

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
ACADEMIC SENATE
PROCEEDINGS OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE

January 25, 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: Monica Brockmeyer, Senior Associate Provost for Student Success

1. Data Updates:

Provost Clabo welcomed Monica Brockmeyer to the meeting to provide updates on student success data requested by the Policy Committee. Brockmeyer reviewed a PowerPoint with data on the GRS compared to Kickstart and Heart of Detroit (HOD). See charts in Appendix. This data is only for this term, with no retention data though Brockmeyer understands that Policy wants to see a breakdown across several years by ethnicity, gender, Kickstart, Apex, HOD showing, when possible entering GPA/ACT data and retention/success rates across terms. Beale reminded Brockmeyer that we also would like to have the information requested on how the university is applying the test-optional 'cognitive skills' information in admitting and placing students in programs.

An initial question regarding retention data to be provided regarded the grades, given the use of P/N for two semesters. Beale asked whether the system retains students' grades when they choose P/N, since having that data would be necessary to fully understand how successful students are and would be useful for advisers. Brockmeyer responded that the data is retained, not a part of students' formal records, and not accessible to advisers. It is only accessible to a group she is establishing called the "strong start group" who will assess the first year coursework to determine where additional tutoring or supplemental instruction is needed. Beale asked whether that group would talk with faculty teaching those courses for which they draw that conclusion, but Brockmeyer responded that her group does not usually reach out to faculty.

Beale asked again why the only group that had access to this information, in order to understand which courses had high P/N levels, would not as a first step talk to faculty to learn something about the nature of the class and the faculty's view of what hurdles the students faced and what supplemental instruction would be useful. Brockmeyer stated that retention and GPA data are considered closely as a strong indicator of how well students are doing. The data pulled (some of which Brockmeyer is sharing with Policy) looks at percentage of credits passed, GPA and the impact of P/N on GPA. She added that this year for the first time the division also will look at data on the 42 largest courses to see if there are any patterns suggesting need for outreach for which additional instruction might be needed. She stated that they had not ever looked at this granular data before (the 42 courses) and that data has not been analyzed yet.

Beale responded that Policy would want to see that data, mentioning Policy's review of data several years ago on courses, looking at the fail/withdraw rate, that showed that math competency wasn't working because of the math placement exam that led many students to take math at community colleges instead, demonstrating a need to address the hurdle problem. Brockmeyer agreed to provide the data when developed by her office.

Brockmeyer discussed her PowerPoint presentation on the September 2020 cohort. The first slide shows that the entering cohort was 52% white, 18% Black, 8% Latinx, 22% Other, with the profile for Kickstart similar. HOD had 12% white, 53% Black, 17% Latinx, and 19% Other. For the incoming class, 62% were female and 38% male but Kickstart had 74% female and 26% male. Differences in outcomes by gender were not significant, but by race/ethnicity were.

Naida Simon asked whether students could be in both programs. Brockmeyer responded that they could, as well as APEX and Warrior VIP (which she did not include in this data).

Beale asked whether the 53% Black students in HOD was proportional to applications or related to some factor about the application other than number of applications. Simon reminded that HOD was given to anyone who met the criteria of either living in Detroit or graduating from a Detroit high school. Brockmeyer wasn't sure how much HOD affected the yield from applications.

Beale noted that we have also asked over at least three years for longitudinal data on APEX and more recently, Warrior VIP: for APEX especially, we would like to see data by ethnicity/gender/GPA for numbers entering the programs, retention from year to year, including after the special APEX support ends. Charles Parrish seconded the question, noting that we would like to see these data for our Black students. Brockmeyer indicated that she would provide that data but did not have it with her at the meeting but that our students have a much bigger race gap rather than gender gap: at other public universities the data seems to show that Black female students perform at a much closer level to white female students.

Brockmeyer moved to the Kickstart slide, showing that the fall cohort was 3013 students, with 643 in Kickstart. Kickstart students attempted 14.9 credits on average, with 67% attempting 15 because of the Kickstart requirement; whereas the overall cohort attempted 14.3 on average, with only 47% attempting 15. For Kickstart, an average of 13.6 credits were passed with a 3.2 average GPA and only 12% with a GPA less than 2.0. Similarly, more of the Kickstart students satisfied the Wayne Experience, Basic Composition, and Quantitative Experience Gen Ed requirements in the fall. Brockmeyer suggested this outcome showed the boost from students being able to take courses in the summer. Beale asked whether the summer course taken by the Kickstart students was included in the chart. Brockmeyer explained that the summer course is not included in the statistics, but students were able to take the remedial English 1010 in the summer and she believes that is why they were more likely to succeed when they took Basic Composition during the fall. Beale noted that it would be helpful to have the information on the course taken during the summer to fully understand the data.

Jane Fitzgibbon asked what classes caused about 12% of the students to finish with a GPA below 2.0. Brockmeyer said she did not know. That is one of the reasons they have asked for the first time for the data on the 42 large courses. They have not looked for those kinds of patterns before.

Brockmeyer noted that her data for HOD compared HOD Black students to GRS Black students and Latinx HOD to Latinx GRS students, without providing the overall HOD data compared to the overall GRS data. She indicated she would provide the additional information after the meeting.

There are 554 Black students in the 3013 GRS cohort, 298 of which came through HOD. The outcomes for the HOD students were slightly lower than for the overall group of Black students (that includes HOD students). HOD does not include any academic support, though many of the

HOD students are in either APEX or working with the Center for Latin American Studies or other program. Ricardo Villarosa asked whether there are any HOD Black students that get no programmatic support, but Brockmeyer did not have data on that at this point.

Black students in HOD attempted 13.6 credits on average (compared to 13.9 on average across all Black students). 29% of Black HOD students attempted 15 credits but passed only 10.1 on average (compared to all Black students, including these students, passing 10.9 on average). Average GPA of Black students in HOD was 2.2, and of Black students generally was 2.4. 39% of HOD Black students had a GPA less than 2.0 (compared to all Black students where 32% had a GPA less than 2.0). Fewer Black students in the HOD program satisfied Wayne Experience, Basic Composition, and Quantitative Experience than the overall Black student group. Retention into the winter term for HOD Black students was 77% and for the overall Black student cohort was 78%.

This data is less useful than seeing the Black HOD cohort against the overall GRS cohort. Beale noted that the data suggests that if we admit students who do not qualify for an existing support program the students may not succeed. That is the perennial issue we have discussed: admitting students who just barely have the credentials doesn't mean they do not need support. That is a problem, because we may be misleading them to think they can succeed without sufficient support. Brockmeyer responded that she has no data on credentials. Detroit students generally have less economic and educational capital than other students but some are honors student. She indicated that she believes we should admit these students, indicate that they will get the support they need, and ensure that they get it. Villarosa noted that although scores identify risk, they do not accurately target all students who are at risk. Brockmeyer added that the VIP program is not funded at a level to support all students who needs it and it is voluntary. Parrish asked how many students are in HOD and in APEX. Brockmeyer did not have that data but said she would provide it.

Beale added that this was exactly the issue that Policy discussed when the HOD program was announced without consultation—that there would likely be students admitted without the support needed, a form of cheating the students. This data on the lack of success suggests that is what happened. Brockmeyer responded that she thought we needed to look at the program as a whole as to how we were meeting the needs of our incoming students. Beale suggested that it would be most interesting to take the GRS cohorts over several years (including numbers by race/ethnicity/gender/ GPA etc.) and look at all of the programs that provide academic support and consider by race/ethnicity/gender/GPA who is in programs and who is not included in programs and track outcomes across multiple years. That is what the data that should help inform us on where the hurdles are to success. If there is a group that is coming in and clearly not succeeding, we need to recognize that and figure out how to address it. Brockmeyer indicated that is the formal evaluation that her group is attempting to build and that based on the questions the group has raised she understands better than she did before the data that we would like to see. Provost Clabo added that the further data suggested here will help us answer the question. It may be that students who get none of the support do better or it may be that we can identify students in a range of factors that do need the support. We need to answer that question. Brockmeyer resisted doing year over year comparisons. Beale urged that the data, even with the Covid crisis, needs to look at multiple years. For example, the issue of particular large classes that are hurdles will be important. If you don't compare multiple years, the data won't be clear enough in showing patterns.

Brockmeyer next presented the Latinx data, noting that it showed similar results for those students in HOD compared to the entire entering Latinx population.

Beale raised an issue that had been discussed earlier—the number of credits that students are taking. She suggested that we should have students take 12 credits their first semester rather than 13-15 credits. Students who are facing a variety of stresses, whether it's poor academic backgrounds or financial stresses or personal/home stresses or all of the above tend to do better when they have fewer courses on which they can concentrate. That is a primary reason why Policy objected to the HOD requirement of 15 credits a semester when it was unveiled.

Parrish asked who has responsibility for thinking about those types of issues in the administration. Brockmeyer answered “everybody”, but Parrish noted that means ultimately “nobody” takes responsibility. Brockmeyer answered that of course she and Darin Ellis share that responsibility, under the Provost. In addition, the deans, chairs and advisors share responsibility.

Brockmeyer said she does not know what is causal and what is correlational. National studies suggest that most students benefit from taking more courses for credits and graduation rates go up. There is an interplay between credits and paying for college, she said, but a student who works cannot take four classes and work full-time. We think HOD funding need-based aid at 15 credits is valuable because it can move students closer to being able to take the credits that they might be academically qualified for but can't afford.

Beale disagreed, noting that such an assumption appears undone by the data provided here, limited as it is, perhaps because students have come from low-income households where they haven't had as many advantages or underperforming high schools. Passing only 10 credits out of 14 and having substantial numbers of the HOD Black students with low GPAs suggests that requiring more credits isn't the best path for HOD students. Simon added that it would be more reasonable to promise enough funding to give the student 30 credits, whether in fall, winter, spring or summer. They could do 12-12-6, which is what Policy suggested when the policy was changed to permit 12 instead of 15 because of Covid. [Note: Policy objected when told HOD students would be allowed to take fewer credits because of the COVID pandemic but would not get the funding to allow them to take the remaining 6 credits over the summer.]

Brockmeyer insisted that there is no way to know that 12 credits would be better. Students, she said, are taking more credits than they did a decade ago. Beale responded that this doesn't answer the question whether that holds for the particular people that we are now admitting under the HOD program. Brockmeyer returned to her statements about finishing college earlier so that debt doesn't pile up being an advantage. Beale noted that the Policy recommendation wouldn't result in debt piling up or time in college slowing down—it would just spread the credits out over the first year in a way that would reduce the up-front stress (funding permitted to be used for 12-12-6 instead of required to be used for 15-15). From this data, she said, and considering the problems of systemic racism and other issues that underrepresented minorities face, it seems that the 15-credit requirement is likely a stressor that creates more problems than it solves.

Brockmeyer “welcomed the chance to have this conversation over time.” Simon suggested she talk to students. She will likely learn that they think they would have had a higher GPA with one fewer course. If a student graduates in four years with a 2.4 GPA, they are not likely to get into graduate school or be able to go into the nursing school. If they reduce their academic year courses and take a summer course, they may get a higher GPA and the only additional cost is the registration fee charged for the summer. If we give them the funding over three semesters or two, their choice, they can take that route if they think it will be more successful for them. Beale agreed, noting the award should be total dollar amount rather than fall-winter credit determined.

Simon added that the time for the extra course makes a big difference. Villarosa agreed, noting that any programming support students get adds to their time, making it hard to do well in more courses. Parrish worried that the data here are still not granular and so almost anecdotal. There is apparently not a single person who is in charge of developing an integrated program to deal with these issues we have raised. Provost Clabo said that the responsibility falls with the student success office. Brockmeyer agreed that she is the one accountable and needs to ensure people get the information they need.

Beale asked that Brockmeyer provide the full data on the various support programs discussed, including APEX and Warrior VIP, across multiple year cohorts with ethnicity, gender, GPA, and test score data. Brockmeyer indicated she understood much better what Policy had been requesting. Beale also asked that Dawn and Monica provide information on how the test-optional information was being used, both for admissions and for considering placement in support programs. Brockmeyer had agreed to provide that some time ago, but Beale has still not received it. Brockmeyer indicated she would talk with Medley and provide that information.

Policy thanked Brockmeyer, who then left the meeting.

2. PC Proceedings January 11, 2021.

Beale noted the highlighted items to check regarding current status. One was the IndustryX Center at engineering, which showed in the Bold Moves documents. This relates to the question on January 11 from the discussion with Tonya Matthews regarding the increasing use of “center” by faculty without apparently going through the process required by the Board of Governors statute on centers and institutes. Sheryl Kubiak was given a temporary, one-year charter, for example, for her “center on behavioral health and justice” and was supposed to come back for full charter approval. The question of centers will be tabled for now, with the idea that the Provost will come back to use with some analysis and data.

Beale noted that we would like to send a condolence note regarding the death noted last meeting but need next of kin information. Simon suggested that we could contact the Dean of the College of Education for that information.

The emeritus issue is also still pending. Provost Clabo thought Faculty Affairs would review the proposal the Policy Committee supported before and bring a recommendation back to Policy. The FAC chair will do so at the next meeting, and Beale will send the materials again to her. Villarosa indicated that the review should also include ESS/tenured academic staff as well. Beale noted that the earlier proposal was a faculty proposal. Simon indicated that the same problem of going through the supervisor existed for ESS. Parrish again noted that he finds it objectionable that the administrative hierarchy should treat this as an administrative decision, where biases enter in. Beale agreed, noting that is why we are asking yet again for this policy to be changed in line with the Senate’s suggestion.

Clabo asked whether the approval of the proceedings could be delayed until next meeting and it was so agreed.

3. Report from the Chair:

- a. The administration decided in December to extend remote instruction until February 1, with the expectation that in February a limited number of courses that were scheduled for face-to-face could resume in person classes. Based on the improvement in positivity rate, the umbrella Restart Committee agreed to go forward with that plan. It will generally be gross

anatomy and clinical skills classes in the med school, chemistry labs, some performing arts classes. It will impact a very small number of sections. An email will go out to the relevant faculty today asking them to recheck their safety plans (social distancing, masks, etc.) and letting them know that all involved faculty, staff and students involved in face-to-face classes will be required to undergo random Covid testing. The public health restart committee will finalize what the sampling will look like. Faculty will be permitted to decide if they do not want to move to face-to-face.

- b. As for a vaccine update, regrettably the campus has no vaccine at this point. None was available last week and will likely not be available this week. The campus allocation was diverted to the TCF center for community-based testing. The hope is to get direct delivery of vaccine rather than through the Detroit health department, which creates delays. Regrettably, there was no national distribution strategy under the Trump administration. The Campus Health Center has been subject to many complaints, but they simply do not have vaccine to use. Beale suggested a concise notice to the campus community about this supply issue. Provost Clabo agreed that the plan is to do a weekly update. Villarosa noted that the resident assistants are asking whether they are considered front-line workers eligible now. Provost Clabo responded they would be 'early 1-C' status, but we are not even up to the 1-B status group yet. People should get their vaccine wherever they are eligible, rather than waiting for the campus to have adequate supply. The campus has been told it will have enough for the entire community, but the question is the timing.
- c. Parrish raised an issue for the Provost's attention. He noted that he had received an interesting document from a faculty member that showed the entire departmental faculty would be ranked on a large number of items—a spreadsheet with an extraordinary amount of data in about 30-40 categories on each faculty member. The spreadsheet is titled WAYNE Servi3.SpaceStem. He noted that collection of this type of data will be a major topic of bargaining.

4. Report from the Senate President:

- a. Ms. Beale noted that she had distributed budget documents from the meeting this morning (in preparation for the Board of Governors meetings on Friday). They are generally self-explanatory.
- b. The enrollment document received this week is not a comparison because of the lack of a comparable report in the prior year.
- c. Beale noted that we have not yet provided the Ombuds committee names to the Provost. She asked each of the committees to provide the names to her so that she can send an official document to the Provost's Office.
- d. Beale provided brief information about the Provost search. There were a series of virtual airport interviews, and the committee as a whole did come up with a list of "semi-finalists" that are being scheduled for campus interviews. Beale noted that she pushed to be sure that the Policy Committee is included, since (incredibly) we were not when the last search for a Provost was conducted. She expects it will be at most 30 minutes on different days.
- e. As for replacing the Senate secretary, the position has had 26 applicants but there has been no time when Beale could work on scheduling interviews, given the secretarial work she is doing for the Senate and the Bold Moves and Provost Search and other demands. She hopes to find a time when those interviews can be set up within the first part of February.

5. 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. There were no other suggestions, so that agenda will be assumed final.

6. Distinguished Service Professor Selection Committee. Beale noted that it is time to select the three Senate representatives to the Distinguished Service Professor Selection Committee. Brad, David and renee served for the last two years. David has retired and so will need to be replaced. Renee is willing to continue, so that we have one of the three at least having prior-year experience on the committee. Brad has stated that he does not want to serve another year as he has already too many committee responsibilities. So we need to find two additional names for Senate appointees. Boris will be the administrator handling this committee. Beale indicated that she thought it was important for the committee to include a person of color since there has been no person of color in the prior two years. The committee agreed to ask Bill Volz, who is a distinguished service professor, and Howard Matthew, a professor in engineering, to serve.
7. Academic Senate Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Committee Proposal: Parrish asked questions indicating that he did not recall the discussion of the DEI proposal at the last meeting and had only seen it in the second distribution for this meeting. Beale reminded him that we had discussed it at the last meeting and agreed that we would need further discussion. The goal is 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 of an administratively appointed committee in which the Senate has only 2 of 41 slots would take much of that jurisdiction away from the Senate on these issues. As agreed at the last meeting, Beale shared the first draft with President Wilson and Associate Provost Marquita Chamblee, indicating that it was quite likely to change with further discussion at Policy.

The members talked extensively about the issues. Parrish thought the suggestion of serving as an advisory committee to Marquita Chamblee on her request should be deleted: she will choose her own advisory committee if she wants one. He considered the proposal too ambitious and thought it would be disregarded by the Administration anyway. Parrish also objected to having her participate when Policy selects representatives, although we do something similar in having Boris Baltes participate when we select the Article XXX committee members.

Beale suggested that Marquita would be the likely administrative liaison to the committee, and it would provide consultation on issues that come before her in the same way that the Budget Committee or Faculty Affairs or Student Affairs committees talk through issues with administrative liaisons. Provost Clabo suggested that the Senate should address Senate issues but questioned whether it was appropriate for it to consider student DEI issues or other staff. Parrish suggested that was an important point but added that the Academic Senate has broad responsibility that does encompass the entire university. He just thinks we should not think of negotiating this with the administration but rather establishing a committee for the Senate. Beale added that is exactly what this is intended to be—a new standing committee of the Senate. Simon agreed, but noted that our current bylaws note that members are only expected to serve on one standing committee, other than those who are on Elections or Policy. We should start out with having people volunteer to serve from each of the committees, and include the regular liaisons (Student Senate, etc.). Villarosa noted that the draft was trying to do two things—address the need for a DEI standing committee that the Senate has not considered til now and address the challenge that the proposed DEI council would bypass the Senate’s jurisdiction in many areas. He agreed with the former but questioned whether the structure and charge was the best way to address the latter issue.

Beale agreed that it makes sense to set this up more like our regular standing committees with liaisons, while starting as quickly as possible with an ad hoc committee. She asked what the members thought about having a liaison from the Coalition of Unions, which is not typical for

other, more educationally focused committees, but which she considers important for ensuring broad perspectives for a DEI committee. Members agreed to include that membership.

The group moved on to discuss the charge. Beale invited members who had not spoken up to share their perspective on the rough draft charge. Renee noted that she does not want to have the DEI issues—which are relevant to each of the standing committees and often talked about at those committees—be treated as ‘separate’ and removed from everything that the other committees do. She does not want the DEI committee to become a box which is the only place that DEI issues are discussed. Beale asked whether it would help resolve that issue if the faculty and academic staff were chosen from each of the other standing committees, to ensure that there is cross-communication with the DEI committee. Simon agreed that would work. Fitzgibbon was concerned that people would not want to serve on two major committees. Roth noted that as a practical matter, we have created a number of special ad hoc subcommittees over the last few years and there are people already serving on them. This may strike members as being more compelling than some of the other projects.

Parrish suggested that the proposal is a negotiation with the administrators whereas when the Senate sets up its own committee, it controls the agenda. Beale stated that it was not intended to be a negotiation but a transparent sharing of information: she wanted the President and Marquita to know that we were developing a proposal that would likely expect the eventual involvement of Marquita. She would need to know what the proposal was and might want to comment on it.

Beale asked members for specific thoughts about what to include in the charge. The draft was put together to spur thought, so it would be helpful to have suggestions about edits. Simon agreed that forming an ad hoc committee for the winter term made sense with the bylaws amendment later to establish the Standing committee (and make any other changes needed to accommodate that).

Villarosa suggested there was no need to have DEI members be also on other committees, since Policy can act as liaison among committees. Beale said that she saw value in what Simon and Hoogland were saying: it is more important in this case for there to be clear communication between the DEI committee and each of the other committees. Villarosa said he meant to agree with having people who serve on DEI represent another standing committee but also wanted to emphasize the need for communication.

Fitzgibbon asked who would chair the DEI committee. Beale responded that the Policy Committee assigns members of committees as chairs in August when it establishes the membership of the committees, trying to ensure appropriate diversity of perspectives. There would be no reason to do this any differently. The members of all the standing committees would be established, and Senate members would be asked to indicate if they are interested in also serving on DEI. Then after establishing the members, the DEI chair would be selected.

Roth agreed with the idea of avoiding keeping the DEI committee separate from the rest of the Senate since the issues cut across all that we do. It is important to have a body that can rise to the challenge of what is occurring now in the Social Justice Action Committee, so that it is clear that we are engaged in the discussion and that whatever comes out of those committees in the area of Senate jurisdiction will need to come to this DEI committee.

Beale agreed, noting that is the discussion she has had with Roy—that those recommendations within Senate jurisdiction should come to the Senate for review rather than his acting on it. She

has had that discussion privately and in the SJAC setting. Since the committee was out of time, Beale asked that members send comments and edits to her so that she can put together a second draft based on this discussion.

8. Future of Higher Education Committee proposal. Beale also asked for people to comment on the proposal for that committee and to provide any further questions that should be included in the proposal. Again, this is clearly directly within the Senate's jurisdiction. If we do not initiate such a process, it will be another administratively run recommendation process. In Beale's discussion with President Wilson, he accepted that this was appropriately within the Senate's jurisdiction.

As approved at the February 1, 2021 Policy Committee meeting