting to discuss the FAFSA changes included in the December legislation. Medley indicated that the specifics regarding the changes will not be applicable until 2023, which reflects the fact that students fill out forms in the fall prior to the fall for which the forms apply, using tax information from the year prior to the year in which they fill out the forms. There is also considerable uncertainty due to the change in administration and possibility that some of these changes will not be retained in any regulations developed to carry out the new law. Further, these changes will ultimately require additional funding that is uncertain at this time.

Medley indicated that the proposal will not impact much about processes for students, other than making them easier for students to use. The current process has multiple questions that are difficult to respond to, such as stating the student's "family." A family unit can be hard for a student to determine if they have stepparents or parents that are domestic partners but not officially married. The expectation is that a broader definition of "family" will make this easier for students. Similarly, the FAFSA should be more available. There was a mobile version, but it was not easily used—it was essentially a mobile copy of a really long paper form. Now, they have reduced the number of questions: some students will only have to answer 30 or so questions.

A significant change is in store for the "expected family contribution" (EFC). The determination of that number via a rigid formula created panic for families and students. Many families consider the number undoable, whereas others may see it as no problem. That will be changed to provide a "student aid index" (SAI). The EFC calculation could not go below zero, but the SAI can go to a negative \$1500, meaning that the university could, in that case, award up to \$1500 in excess of the calculated cost of attendance. That will be beneficial for students in the high-need category. There will also be significant changes for other formulas, but none of those are yet available.

In response to a question from Linda Beale regarding how likely it is that this will move forward, Cathy Kay noted that it depends on operational policies. The financial aid officers association NAFSA is talking to the Department of Education to ascertain what changes are likely. Beale asked whether the changes in question are ones that are potentially negative or changes that are correlated with increased costs to the federal government through Pell grant funding. Kay answered that it was likely a combination of both of those factors.

Medley noted that there had been no discussion with financial aid folks as these changes were being developed, so it will be important to see how the applications work for different types of students. One thing to note is that the drug conviction and selective service questions have been removed: drug convictions while receiving federal aid makes a student ineligible for future aid, as does failure to have registered for selective service. It is unclear whether those two changes will remain. It is anticipated that larger Pell Grants will be available, so that families with slightly higher incomes will be eligible for Pell Grants under these rules but it isn't clear that they have considered the budgetary impacts in depth.

One item that Medley indicated concern about is repeal of the limitation on lifetime subsidized loan eligibility. This could be good for students, since there are often students who are close to graduating but cannot take out additional loans for that last semester because of the current lifetime limitation. On the other hand, the for-profit college scandal is related to federal loan funding: many of these schools have almost their entire revenue coming from federal funding to students and they are the ones pushing for complete removal of the limitation, since students who have exhausted their loan eligibility without getting a degree can no longer attend. Beale suggested that the Biden administration might return to the Obama model of restricting such institutions' eligibility for federal loan funds for students. Medley noted that if the lifetime limitation is lifted, it will require financial aid officers to make difficult professional judgments about loan amounts. It would be important to use for students who are enabled by some additional loans to graduate. NAFSA will definitely seek more guidance.

Other changes include regulatory matters. For example, the changes in the law require regular publication of the cost of attendance calculations, with more specificity regarding housing and books than there has been in the past. Again, that is a mixed blessing: some institutions have inflated costs to justify higher grants, while for others it will seem like unnecessary government overreach in setting students' budgets. Beale noted that the provisions were included in the consolidated appropriations bill that passed in late December 2020. The question is what regulations the Department of Education will promulgate under the act. The Biden administration may not develop regulations as friendly to the for-profits as the prior administration would have done, to the extent permissible under the terms of the statute. It could require legislative repeal if there is anything truly problematic in the provisions. That could mean that there might be actual financial impacts from the provisions, depending on what happens, and that the university should be preparing for dealing with these changes. Kay agreed, noting that the office will look through any forthcoming regulations and provide input; in fact, meetings with the other four-year public institutions in Michigan will be this week. Beale asked that the office let Policy know how the extension of Pell Grants to higher income families will impact the university. It seems like balancing the greater needs of those at the lower end of the income scale with aid to those at the higher end may be difficult. Medley responded that in the worst-case scenario there will not be any increases in funding for Pell Grants, but a better scenario would be an expansion of aid so that low-income families with the negative \$1500 SAI could receive more. She reminded Policy that students who get Pell Grant funding bring money into the university, so either way we are not likely to be any worse off than we have been. And there may be opportunities for increases in funding levels for students.

Ricardo Villarosa asked whether there was an underlying motivation from the Trump administration in allowing the negative \$1500 signal meaning that a university can provide more funding, above the cost of attendance. Kay responded that her only concern is that the negative \$1500 would lead students to borrow more above the cost of attendance. It is not necessarily an increase in a Pell Grant, but more likely an increase in debt. It isn't clear yet whether this amount would be satisfied by federal monies or institutional funds. Beale reminded the group of the

discussion of the private for-profit institutions that have existed because of the students' abilities to borrow federally to fund their tuition: that seems a likely rationale for the Trump DOE to remove the lifetime cap on borrowing.

Jane Fitzgibbon asked whether the PC guests had any sense whether the Biden administration will be less friendly towards for-profit colleges. They responded that there will likely be people in the new DOE who were with DOE under Obama, during the period in which they sought data on graduation rates. That heightened level of scrutiny may continue. Beale agreed that accountability would likely be a stronger issue under the Biden education secretary. Medley added that the Biden administration may also take action on the forgiveness of student debt. Beale asked whether some of those loans were for students who attended for-profit colleges that went bankrupt (ITT and Trump University), and Medley confirmed that was so.

2. Stem Innovation Center: The Provost introduced Tonya Matthews to provide an update on the activities of the STEM Innovation Learning Center.

Mathews presented a computer rendering of the building, noting that the idea was to create a “shared interdisciplinary STEM center teaching and learning space by renovating the old Science and Engineering Library.” It’s a solid building, and it is on track for a silver LEED rating. The mandate driving the renovation is undergraduate STEM education and multi-disciplinary STEM, as well as a K-12 engagement mandate that came as part of the support for the building from the state. The building represents roughly \$50 million capital fund expenditure comprised of \$15 million from the state and the rest through the university’s bond funds.

The building includes three core design features for collaborative and project-based learning. Several lead faculty members who will be using the building had NSF grants to explore teaching in such spaces with flexible classrooms suitable for group or individual work. There are also faculty “touchdown rooms” and student collaboration zones with teleconferencing group-work technology. There are 12 lab spaces in the building, both wet and dry. There is a makerspace/hackerspace that includes a large format printer—something desired by both graduate and undergraduate students to prepare posters for research presentations. There is another printing lab and three conference rooms as well, equipped appropriately. The facilities group worked with OTL to create a “one-touch recording studio” to which faculty will have access. The building is also piloting a virtual desktop infrastructure also used by the College of Engineering; this is a web-based browser system that allows faculty to push particular software that faculty need for their students to the students’ devices.

Beale asked whether the studio and the desktop infrastructure served STEM only or also the creative arts like culture, art design, and architecture. Matthews said that it should do so. She has held conversations with folks in theater arts about use of the maker space. Matthews noted that the “STEM Innovation Learning Center” name of the building was chosen before STEAM had been developed, but she is working to invite folks to participate. The kind of core programming in the building will be recruiting faculty for classes and high impact events.

Matthews noted that she has formed a “Hexagon Advisory Council” as a “collaborative group of academic advisors and faculty who make recommendations for classes that could use the kinds of spaces available in the building.” Beale asked how Matthews had formed such a group, since there had been no request to the Senate for members or information about such a Council. Matthews responded that they kept lists of those who came to tours, but she also noted that the Council has not met yet. Beale added that administrators should come to the Senate when they want representatives of the academic staff or faculty to serve on a group.

Matthews added that the K-12 working space in the building will serve for “various managers and coordinators and folks who work with K-12. She wants the building to become a K-12 hub.” Beale noted again a question that she has had from the beginning. Academic programming, even for external areas, is governed by the curriculum and planning processes within schools and colleges. That is, what is taught, to whom it is taught and how it is taught is determined by the faculty of the schools and colleges. When you say that you want the building to be a hub, serving programming, how is this governed? Matthews responded that the building is not creating any new activity: it is just another space on campus where this activity can happen. Faculty may think about creating a new class that wasn’t possible without the space, but the building is not driving that. Beale followed up again with a question about what wanting a “hub” for K-12 meant. Matthews responded that the idea was to create a space where K-12 staff and coordinators could have their programs. Clabo clarified that most of the K-12 activity on campus comes from faculty with grants, such as the C2 pipeline program funded by the Michigan Department of Education grants. The STEM center is a building where that grant work can occur. It is not a question of creating any new curricular offerings.

Matthews added that art and the elephant skeleton are being installed now. There will be lab equipment moved into the hackerspace and makerspace, which is more easily done when the building is not fully occupied. She noted that the building is the virtual host for the Detroit Innovation Convention. In the past, it was held at Henry Ford, but Detroit did not have its own semi-finals. Now, the Center will work with TechTown to launch a virtual entrepreneurship accelerator. Another possibility is the STEAM challenge. Matthews indicated she is also working with the School of Business to connect with their entrepreneurial mindset and see how the data can be developed related to the K-12 activities.

Beale again noted her confusion. It is one thing to talk about renovating the old Science and Engineering Library into a STEM building. But many university pronouncements and the media talk about a “Center” and programming—such as Matthews just mentioned—that will go on in the Center. But a university Center requires a process, a charge, a budget, and approval, five-year reviews—all of those things. Has there been a review of something called a STEM Innovation Learning Center? Has such a Center been created?

Clabo noted that the term “center” was unfortunate, because this is a building and not a center in the chartered sense Beale has questioned. It is a ‘center’ building in the way the Student Center is a ‘center’ building. But the piece around the programming is a different issue. Matthews continued by saying that she was talking about programming for the building. The building is offering a home for K-12 or for faculty or departments to have visiting scholars or retreats. Part of the goal is to allow the space to be available for other programs that faculty or staff are doing. “Some of the programs that we are generating are interdisciplinary. We are creating a conversation to bring folks from the business school and from mechanical engineering together to talk about a program that will become associated with the building.” These are faculty-driven initiatives.

Beale again noted that what Matthews is describing—in terms of actively working to bring faculty groups together to work on interdisciplinary activities is usually what a “center” does, not a building scheduler. It is one thing to control the timing and scheduling of what happens within a building. But Matthews has talked quite a bit about “bringing people together” and “making things happen.” Beale suggested that most of our buildings don’t have a director who meets with faculty to encourage them on developing certain kinds of interdisciplinary projects. Obviously the Student Center building has commercial spaces, so you need somebody ‘running the building’.

Residence halls have to have somebody coordinating and running the building. But those people do not ordinarily talk about *creating* interdisciplinary programming and collaboration. This appears to breach the line and act like an academic center without going through the process for creating one. Beale encouraged others on Policy to speak about this issue.

Villarosa agreed that the line seemed blurry. Managing space and scheduling events in MacGregor or the Student Center is different from “arranging conversations”. None of the managers of those other spaces are actively recruiting faculty to create interdisciplinary programming, as Beale noted.

Beale added that having an advisory council to advise on programming is what centers do, not building schedulers. We spent a lot of money to create a “business innovation center”—about half a million for Matthew Rowling’s endeavor and then there’s Ned Staebler at I2C. Both of those talk about what they are doing in the same way Matthews has spoken here—as bringing people together to collaborate and talk about interdisciplinary activities (STEM mostly but some other things when appropriate, including community). So this looks like three different recent organizations: Ned Staebler’s economic development/TechTown/I2C 10 years; Matthew Rowling’s Business Innovation “Center” 1 year; Tonya Matthews STEM Innovation Learning Center 1 year. This seems quite problematic because it really represents something that is driving and expanding without any real faculty involvement. Ned doesn’t have faculty—it is whatever Ahmad does and somebody else and whatever seems workable at the moment with corporate funders, even if it is with faculty from other universities. Beale was on Ned’s strategic planning committee—it met once and had one other tenured faculty member on it. Everyone else was staff or development or community activists. These issues are important, and the space is important. But we need to ensure that the consultation is taking place that is supposed to take place. It is good to have space so that faculty who have grants for K-12 know that there is space that may serve their needs. It would be appropriate to announce to the entire faculty what kind of space is available in the STEM building and how to apply for its use. But it seems that bringing particular faculty together for particular kinds of conversations around potential programming and interdisciplinary work starts to be something closer to an academic center than Matthews is acknowledging.

The Provost agreed that it is important to have a discussion about what the role of the Provost’s Office should be in this area. She noted that Provost Whitfield believed it was important to have someone help bring people together in connection with the STEM building. She thinks it may be important to draft some explicit language around the building and the development of programming that fits into the building.

Brad Roth noted that there is a range of concerns about these things and faculty having input into these kinds of processes. Regarding this “Hexagon Advisory Council” that Matthews has planned to use to advise on potential interdisciplinary programming, it is important to note that it might be that the identical people that would be recruited by an administrator would be the people that we as the Senate would put forward to occupy these positions. It matters, though, whether faculty think of themselves as being ultimately accountable to an administrator who selected them or to the Senate on whose behalf they are acting. So that is a significant part of our concern here—that we understand faculty participation should be accountable to faculty processes and not simply to people who are there at the pleasure of the administrators who appointed them. Beale noted that Matthews could provide a list of the names received that could be considered in appointing a faculty council to assist her in facilitating discussions among faculty, assuming there is a legitimate way for her to take that role. There should also be a charge to that council that perhaps Matthews could draft and share with Policy. Roth noted that

in the past there had been a Center for national security intelligence studies that involved Engineering: he became involved in the Senate to defeat the Center, which was developing programming and a degree that would equip students to be hired by the CIA. Beale noted that Microsoft and Engineering are apparently engaging in something similar now—Microsoft provides the materials and we provide the students. Charles Parrish added that the idea of a center is that it be at core an intellectual activity that allows the kind of organization that goes beyond the disciplinary department. It's not clear what this SLIC is meant to be, so it seems there needs to be some attempt to define what it is. We all appreciate Matthew's expertise and professionalism, but it just isn't clear what the focus of this activity is. Naida Simon suggested that "hub" should be substituted for "center", for a start. Renee Hoogland added that the problem is that nobody really knows what is going on in the building. Apparently there are the K-12 grant-driven projects. But for every other faculty member, how are we supposed to know what the building has to offer. What is needed is a concerted effort to inform faculty how they might be able to make use of the building. This is a communication problem: no one has informed faculty about what kinds of activities the building can support and how to go about getting permission to use the space. Beale seconded the idea of a need to inform faculty what facilities are in the building and how one goes about asking to use those facilities.

Provost Clabo concluded by noting that it will be important to think about how to describe what the space is, what happens in the space, and how the space can function as an opportunity for cross-disciplinary work. This will come back to Policy with a more careful description after that discussion. In the meantime, Matthews agreed to send her PowerPoint to Beale for Policy's use. [*Note: PowerPoint received and shared separately with Policy.*]

3. PC Proceedings December 14, 2020.

The proceedings were approved with a few corrections to names of individuals and clarification of the interim handling of the Ombuds role by David Straus and Darin Ellis, with student code assistance from Naida Simon.

4. Report from the Chair:

- a. Provost Clabo informed the committee of the death of Professor Shlomo Sawilowsky (College of Education). Policy will send a condolence note when Provost Clabo provides information on next of kin.
- b. Enrollment is looking considerably better at this point. This is likely attributable to outreach to second semester freshmen to get them registered. Undergraduate is down only 0.1% over this time last year and graduate enrollment is down 2.9%. Both are considerably better than expected. Total enrollment is down just under 1%. There is a way to go until census, but this is looking much brighter than at our last meeting. Beale commented that the report showed that the health professions such as medicine, nursing, pharmacy and social work were the saving forces for graduate and professional enrollment. Similarly, the MLS program may have made Law's situation much better than it otherwise would have been. Villarosa asked whether we have information on other in-state competitors. The Provost responded that Oakland is down about 5-6% in undergraduate, MSU is down somewhat, Michigan is flat for undergraduates, but graduate enrollment is down about 3% from international falloff. Central is the only place reporting an increase in enrollment. Beale noted that the additional federal funding would also be a help. Simon thought the P/N grading had helped, and Fitzgibbon noted she had added three additional sections of a key course last week.
- c. Regarding the pandemic, Provost Clabo noted that campus metrics are good this week. The positivity rate is down to 1.65%, but we are seeing a slight uptick in cases. The 10-day

average in cases for Detroit is now 400 cases a day higher than the previous 10 (about 3700 new cases a day). Deaths have also had an uptick. The holiday travel and optimism around the vaccine are likely factors. It will be important to keep social distancing and use of masks a bit longer to control the virus.

- d. The campus community is filled with questions about the vaccine. Some are asking when their sons or daughters will be eligible to get the vaccine, while others are worried that we will mandate it but stating that they simply will not take it. There is also confusion about the two vaccines and whether they are safe. Clabo stated that in her professional experience she is confident that the development was a rigorous process and she will take the vaccine as soon as possible. The biggest problem is that there was no national strategy for distribution of the vaccine from the manufacturer to the people to be vaccinated. There is considerable pushback against the state and the city's process. The university signed an agreement to act as the deputy of the health department in dispensing the vaccine. As a result, the campus will be carefully monitored in the priorities under which the vaccine is administered, starting with 1-A medical students and others in clinical practice exposed to patients. Most young people will have a sore arm, a fever, maybe a headache and be incapacitated for a day, so not all of the medical students can be vaccinated in the same day. The university will move those through in waves. Now the governor has also included over 65, but the campus has been told to stay with the prioritization already given it. When we have the allocation, we will vaccinate the entire campus community. We are getting both Moderna and Pfizer, since we have ultra-cold storage and access at the Campus Health Center and College of Nursing. The campus administered 264 doses in the first two days, from an initial allocation of 1800 doses. Conversation noted that Beaumont had sent an email to almost 100,000 people telling them they were eligible and to make an appointment, but the website crashed, and many people were upset. The campus is also mobilizing medical, nursing, and pharmacy students to work with the health department to administer vaccines in nursing homes and for the homeless at TCF. There is no plan to mandate, but there will be information on the percentage of the campus community that is vaccinated, which will shape individual's considerations about how dangerous it remains. There is a central Michigan registry on vaccination information, to ensure that the information is there on what kind of vaccine each person has received, to ensure that the right kind of vaccine is given in the second dose.

5. Report from the Senate President:

- a. Ms. Beale noted that given the time she would not go through her entire report. She did want to raise the issue about the emeritus proposal the group had discussed last fall. Provost Clabo indicated she thought a proposal would be forthcoming from Policy, while Beale had thought the proposal was essentially the one made earlier—removal of the P&T-like process and simple expectation that anyone with tenure or here at least a certain number of years (perhaps 5 or 10) could be given emeritus status. After discussion, it was agreed that Provost Clabo will await the Faculty Affairs Committee consideration and recommendation to Policy.
- b. Ms. Beale noted that the Distinguished Service call for nominations had gone out but that we have not yet selected anyone for the committee. She asked members if they recall whether we had multiyear terms or whether a new committee was established each year. Perhaps the Provost's Office can review and let us know what number of people need to be selected for that committee. Brad Roth indicated that he had served several years and would prefer not to be re-nominated for service again this year.

6. Academic Senate Agenda for February 3 Meeting: The draft agenda includes the election to fill David Kessel's slot on Policy, the DEI proposal, and the Future of Higher Education proposal. Beale asked for any other suggestions. An appropriate person to invite as guest did not come to mind—either of the two we had last week would not likely serve. The group was satisfied with that agenda, assuming we finalize the two proposals.
7. Academic Senate Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Committee Proposal: The proposal presents a specific charge for the committee and suggested makeup (with alternatives) that would be about 2/3 or 1/2 the size of the DEI Council that Marquita Chamblee discussed with us in December. The goal was to demonstrate that the Academic Senate can handle the issues that are within its jurisdiction on this issue—faculty affairs, instruction, research, student affairs, educational policy, serving as the voice of the faculty and staff on issues before the administration. The Council idea is an administratively appointed committee in which the Senate has only 2 of 41 slots.

Paul Beavers said that this committee is different from all other Senate committees because of the non-Senate members. Beale responded that we have frequently asked non-members to serve on ad hoc Senate committees, and we also do have the possibility of people from outside the Senate serving on standing committees—the Budget Committee invites a non-Senate member to serve as a voting member of that committee under the ByLaws. We also have liaisons and committees expand those depending on the topics they are addressing. This is different in that it provides for a more permanent group of voting non-Senate members of the ad hoc committee, by including non-administrative staff as actual members. Of course, we are intending to convert this ad hoc committee into a permanent committee, and that might be slightly different from the committee we establish at this point.

Naida Simon suggested the committee, if the larger alternative in the draft is selected, would be too big with 31 people. Beale agreed that it would be rather large, even though 10 people smaller than the proposal before SJAC. Brad Roth suggested that cutting against the need for smallness is the need to be able to take in perspectives from a wide range, not only disciplines but also demographics. So while both options are better than 41, he is uncertain which would be best. Beale noted that the addition of staggered terms was partly to ensure that different perspectives are rotating into the committee. And there needs to be care in selecting members to ensure a mix of race/ethnicities, differently abled, LGBTQ as well as academic fields and interests. Our academic staff likely has more underrepresented minorities than our faculty. Fitzgibbon asked whether we could start with a committee of 12 and then grow it beyond to a larger number. Parrish suggested that a committee of 31 or 41 was an invitation to paralysis. Beale asked where to draw the line: too many, and it can't work; too few, and it isn't diverse enough to bring in different perspectives. Also, too small a group will not be able to divide into working groups to do the work that needs to be done, ideally, on different topics. Simon said that staggered terms would work. For the first few meetings, everyone will be learning how the committee can operate.

Beale noted that the SJAC is scheduled to meet the next day so she would like to have something to present to them. The committee agreed that they were comfortable sharing the draft, though noting that we may well make changes before finalizing.

8. Grade Appeals Process: The committee quickly discussed finalizing the Student Code of Conduct revisions committee. The charge drafted by Brad Roth was discussed and the chairs of the committees noted that they had picked the two from each committee to serve. Names will be provided to Beale asap so that the charge can go out. Roth will serve for Student Affairs Committee, and Simon will send the name of the advisor who will serve to Beale.

Given the time, Beale asked the committee members to review the other materials that were on the agenda. We will need to have a full discussion on the 25th so that we can put the two committee proposals on the agenda for the plenary session.

Approved with revisions at Policy Committee meeting of February 1, 2021