

**WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
ACADEMIC SENATE
PROCEEDINGS OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE**

April 5, 2021

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

1. Approval of March 29 Proceedings.

The Proceedings were finalized with corrections suggested by Brad Roth.

2. Student Success Data Presentation:

Monica Brockmeyer, Senior Associate Provost for Student Success, presented some data requested earlier by Policy related to student success and retention. (Brockmeyer's slide presentation and a spreadsheet with additional data were distributed separately to Policy.)

Brockmeyer also provided some information regarding the test-optional "psychosocial/non-cognitive" factors used in application review for the test optional pathway. Her office and Enrollment Management (EM) collaborated last year in developing the process, honing the eight factors developed by William Sedlacek to three so that the review process can be completed in a timely manner. The result is to determine if the applicant has (i) a realistic self-appraisal, (ii) a preference for long-term goals, and (iii) examples of leadership, community activities, and/or knowledge of a field of study. Those factors are considered with the transcript, short essay, and advising staff evaluation. After the admission determination, some students are recommended for an interview for APEX or the VIP program.

Roth explained that the Senate is attempting to understand how decisions are made to assess a student's likely ability to succeed. How does this contribute to EM's scoring for admission decisions, and how are these decisions made? Who is involved in assessing the short essays? Are people with academic expertise reviewing the essays? These are subjective issues rather than quantitative or objective. How is that taken into account in the admissions decision? Brockmeyer explained that Student Success is not a part of the entire admissions review process but has some role at the beginning and conducts a second review in some cases. The area also tracks the number of students admitted. Information about the way the rubrics are applied "is not shared in detail outside of EM."

Brockmeyer explained the admissions timeline, beginning with the recruiting stage (the current point for Fall 2021). The statistics show the rate of acceptances and provide some qualitative understanding of the interviews. Yield and class size will be available at census in the fall. At the end of the first semester, Student Success can review outcomes and how those relate to the admissions scoring.

Beale asked how the process determines which students may need more support to succeed. Brockmeyer responded that there is a number threshold based on the EM determinations for admissions. She confirmed Beale's hypothesis that the factors are transformed into an overall score, but without providing any information on how the weighting is done. For Fall 2020, the university had expected a large number of students would forego the tests under this approach, but that did not happen, perhaps because it was a new process. Brockmeyer considers that the factors used are

grounded in the Sedlacek literature and that students can be appropriately supported through the onboarding process.

Beale objected to Brockmeyer's characterization of the information Policy had requested about how test-optional admissions is being scored as appropriately kept secret within EM: this is educational policy to which Policy must have access. Administrative personnel should not be making that decision without Senate input. We have been asking for data and information on these admissions and outcomes processes for several years, and the data has not been shared. This is just one more item in that list. Note that the scoring process can be shared on a confidential basis to ensure that it would not be made publicly available to either applicants or other universities. Beavers agreed that the rubrics and scoring should be shared. Simon added that Dawn Medley and Ericka Jackson from EM would be coming on the 14th to the Student Affairs Committee to discuss the admissions process. Roth and Beale asked for acceptance and yield rates based on those factors, and Brockmeyer indicated she would notify EM of the requests.

Beale asked how many students were referred by EM to Student Success support programs in the first year of the test-optional use of these psychosocial factors for admissions decisions. Brockmeyer responded that sixty-five were accepted for the Bridge program, though total numbers referred for support were down considerably. The market is changing. For example, Eastern Michigan allows students to self-report scores without validating them, making it hard to predict what will happen in this cycle.

Responding to Parrish's question about the qualifications of the people scoring the psychosocial factors, Brockmeyer stated that the decisions are made by academic staff who are admissions counselors in the Office of Undergraduate Admissions, all of whom have undergraduate degrees. Many also have master's degrees or even doctorates.

Brockmeyer shared some APEX results but these represented only selected retention information and no admission statistics information (i.e., GPA and test score if available) as well as average GPAs of students in these programs both in the programs at Wayne and as they move into regular classes at Wayne, as had been requested by Policy. The data also did not show race, gender, or ethnicity information. Brockmeyer stated that (some) GPA data was in a larger analysis (not shared at this point). There are no graduation rates for Kickstart yet since it is a new program. She indicated she would share academic information soon.

Rossi commented on the big drop between second term and first semester of second year, wondering if there is data on why those students do not return. Brockmeyer said financial concerns weigh heavily as well as other responsibilities. Rossi would like to see the data to be sure it is not due to academics, where there might be an action item that can improve the student's ability to stay.

Beale pointed out that the second-to third-year retention is even more disturbing. The students arrive with a cohort, taking prescribed courses: perhaps support is reduced after that point. Roth added that there is at least an improvement in retention over time and wondered if the Student Success group had identified what helped to improve student retention. Parrish added that the trend did not seem significant. Brockmeyer thought the improvement was due to Jackson's arrival in 2015, boosting staff professionalism and morale. Retention into second year has ranged from 77 to 81 percent for the last decade. Beale mentioned that retention into third year needs to improve. Simon added that the students shown on the graph are not students that would have normally been admitted to the university, and they have severe skill-set deficits. When they take classes in a cohort, they do okay; but when they go into their majors, they have trouble. The APEX program does not give up on the students. Some students are unrealistic, some hit a wall, some don't have

scholarships and only have Pell. These students need the most support, and it has to be more than financial. Beale added that the university likely needs to provide more support once they have declared a major. Clabo commented that we know the variables for success in some majors, such as the health professions; but we may not have this data across the board. The university needs to recognize that these students are not all alike and consider how to help them get into an appropriate major and get appropriate support. Parrish commented that Athletics has done that well, so perhaps the university simply needs more intervention along those lines.

Brockmeyer pointed out that Kickstart's purpose is to increase yield, whereas Heart of Detroit is a financial support program. APEX and VIP are programs that provide academic and navigational support. Beale asked whether Heart of Detroit and Kickstart could be combined into one program, and why we bring students into APEX that we know tend to be less advantaged and less financially stable without providing financial support. Beale suggested that it would be more efficient to market a systematic way to help anyone who needs academic, financial, and/or navigation assistance. Brockmeyer supports collaborative programming, but stated her view that one-stop shopping has benefits.

Beale asked why there was not an exit interview process in place from the onset of each of these programs, since it is critical to evaluate their successes and their failures. Brockmeyer stated that advisors do take notes. Beale suggested that a system is needed to collect data automatically and more comprehensively regarding students who leave the university so that roadblocks can be identified. Brockmeyer welcomed the opportunity to collaborate on such a project.

Rossi asked if the students applied separately to each of the programs. Brockmeyer explained that students are channeled to specific programs by staff. Warrior VIP students get an invitation with their admissions letters, but the program is optional. APEX and VIP students receive the invitation with their admissions letters. Heart of Detroit students are identified by the financial aid office. Rossi recommended making it easier for these individuals by providing a global package, depending on their qualifications. Clabo did not think it fair to group these students together because they represent different audiences with different needs. For example, Heart of Detroit is for all Detroit High Schools, but this does not mean that they are necessarily academically or financially disadvantaged. Kickstart was used as a pilot because those students' first year would be online after an interrupted senior year in high school. The idea was that a single online college course could provide an easier transition to remote college studies. This is not as important for Fall '21, when we are preparing for most classes to be face-to-face.

In discussing the programs, Beale noted that the Senate is most interested in seeing full data about APEX and VIP. We have asked for admission data and semester-to-semester GPAs, credits, and retention rates by cohort, broken down into overall and by gender, race and ethnicity. Brockmeyer said VIP data provided in these materials is only from summer and fall 2020. Extensive outcome data for the first year will be shared, but there are no second-year outcomes for fall. Institutional research will provide more comprehensive official data. Beale again requested that admission GPAs and semester GPAs, race, ethnicity, and gender be included in the outcome data. Brockmeyer agreed that unofficial data could be provided. Like the Senate, she would like to ensure that students are in the right programs and that the decision is equitable with respect to race, ethnicity, and other factors. Fitzgibbon asked if we know race, ethnicity, and gender for students who drop out and whether financial issues related to dropping out are explained to students. Brockmeyer responded that drops are tracked by those factors, but Student Services handles any information on financial impact of dropping out.

3. C&IT Reorganization, Ongoing Planning, and Captioning Policy

a. Consolidation

Rob Thompson, Interim Associate Vice President and Chief Information Officer, explained that the consolidation is going well, as the unit works to provide centralized, consistent, and high-quality support to the campus and academic units. Inventory is underway, as is computer refreshing and hardware. The unit will implement virtual desktop infrastructure for the campus in order to deliver software updates remotely. Adobe, Microsoft project, and others will be deployed to academic units. Since consolidation, the unit has serviced 1200 incidents from academic units, with a 97% satisfaction rating. Service infrastructure is migrating to C&IT, Pharmacy classroom installations are underway, and the Law auditorium hardware is being updated. Another project will be to update faculty and departments doing face-to-face instruction to ensure that they have whatever is needed, such as laptops and headsets.

Beale noted that the Internet Systems Management Committee had been the primary way in which Senate representatives could suggest that C&IT consult on particular developments with the Senate and with faculty. It seems that communicative function has declined, and communication that is sent is often not well designed for the academic (non-tech) audience. For example, Law faculty received an email recently that was very poorly thought through—it assumed that faculty would know what was included in C&IT contractual agreements and provided information about process that was not easily accessible. It is important that C&IT have appropriate consultation—and that the communications that are sent out are reviewed by faculty before sending so that they will not merely be deleted and ignored. Thompson said the governance committee is in place and perhaps requires an increase in faculty participation. C&IT does have a faculty liaison, College of Education Associate Professor (clinical) GERALYN STEVENS, who assisted in the transition from Blackboard to Canvas: she can be asked to review communications to faculty. Thompson asked if there were other ways that this problem could be addressed. Beale suggested making sure that FITZGIBBON, the current representative on ISMC, is aware of communications expected to go out early enough for her to bring that information to Policy for discussion and comment. Providing the agenda for ISMC meetings ahead of time, with a copy to FITZGIBBON and Beale, would also help delineate issues that may raise questions and permit adequate discussion.

Beale also referred to a confusing email from C&IT that appeared to most faculty as a phishing attack. ROTH recalled a major Canvas function change that had been poorly explained. Thompson noted that the Student Senate asked that Canvas be used more for communication and wondered if that would work for faculty as well. Members responded that listservs are preferable for faculty, because most faculty pay attention to their email daily. Beale added that the system should provide for an actual person to send the email so that nameless emails are eliminated, and the language in emails should be more carefully considered. Command structure does not sit well with faculty: the emails should be more polite, informative, and personable to be effective. ROTH explained that the anti-phishing emails had various features of actual phishing attempts. Thompson indicated that the C&IT team is endeavoring to make sure that this does not happen again.

b. Captioning and Transcribing

Beale explained that she had received complaints about restraints on ability to do question and answer sessions in a virtual open house because of the lack of captioning and transcription services. She asked Thompson to explain the new federal requirements and how the university

is handling them. Thompson introduced Krystal Tosch, Web Accessibility Coordinator, who is the expert for the WCAG 2.0 standard adopted 2 years ago. The good news is that automatic real-time captioning will be available via Zoom soon, and TEAMS has already released its version of the option.

Tosch explained that public-facing events must have live captioning. The university has contracted with a captioning vendor, and RSVPs now include an accommodation form so that departments can be proactive. Beale asked if there is special software used for special events, and Tosch responded that Student Disability Services should be involved so that live captioning can be scheduled for current students. Beale asked how captioning is provided for outside guests or prospective students. At this point, TEAMS provides an option, and Zoom will soon. Rossi mentioned that her Zoom lectures produce a transcript, but the technical term translations were poor quality. Tosch explained that the Zoom transcript is not live, so the host can edit the text if needed. Roth mentioned that he had participated in a CLAS open house event that was held on a platform that no one understood because, he was told, Zoom could not be used for the event because there was no live captioning. Beale suggested that C&IT should prepare a flier on conducting open houses that clearly states the captioning policy and what software can be used. Thompson indicated he will work on developing such a document.

Parrish asked whether the issues of concern regarding Mac users in the Art Department have been addressed. Thompson is working with the dean to train the support team. Parrish suggested that Thompson speak with Danielle Aubert, and Beale suggested that he also talk with Judith Moldenhauer, a professor of Art in Graphic Design and one of the Senate representatives on the Academic Restart committee. Thompson agreed to do so.

4. Report from the Chair:

Provost Clabo announced that the President will be moving most campus activities to remote. The campus itself remains relatively safe: the positivity rate last week was 2.02% and the number of cases has fallen from the high of 48 a week ago. Nevertheless, when the City of Detroit hits a 15% positivity rate, the metrics indicate that we must depopulate the campus. On Saturday the 7-day rolling average in Detroit was 16.1%, and today that 7-day average is 17%. Conditions are changing but going in the wrong direction. The announcement tomorrow will require the campus to move to remote effective Wednesday except for the health professions, students in clinical rotation, and those personnel determined to be essential workers. If metrics improve in 10 days, the campus will move back to limited on-campus operations; otherwise, the period of largely remote activities will be extended. The Student Center is closed except for vaccine clinics, and the fitness center is closed except for COVID testing. Libraries will remain open to accommodate students who need a place to study. Villarosa added that there was a communication from a dean's office that was misleading in suggesting how much campus activity would remain. Clabo explained that the dean's message would be clarified, since the exception from the suspension is for on-campus research laboratories.

As for vaccine mandates, Clabo said this is a discussion at the Public Health Restart Committee. Beale has received questions from faculty regarding the requirement and their ability to communicate their requirements for students in the classroom. Clabo discussed issues under consideration. Legal scholars differ on whether a vaccine that is under emergency use authorization without full FDA approval can be mandated. Some argue that the vaccinations are no longer experimental because millions of people have received them and there is now solid data. Various universities have announced decisions to mandate, such as Rutgers and Cornell (for students and not faculty and staff). They are avoiding HR issues by not including

faculty or staff. Beale suggested that the university could use the same type of mandate used for the flu vaccine, with various categories of exceptions. Clabo thought the significant difference between the flu and COVID viruses required further consideration, but insisted that the university would continue to follow science. If the university decides to mandate vaccination, it will need to do so fairly soon.

Parrish asked what contingencies will need to be considered if there is a large student population that is not vaccinated. Clabo responded that metrics will be published for in-person gatherings and meetings, and classes will likely follow similar principles. This is not about singling out students, faculty, and staff that are not vaccinated but about achieving a suitable number of vaccinated personnel. Parrish expects there will be evolving surprises so plans to use Zoom in the fall.

Simon noted that even if faculty are vaccinated they may be worried about carrying the virus home to family if exposed to many unvaccinated colleagues and students. A vaccination passport might help address those issues, but Clabo noted the legal issues associated with the vaccination passport. This experience is “building the plane as we fly it.” The Director of the CDC has stated that vaccinated individuals do not transmit the virus. The university cannot ask faculty to be health professionals. Rossi mentioned that the vaccine will protect you 95% of the time, but 5% may get it. If so, then the person is 100% sick. That’s why it is so important to wear masks and wash hands frequently. Many health professionals have declined the vaccination already, so it would be difficult to mandate in the university setting. The medical school is in some ways insulated from any shut-down/open-up cycle. Rossi’s classes have been recorded for 20 years, and students did not show up even when there was not a pandemic. But she suggests that more thought needs to be given to the idea of cycles of opening and closing as it relates to faculty. The cycle may continue past this semester. Clabo suggested the local projections are worst in the next 2 weeks. An opening in the vaccine pipeline may put us in a better position later. Parrish thought teaching face-to-face is nonetheless a risk.

5. Academic Senate Plenary Agenda for April 7.

President Wilson was invited to the meeting and replied merely “thanks.” While Beale assumes he intends to participate, she will have to follow up to get a definitive response.

6. Strategic Planning Steering Committee Senate Representatives.

Beale noted that Wilson had asked the Senate to name only two representatives to the Strategic Planning Steering Committee. She noted that the projected membership provided by Wilson includes various deans and members of the President’s cabinet, with Provost Laurie Clabo and Michael Wright as co-chairs. Wilson is apparently appointing Associate Professor Paul Kilgore (Pharmacy) and Professor Walter Edwards (Humanities Center) as his selected faculty to serve, in accordance with his claim that he has a right to appoint at least as many faculty as selected by the Academic Senate to any university committee. The group agreed to ask the Senate President and Academic Staff member Marisa Henderson to serve. Beale asked Clabo if there was a written charge yet and Clabo said that she doubts it.

7. Standing Committee Higher Education Topics.

Beale asked if the liaisons and chairs have selected topics and started developing working groups for the higher education issues. Rossi has selected four topics and asked her committee to break into working groups around those topics. The committee will finalize the groups on

April 22. hoogland has groups selected with members: Elizabeth Stoycheff, Poonam Arya, and Marisa Henderson on one, and renee, Thomas Pedroni and Daniel Golodner on the other.

The group discussed overlapping of the topics. hoogland thinks that there will be overlapping but different perspectives. Roth suggested that item 4 be broken into multiple items. Rossi mentioned that there will be a process for reviewing the overlap after the individual committee reports come to Policy. Fitzgibbon and FSST will work on topics related to facilities but noted that it was hard to get participation. Beale suggested sending the selected topics and asking each member to pick a topic with which they are willing to participate over the summer. Beale asked Rossi to send to the committee a copy of how her group is handling this issue. It would also be helpful if each chair would create a document with the topics selected and the members of the working groups, so that all are aware of that information. Fitzgibbon requested that Beale address this in her President's Report at the Senate plenary session.

Approved via email on April 28, 2021