

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

ACADEMIC SENATE

PROCEEDINGS OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE

March 4, 2019

Present: L. Beale; P. Beavers; V. Dallas; r. hoogland; D. Kessel; C. Parrish; B. Roth; N. Simon; W. Volz; K. Whitfield; A. Wisniewski

Guests: Darin Ellis, Associate Provost for Academic Programs and Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness; Ahmad Ezzeddine, Associate Vice President for Educational Outreach and International Programs and Senior Associate to the President for Special Initiatives; Monica Brockmeyer, Senior Associate Provost for Student Success

The item marked with an asterisk constitutes the Action of March 4, 2019.

1. Graduate Enrollment Data: Ms. Beale mentioned that there are inconsistencies in how the Graduate Admissions Office counts the students who have completed applications. At the Graduate Council it was reported that 16 students had filed completed applications to the LL.M. program in the Law School when only 2 had actually filed required transcripts and paid the application fee (and were admitted by the Law School). She added that the requirement that law LL.M. students go through the Graduate School application process deters applicants, since other law schools handle the applications directly from LSAC. Mr. Ellis said that the Data Governance Committee is working on that issue to ensure that we have accurate information.
2. Spring/Summer Enrollment and Enrollment at Extension Centers: Mr. Ellis noted that we now have a more holistic undergraduate admissions process. The enrollment data for Spring/Summer nonetheless continues to show lower enrollments than last year, with significant declines in some schools. Much of the decline is due to fewer continuing students (which could be drop-outs, grads, or more students deciding to work full time in summer). The Policy Committee is interested in the enrollment trends for the spring/summer term, for particular courses and sections, and whether enrollment varies among the schools. Members noted that they would particularly like to understand enrollment at the extension centers: enrollment throughout the day and the schools that offer courses at the centers. Mr. Ellis noted that over the last three years total enrollment for the spring/summer term, which includes the spring term, the spring/summer term, and the summer term, is up .5% and up 1.3% in credit hours. This includes all programs, all campuses, online courses, and in-person classes. The University is continuing to offer a 30% discount for spring/summer classes for students who meet certain criteria. It appears to Mr. Ellis that we could accommodate more students in the spring/summer term.

Mr. Ezzeddine said that his office targets Wayne's students and guest students with mailings and direct online advertising to enroll in the spring/summer term. About 150 students register as guest students. Advisors also encourage students to take summer classes. During the academic year, the extension centers offer 500 classes

and in the spring/summer term about 1,000. In the spring/summer term the median enrollment for lecture classes is 17. In the Schools of Business and Social Work enrollment is between 20 and 25. In Engineering it is about 10. In the last three years the number of freshmen and sophomores who take more courses increased 4% and the number of juniors and seniors who take more courses has increased .2%. The trend in juniors and seniors taking lower division courses in the summer is down 6%.

Ms. Dallas mentioned that students could take courses at a community college in the summer and transfer them to WSU. There was some disagreement whether students who have merit scholarships could transfer credits. [After the meeting, Provost Whitfield notified the committee that credits students transferred would count toward the scholarship requirement.]

Policy Committee asked to see the number of courses that are offered in the spring/summer term at the different levels, 100 level, 200 level, etc. [After the meeting, Mr. Ellis provided a comprehensive spreadsheet showing courses by school and campus.]

Ms. Beale asked Mr. Ezzeddine and Mr. Ellis if they knew of any needs that were not being met in the extension programs or in the summer programs. Mr. Ezzeddine was not aware of any, but said they probably could offer more programs at the centers. They are trying to identify areas of need tied to student progress. For example, it would be helpful to offer the second course in a series for students who took the first course at an extension center. Ms. Dallas asked who was responsible for promoting programs at extension centers. Mr. Ezzeddine said that some departments prepare the materials but his office also works with departments that ask for their assistance.

Ms. Beale asked how many students were affected by the moratorium on the math competency requirement from fall 2016 through spring/summer 2018. Mr. Ellis said that the suspension of the requirement affected only a few of our programs but did not have specific numbers.

Mr. Volz said that the Budget Planning Council had discussed incorporating the spring/summer term into the normal budget cycle. If there were a richer array of courses available people might think about the academic year as being 12 months long. He asked if there were structural constraints that would always make the spring/summer term small. Mr. Ellis said that with the compressed schedule and longer class periods it is difficult for students to take two courses and not be on campus four days a week. If we had year-round cohort programs and structured financial aid to support programs it would be feasible. Mr. Ezzeddine added that another challenge is the faculty's nine-month contracts and how each college schedules their faculty to teach. Mr. Parrish said that the colleges generally will not pay faculty to teach in the summer.

Ms. Beale asked Mr. Ezzeddine for the enrollment at the extension centers and the types of courses offered.

[Mr. Ellis and Mr. Ezzeddine left the meeting. Senior Associate Provost Brockmeyer joined the meeting.

3. Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program (UROP): Ms. Brockmeyer explained that she and Matthew Orr, program coordinator for the UROP, reviewed the program and concluded that it was serving academically successful students rather than a broad spectrum of undergraduate students. When the UROP was established it was administered by the Honors College with funding from the Provost's Office. The intent was that all students could participate, but primarily honors students benefited from the awards. Ms. Brockmeyer and Matthew Orr concluded that there were undergraduate students who should be provided research opportunities in ways not possible through UROP's award mechanism. Ms. Brockmeyer's office therefore sent out an announcement that undergraduate research would no longer be directly funded through the existing UROP mechanism and instead would be operated as a "partnership" with the McNair Scholars Program and other research experiences for undergraduates (REU) programs.

Ms. Brockmeyer claimed that the new mechanism would have a greater impact on students and on the mission of student success. National research supports the idea that access to undergraduate research is important and may be an effective way to close educational disparities. Undergraduate research has therefore been "broadened" with the expectation that it will reach more first-generation low-income students. This reflects Ms. Brockmeyer's sense of priorities for student success. Even though our overall graduation rate has increased, racial disparities continue. Ms. Brockmeyer noted that the primary principle for organizing our activities for student success focus on reducing racial disparities. The money for UROP was therefore moved to the McNair Scholarship Program because that program has been successful in working with first-generation students: eligibility for the new research program is slightly broader than the McNair Scholars program is, because McNair Scholars must be both first-generation and low-income students, but it is nonetheless targeted towards that population of students.

Ms. Beale indicated her concern that there had been **no consultation whatsoever** on this change, which is a clear shift in educational policy. Ms. Brockmeyer said that she did not think this was educational policy since it was the design of an academic program. Ms. Beale noted her surprise that Ms. Brockmeyer did not understand that academic program changes are clearly educational policy changes. She suggested that any time Ms. Brockmeyer was considering a new proposal, it would be helpful to share it with the Academic Senate President, who could let her know if it would be appropriate to bring the proposal to Policy or other Academic Senate committees for discussion. Ms. Beale also asked Ms. Brockmeyer whether she had discussed the change with current faculty who have students with UROP funding or with the Honors College Dean. Ms. Brockmeyer responded that she had not discussed it with those groups but had presented it briefly to the deans as a way to expand the population of students who engage in undergraduate research. The deans supported the idea and value of expanding undergraduate research but expressed a need for increased funding to support a broader effort. All the deans indicated their willingness to include it in their development and fundraising in the

future. Ms. Beale noted that this is clearly something deans should support, but does not provide justification for shifting the entire funding for a successful program that has benefitted some of our top students in moving on to graduate research programs to a program dedicated to a very different set of students who also merit support.

Ms. Brockmeyer noted that Bianca Suarez, Ph.D., directs the McNair program. She developed a proposal for ways the McNair program (funded by the Department of Education) could increase the impact of benefits of undergraduate research. One goal is to narrow/close the gap in graduation rates by attracting students to do research and to use that opportunity to help those students graduate. Under the guidance and restrictions of the Department of Education schools can only provide awards to low-income first year students and students with disabilities. Ms. Brockmeyer noted that Wayne has many students who are like those described but who don't meet all the criteria: the new program will take funds currently used for UROP to provide internal funding for that expanded group of generally low-income students (\$50,000 for student research support and the remaining funding from UROP for connection software, a campus conference, travel to the national conference, and undergraduate travel awards).

Ms. Beale asked what criteria would be used to distribute the funds that the Provost supplied to the McNair-partnership program for undergraduate research. Ms. Brockmeyer said the money would cover the needs of students who did not meet the criteria for the McNair scholarship. They could be low-income students or first generation students but not necessarily both. It also would be used for a sophomore research experience.

Several Policy Committee members noted that this information was not included in the announcement, and neither faculty nor students were given adequate information about the "new" undergraduate research program. The announcement about the changes in the UROP did not provide adequate information on any aspects of the change or provide adequate rationale for the change. Moreover, the lack of consultation with faculty or with any of the relevant Academic Senate committees (Policy, as well as Faculty Affairs, Student Affairs, Curriculum and Instruction, and Budget) means that this was a unilateral, administrative decision that did not take into account any input about the success of UROP or the harm that would be caused by such a radical change in the students eligible for the funding support. Ms. Beale asked whether this program was firmly in place or whether there was still opportunity for input, and the Provost indicated there was still opportunity for input.

Policy Committee members asked for a detailed description of the scope of the planned new program and how it differs from the past program, the procedures for faculty, eligibility requirements for students and the deadline for applications, whether the changes would have a negative impact on another group of students and how that impact would be mitigated. Ms. Beale pointed out that some faculty who were involved in the UROP might not have seen the general announcement. It should have been directed to the faculty who have worked with students in the past. Members asked to see the budget for the program, comparing last year's budget

with the budget for the revised program. They also asked for information about the number of students that had participated in the program in the past and their majors.

There was lengthy discussion about the problems with this change—in particular, the idea that the *University was shifting the entire funding from a program that had been very successful in providing substantial research opportunities to interested students who excelled in their academic studies in order to fund an entirely different research opportunity for students who are in danger of not graduating.*

Mr. Roth expressed concern that the entire focus of the revised program is on students who are in danger of not graduating by being involved in a research-related project to address disparity issues. The UROP has focused on students who are excelling and doing a project over and above what is required in a course. The university needs to have programs that make it worthwhile for these achieving students to be here when they could be admitted to a much more competitive institution. Students with whom he has worked have been high-achieving students who may not have been able to participate in such a program for lack of money.

Ms. Beale said that the new program is probably a good idea and may make a difference for the targeted group of low-income and/or first-generation students, but in creating it, a program that has been very successful targeted towards high-achieving students is being destroyed. It is problematic to make that drastic change without any consultation with academic governance and apparently *without considering the harm caused to the students who had benefited from UROP previously.*

Ms. Brockmeyer responded that it was her belief and understanding that she was hired to increase the graduation rate of those students who have had trouble succeeding and to help close racial disparities on campus. She described her role as allocating resources toward that end rather than to reward students who will graduate anyway. She stated that this change is intended to help students graduate who otherwise might not. Ms. Beale noted that this seemed to be a very limited view of the role of a student success administrator—to serve one group even if at a cost of eliminating a program important for another group. Ms. Brockmeyer agreed that it is her job to retain and support students at every level, but she believes that it is her top priority to use resources as effectively as possible to increase our graduation rate.

Policy members expressed their strong concern that while the new program may serve a need, it may negatively affect our retention of high-achieving students. Supporting high-achieving students is an important function of an urban research university. If we cannot offer high quality research opportunities to our best students we will fail as an academic institution. Ms. Brockmeyer responded there are many examples of research universities that have the highest Carnegie ranking that have broad support for undergraduate research distributed through the university, raised from donors. She suggested that the deans could create and fund programs for excelling students. Ms. Beale noted that Ms. Brockmeyer's statement disregards the context here, in which our financial aid funds have been shifted to focus on need

rather than merit, and that even programs that provide challenging opportunities for students who excel—like the Honors College and UROP—are being downsized (Honors College number of students and number of credits required and courses created) or eliminated (UROP replaced by a McNair-targeted version). Deans' fundraising focuses on many college-specific needs—it is unlikely that they will adequately fill the gap created by the change in UROP. Donor funding might be a way to support undergraduate research programs, but that is a long-term initiative and cannot affect the program in the fall 2019 term or even likely in the next few years.

The money to support the revised undergraduate research is General Fund money. Ms. Simon noted that Michigan's constitution and state law prohibit using gender, ethnicity, and sexual orientation to determine how funds are spent. Ms. Brockmeyer replied that those factors would not be used. Distribution will be to low-income and first-generation students. The state constitution does not prevent creating a program to close racial disparities: it prevents the university from explicitly allocating resources according to those criteria.

Ms. Beale suggested that Ms. Brockmeyer consult with several of the faculty, such as Christine Chow and Brad Roth, who have worked with high-achieving students funded by UROP and then prepare a more thorough proposal describing the change she is proposing for a further discussion with Policy, answering the many questions raised in this discussion. Ms. Brockmeyer agreed to do so.

Ms. Brockmeyer will also review the activities designed to improve student success to see if there are other programs that should be brought to the Policy Committee for discussion. Ms. Beale said that any time a program affects academics it is within the purview of the Senate.

[Ms. Brockmeyer left the meeting.]

4. Report from the Chair:

- a. Provost Whitfield reported on the enrollment in the Honors College. The number of honors students has increased this year; 375 have accepted our offer. The Honors College does not have the personnel to provide the attention they should have. Many students who matriculate into the honors program transfer out before they graduate. The profiles of this year's entering students have improved. We do not have enough faculty to offer the smaller classes and the attention that other universities provide. Changes may have to be made in the allocation of funds to support the students. Mr. Parrish said department chairs need to offer more honors courses. Mr. Roth commented on the earlier discussion about the UROP. He believes that, in discussing the UROP, it is important not to focus on the Honors College. Some high-achieving students happen to be in the Honors College; many are not. The revamped program does not focus on high-achieving students. It is an important program and needs to be funded, but it is very different from a program that makes the general experience of high-achieving students commensurate with the kind of opportunities they would have

at other institutions that are seen as more prestigious. Making those opportunities available is one of our distinctive elements.

- b. The capital projects steering committee is discussing the possibility of placing State Hall at the top of the list of needed projects, to seek some State support (along with bond funding) for complete renovation. The Provost wants many people to have input into the planning and the funding. There will be more discussion at Policy as this project moves forward.
- c. The recommendations of the Pay Gap Committee will be discussed with the Senate's Budget Committee and with the AAUP-AFT.
- d. The candidates for the dean of the College of Education are visiting campus.

5. Report of the Senate President:

- a. Ms. Beale reported that the membership of the search committee for the Vice President of Health Affairs and Dean of the School of Medicine has been announced. Ms. Beale serves on the committee. She noted that there is concern that, in correspondence between President Wilson and Mr. Parrish, the President quoted the letter of intent between Henry Ford Health System and Wayne State University that no one else has seen. She hopes that the search process will be more transparent.
- b. The hearings of the Budget Planning Council with the deans of the colleges and the vice presidents of administrative units will be completed in March.
- c. The University Foundation Board met last week. The foundation received a sufficient return on investment to make the 4.5% payment out of the endowment but the managers of the investment say that the amount paid out should not be increased this year.
- d. Ms. Beale made a report to the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Assembly about the activities of the Academic Senate.
- e. Philip Cunningham, Associate Vice President for Research Compliance, met with the Research Committee about research misconduct. Mr. Kessel and Ms. Beale will continue to work on the issue of suggesting changes to our research misconduct procedure.

*6. Proceedings of the Policy Committee: The Committee approved the Proceedings of its meeting of February 18, 2019.

7. Microsoft Partnership: Ms. Beale attended the meeting with the Microsoft program personnel and interested university staff and faculty. The faculty attending were primarily faculty in the College of Engineering who indicated an interest in using the online materials as supplements to their traditional courses but were not planning merely to adopt the entire set of materials as an online component. The main value of having the partnership, from the faculty perspective, was that Microsoft will provide some additional measurement components to faculty to see how their students are doing. It is not clear how long the "free" use of the modules will last, since the purpose of this for Microsoft is to gain information to facilitate further commercialization.

8. Faculty to Discuss Classroom Renovations: Policy Committee selected faculty with whom the administration of Facilities Planning and Management could consult

about the renovation of classrooms, in particular in regard to the potential renovation of State Hall. They are Richard Pineau, Mathematics; CLAS, Fred Pearson, Political Science, CLAS; Adrienne Jankens, English, CLAS; Sue Fino, Political Science, CLAS; Alisa Moldavanova, Political Science, CLAS; and renee hoogland, Professor, English, CLAS.

9. Search Committee for the Associate Vice President for Facilities Planning and Management: Policy Committee selected Rayman Mohamed, Chair and Associate Professor of Urban Studies and Planning, CLAS, and Robert Reynolds, Professor of Computer Science, CLAS, and Chair of the Senate's Facilities, Support Services and Technology Committee, to serve on the search committee.

10. National Survey on Student Engagement: Ms. Simon told the members that there are two surveys of student engagement: the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSEE) and the FSEE (Faculty Survey of Student Engagement). The NSEE has two core objectives. The first is to refocus the national discourse about college quality on teaching and learning. The second is to provide colleges and universities with diagnostic actionable information that can inform efforts to improve the quality of undergraduate education. In 2016 the student response rate in the NSEE was 21% of all freshmen and seniors, the two groups who are surveyed. Faculty had a 36% completion rate. Faculty are defined as anyone who taught at least two classes in the fall semester. Currently the student participation rate is 2.6%, which doesn't provide enough data. The survey was sent to about 3,000 students. The student survey is available from February 14 to May 1. The faculty survey will be conducted from March 26 to May 1. Ms. Simon is on the implementation committee. That committee is asking that the Provost send a letter to students and faculty to ask them to complete the survey. Ms. Simon contacted the President of the Student Senate, Stuart Baum, asking them to send an email to students. The implementation committee is trying to get a list of the students and their majors so they can ask advisors to reach out to students. The survey has been out for many years. Indiana University compiles the data, which was used in our recent accreditation. The Office of Testing, Evaluation and Research Services is asking that an announcement be made at the Senate meeting to complete the faculty survey. Ms. Beale will plan to mention this at the April Senate meeting.

11. Pay Gap Analysis: Mr. Beavers is a member of the Pay Gap Committee that has outlined a plan to address issues revealed in the analysis of the 2016-2017 faculty salary data. He discussed some of the challenges in analyzing the data and getting information to the colleges and departments. The committee is discussing how to make equity adjustments. The Pay Gap Committee's effort is to generate discussions that will lead to alterations.

Ms. Beale said that this is an area in which the unit salary committees should play a strong role. Members should always examine whether an anomaly exists and, if so, consider what the basis for the anomaly may be. Is it based on gender or under-represented minority status, or is it based on a significant period of lower production when it was reasonable that no salary increase was awarded for research or teaching? Although the salary committee may not be able to rectify the inequality,

they should be aware if one exists and make appropriate recommendations to the unit head.

12. Reports from Committee Chairs:

- a. Mr. Roth reported that the Dean of Students and the Conduct Officer met with the Curriculum and Instruction Committee about academic issues related to the Student Code of Conduct. They will continue the discussion at their next meeting.
- b. The Student Affairs Committee will have a tour of the new dorm on March 27. Ms. Simon invited the Policy Committee to join the SAC.

Approved as submitted at the Policy Committee meeting of March 25, 2019