WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
ACADEMIC SENATE
PROCEEDINGS OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE
September 16, 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: Stephen Bowers, Interim Associate Dean, Library System; Mike Hawthorne, Director of Library Resource and Collection Strategy Services in the Library System; Loraleigh Keashly, Associate Dean, Fine, Performing and Communication Arts

The item marked with an asterisk constitutes the Action of September 16, 2019.

1. **Unbundling of Journals**: Mr. Hawthorne explained the work the Library is doing to unbundle the journals the university buys from Elsevier. Elsevier publishes about 3,200 titles and claims around a quarter of our acquisitions budget. In the 1990s when bundling of journals started, libraries thought it was a great idea. They could have access to the titles they were currently purchasing plus digital content they hadn’t had previously. As more societies added more titles to the packages, the costs increased exponentially to the point where we receive many open access titles that we do not use: more cost with little added value. Elsevier has a content fee that is a tax on the market value of the journal price. It ranges from 15% to 25%. The company makes about a 35% profit margin. The library’s costs for journals increase every year but they receive the same resources. Some journals cost between $6,000 to $10,000 per year. Year over year there were increases of 4% to 6% for 3-year or 5-year contracts. The total Science Direct budget is now about $2.4 million. That locks up a significant amount of library resources. As new research fields open or there are new avenues of growth, we cannot make changes until each contract expires.

   The “Science Direct Big Deal” is a separate package from others in the overall Elsevier bundle, and the contract for that ends at the end of 2019. It is a stand-alone product costing about 23% of the total Elsevier package. The libraries intend to stop paying for the Science Direct Big Deal, though they will continue to subscribe to $1 million to $1.25 million of individual titles “a la carte” that are currently included as a part of the Big Deal. When there is money in the budget because the libraries have not had to make as many one-time purchases as budgeted, the funds will be used to purchase back files.

   Ms. Beale urged the library staff to be sure to meet with each of the school/college/department faculty liaisons and committees to get input on decisions. Mr. Bowers agreed that this is important and said that the library staff will be scheduling meetings over the next month or so to talk with faculty liaisons and committees in the schools and colleges about the journals they need. The library hopes to have met with all the departmental library committees by mid-October. Mr. Bowers said that the library expects to retain individual titles. They are working out how to make decisions about which titles to keep, including the ones that are important to one person. They have data on what is being used though the data is not always reliable. They will talk to the Senate and to the department committees to work with the faculty to identify the titles that are needed. They will show the data to the faculty and also talk about the titles
individuals use. They will retain high usage titles but they want to have money to buy the single titles that are important to individuals.

Ms. Beale asked how, when the journals are unbundled, scholars would get a journal in a timely manner if they were the only ones using it. The libraries will retain indexing so materials can be discovered and will shift to a delivery model so they can meet the research needs of individual faculty members by purchasing materials that are not in bundles or in individual subscriptions. The delivery model will be mostly electronic. Some resources are only in print so that would be in print. Shifting the purchasing model will give much more flexibility to be able to deliver specific materials that aren’t in the bundles. If an article costs money, it is easiest to request the materials from the library because the library will not have to pay the list price. There are partnerships to facilitate getting resources to faculty. In many cases, they can get resources from other institutions within 24 hours, sometimes within a few hours, delivered to faculty. Faculty can go to the library website to search the index and request the material or they can work with their liaison librarian. Indexing, i.e., finding the article, is critical. Our discovery platform has indices with about one billion articles and 900 different formats. The library has partnerships with institutions in other countries from which they can get materials electronically in a quick timeframe. Mr. Kessel noted that he also frequently requests copies of papers directly from the authors and likewise researchers request them from him.

Even if the library no longer has access to the bundled Elsevier Big Deal, they can order articles separately. The library is trying to switch its paradigm from “just in case” someone needs an article to “just in time.” Dean Cawthorne has made partnerships with institutions throughout the nation. They want faculty to find what they need. The library will be able to invest in new services. It has not had the money to do that in the past. They want the flexibility to purchase electronic copies, videos, books, journals, and monographs.

Mr. Hawthorne explained how articles are filled through a consortium of libraries in Michigan, with the majority of requests filled within one day. In addition, Rapid ILL is an international research-sharing consortium of 350 libraries from Europe to Taiwan. Their turn-around time is 12.5 hours on average with a 97% fill-rate. The Greater Western Library Alliance is a consortium of 39 academic institutions mainly west of the Mississippi. Many of the University of California libraries are part of the alliance. They fill a lot of our requests. The Hathi Trust Digital Library is a consortium of 150 libraries that has access to a lot of out-of-copyright resources and some in-copyright resources. It is located in Ann Arbor.

The library had considered the possibility of colleges covering some of the costs of journals that are used by their faculty, but the framework of libraries is not to charge specific departments for specific items but to support the overall mission of the university. It was agreed that Dean Cawthorne, Mr. Bowers, and Mr. Hawthorne would present this information to the Senate on October 2 to help provide notice to the schools and colleges about the need for input from faculty liaisons and library committees.

[Mr. Bowers and Mr. Hawthorne left the meeting. Associate Dean Keashly joined the meeting.]

2. **Childcare:** Ms. Keashly, who chairs the Daycare Implementation Committee, updated Policy Committee on progress to provide childcare for students, staff, and faculty.
The university launched a childcare resource website on August 9. The university had arranged a partnership with Rainbow Child Care Centers, but it has been purchased by KinderCare Child Care Centers. The new owner does not have the same approach as Rainbow and its policies are more costly. For example, KinderCare would charge the university $5,000 to have a waitlist and $12,000 to support the possibility of a limited tuition discount. Rainbow was flexible because it was small and wanted to form a relationship with the university. KinderCare is a large company and has many partnerships. KinderCare has a proprietary curriculum, so it does not use the same curriculum as the university’s two centers (the Merrill Palmer Skillman Institute and the College of Education). KinderCare said they would think about providing drop-in care, but at this point it is not a possibility. Nevertheless, several parents who work or take classes at the university are using KinderCare.

The AAUP-AFT is interested in including a childcare benefit in the upcoming contract negotiations, and the implementation committee will explore other options, including if there are ways to create financial offsets. Another consideration is the university’s policies regarding flexible work arrangements: although some employees can participate in flexible work, the policies apply only to certain classifications.

Infant care was one of the items requested by university personnel. Most infant care is home based, which can be certified by the state. The University of Michigan has partnerships with home-based caregivers and offers them professional development opportunities and small equipment grants, so that may be a possibility here. Infant care is difficult at large centers, because the state requires one crib per infant. Accordingly, most commercial childcare centers do not provide partial infant care.

The university would like to provide childcare in a campus facility, for which the master plan considered several possible locations. Ms. Keashly mentioned that the university has a “children in the workplace” policy 3.0.13 (located here https://policies.wayne.edu/appm/3-0-13-children-in-the-workplace). It indicates that “the workplace is typically not an appropriate place for children of employees” other than for brief visits or specific events, with prior approval. It does not apply to students bringing their children to class.

There is a network of options for childcare in the city on the website. There is the Wayne State University Early Childhood Consortium, which used to be known as Woodward Corridor Childcare and is a grant-funded program. Professional development is offered by the university. At this time, Ms. Keashly said, the Daycare Implementation Committee would like people to think about the options for childcare. They want to expand and find other possibilities.

[Ms. Keashly left the meeting.]

Mr. Beavers noted that the Children in the Workplace policy was effective 6/21/17, but it had not been discussed with the Policy Committee. Its next review is due 5/22/21. Policy Committee members emphasized that the university should share drafts of such proposed university policies with the Policy Committee prior to their being finalized.

3. Report from the Chair:
   a. Provost Whitfield has continued to develop the idea of having a faculty lounge and believes that Ghafari Hall may provide a suitable place. The Provost thought the lounge might be the
equivalent of a coffee shop with light food available rather than a full restaurant. It appears that the cost to rent the space would be reasonable. Members discussed the idea of a faculty facility and most agreed it would be a nice amenity.

b. Provost Whitfield discouraged Policy Committee from proceeding with the motions made at the September 11 Senate meeting to censure members of the administration for academic freedom violations. President Wilson wants to address each of the issues and the people who are named in the motions to censure. Typically, he said, censure is done when there is a recurring problem that is not addressed. He believes both incidents will be addressed with the individuals, but the Senate will not gain anything from approving the motions. He suggested that the people who are named should be able to communicate in response prior to any vote. He also suggested that Policy should delay action to see if the President addresses the issues sufficiently.

Ms. Beale noted that the motions were properly made and seconded at the last meeting and so would come before the Senate for discussion and decision at the October 2 meeting. Ms. Simon said that she had made the motions because she did not think the letter sent by the President in response to his meeting with the committee was sufficient. “University Policy 00-1, Acceptable use of information technology resources” should be revised, and she appreciated that the President agreed to that need. However, she believes that the President should have issued a public statement noting the overstep in the deletion of the whistleblowing email and cautioning administrators to protect academic freedom. Further, administrators, including those who instituted the gag order, should be told that gag orders are unacceptable and they are not to do that again. Ideally, that would be again a public pronouncement concerning the importance of academic freedom.

Provost Whitfield said that there have been and will be conversations with the administrators who made the decisions. Ms. Beale added that she, too, would like a communication sent to the deans and chairs about the importance of academic freedom, saying that issuing a gag order and content-based censorship of emails are inappropriate. The President’s letter seemed dismissive of the incidents, treating them too lightly and excusing those involved. Mr. Roth said it was very important to insist on an appropriate approach with respect to these policies going forward. He understood that those who issued the gag order may have had good intentions given the tensions in the department, but nonetheless it needs to be clear that it was wrong, a violation of academic freedom, and should never have been done. Furthermore, he found it unnerving that the chief information officer would respond affirmatively to a request to delete a whistleblowing email in the circumstances under which that occurred, given the lengthy discussions about privacy concerns and reassurances from administrative officers regarding our email accounts. He was opposed to softening the language in that motion. Policy Committee members talked about the history behind the issuing of University Policy 00-1 and discussion that occurred about email. The Provost said that going forward the administration would modify the criteria and judgment rule. Any previous discussion would be helpful. Mr. Parrish commented that discussion on these issues would be over if President Wilson had issued a clear statement against the actions the administrators took. The statement he made was tepid.

4. Report from the Senate President:
   a. Ms. Beale said that the Foundation Board met last week. Although the investments earned about 10% interest, we were generally somewhat below benchmarks for the categories. The
managers indicated that they were shifting the allocations among assets to the Foundation’s goals slowly. They discussed recession risk and the desirability of shifting from equity (greater risk) to fixed income (lower risk) assets. Their recession-risk model predicts the degree of risk for 6, 12 and 18 months out. At six months, the model shows a relatively low 30% risk of recession, so they are not yet recommending shifting to higher cash and fixed income holdings. The university doesn’t have a large endowment or investment portfolio.

b. The search for the Vice President for Health Affairs and Dean of the Medical School is moving forward. A time for airport interviews has been set aside, and the search committee will be meeting to select interviewees soon.

*5. Approval of Proceedings: Policy Committee approved the correction to item 3.b. Academic Freedom Posting of Notices in the Proceedings of its meeting of June 17, 2019, as had been mentioned at the September 11 full Senate meeting.

6. Centers and Institutes Advisory Committee-I: Policy Committee reviewed the faculty they had nominated for the CIAC-I. They selected additional nominees.

7. Centers and Institutes Advisory Committee-II: Policy Committee will meet on September 23 with Vice President for Research Stephen Lanier to discuss the appointment of faculty by OVPR and the Academic Senate Policy Committee to CIAC II. The goal is to have the committee members have staggered terms, so that it will not be necessary to seek out numerous faculty each year for these committees. Under the BOG statute, Policy Committee and the Vice President each nominate six persons for the committee and consult on confirmation of members and the chair.

*8. Election of the Parliamentarian: Policy Committee elected Stephen Calkins to serve as Parliamentarian for the 2019-2020 academic year. The Academic Senate will be asked to confirm the action at the October 2 Senate meeting.

*9. Election of the Vice Chair: Policy Committee elected renee hoogland to serve as Vice Chair for the 2019-2020 academic year. The Academic Senate will be asked to confirm the action at the October 2 Senate meeting.

10. Liaison Assignments: The Policy Committee members selected their liaison assignments on the Senate committees.

11. Search Committee for the Vice President for Finance and Business Operations: William Decatur is retiring from the university. President Wilson asked Policy Committee to nominate faculty to serve on the search committee. The names of four faculty were submitted.

12. Board of Governors: Policy Committee commented on some of the items on the agendas for the Board of Governors committee meetings. The administration submitted a revision to the Bachelor of General Studies program to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board. The Board approved the establishment of the program on June 21, but the Academic Affairs committee members agreed to revise it when they learned that the item submitted to the Board was not the same as the item approved by the CLAS faculty. The Board was given a Status Report on Accreditation for all programs in the university. The Senate Budget Committee met on September 16 and reviewed the fiscal year 2020 budget. The administration expects the state appropriation for the university will be increased by only 0.5%. The administration had
budgeted for an increase of 0.9%. The difference is about $767,000, which can apparently be handled through money saved on fringe benefit costs that are not increasing as much as originally projected. Of the various major categories of expenditures (e.g., schools & colleges, divisions, financial aid, central accounts), the schools and colleges will get the smallest percentage increase. That means money is continually being shifted from the core educational enterprise to administrative functions. About $2 million has been authorized for hiring faculty and for start-up funds in the new budget. The FY2020-2025 Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan was submitted to the Board with the request to seek state funding for a complete renovation of State Hall. Policy Committee had considerable input into the documents. Mr. Parrish pointed out that our NIH ranking has remained flat. The primary increase in research grants is due to the fact that the drug trials in Karmanos Cancer Institute are now counted in the university’s report.

Approved as corrected at the Policy Committee meeting of September 30, 2019