

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY  
ACADEMIC SENATE  
PROCEEDINGS OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE

November 16, 2020

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

The item marked with an asterisk constitutes the Action of November 16, 2020.

Guests: Marquita Chamblee, Associate Provost for Diversity and Inclusion and Chief Diversity Officer

1. Social Justice Action Committee Initiatives and the Proposal for a DEI Council:

Ms. Chamblee provided an update on the Social Justice Action Committee (SJAC) and Subcommittees established by the President in late June 2020. There are seven different subcommittees or working groupings who are charged to look at issues of bias in various practices, policies and procedures in order to develop recommendations for improving equity across the campus community: Hiring & Retention of Diverse Faculty; Hiring and Retention of Diverse Staff; Student Access and Success; Policing; Inter-Cultural Education; Campus Climate; and University DEI Initiatives. The chair or a co-chair of each of the seven groups, along with President Wilson, Interim Provost Clabo, Chief of Staff Wright, Diversity Officer Chamblee, BOG Governor Stancato, and Senate President Beale, form the SJAC (the steering committee). The subcommittees have been meeting since July 1<sup>st</sup> and their recommendations are due to President Wilson on November 20. Ms. Chamblee will consolidate those recommendations into a single report for review by the SJAC.

Ms. Chamblee indicated that the University DEI Initiatives group is charged to look at structures internal to and external to the institution to consider how we might go about the process of thinking about DEI across the university. One of their recommendations is a DEI Council. (Appendix A includes the DEI Initiative subcommittee's proposal for a DEI Council and Monica Brockmeyer's Extended Comments on the DEI Council.) The Council will have 26 school/college faculty and staff representatives—one faculty and one staff member from each school/college. Ms. Chamblee stated that "these are people that have either some background or connection to DEI or some work in the college or some affiliation with DEI initiatives and direct contact with the Dean. We thought it was important that whoever participates from schools and colleges have contact with the Dean so that they have the ear of the leadership." In addition, President Wilson and Ms. Chamblee will appoint ten additional people, the Student Senate will appoint two representatives and the Academic Senate will appoint two representatives. All appointees other than the student representatives will serve terms of two years; student representatives will serve one-year terms.

Ms. Simon asked about representation from units on campus other than schools and colleges. Ms. Chamblee stated that the President's appointees will be an opportunity to identify other staff and academic staff. Ms. Beale noted that the Board of Governors statute is quite clear that the Academic Senate is to serve as "the" voice of the faculty and academic staff" and asked whether that had been considered. Ms. Chamblee stated that that is why there are two representatives from the Senate. Ms. Beale responded that the structure as proposed is not an appropriate recognition of

the role of the Senate. The Senate is not “a” voice representing faculty and academic staff, it is established by statute as “the” voice representing faculty and academic staff. The group is made up of administratively selected faculty and academic staff from each of the schools/colleges in contravention of the Board of Governors Senate statute. Ms. Beale indicated that this is one of the two most significant points of concern about this proposal for a DEI Council that she had strongly emphasized at the recent SJAC meeting when this Council proposal was put forward in a fashion that indicated that the administration had already accepted the idea: (i) *its “implementation” and reporting function*, which clearly belongs in the Office of the Chief Diversity Officer and *simply cannot be exercised by a faculty/staff/administrative group*, and (ii) the fact that *this proposal creates an administratively selected and run organization that bypasses shared governance and the Academic Senate*. The Academic Senate does not merely appoint representatives who are members of the Senate when we establish groups or when we work with groups that are set up by us with the Provost. For example, we can and do appoint Senate Representatives that are not current members of the Senate or even eligible for membership on the Senate. There is no statement in the proposal that calls for representation from the many custodial, clerical and other represented staff at the university, but the Academic Senate can easily go to the Coalition of Unions for appointees that represent those represented staff whose perspectives are needed and we can easily appoint people from divisions other than the schools and colleges. We do so informally or formally whenever it is important to have that broader perspective to inform our views on issues and appropriate measures to address those issues. The idea that the President should establish yet another university-wide, purportedly “representative” organization that is parallel to and separate from the Academic Senate is a slap in the face of what shared governance is intended to be because this is an administratively run and controlled process, even insofar as the school and college participants are expected to be those who have close contact with the Dean—i.e., administrative staff, department chairs, and faculty who would take their direction from the administration rather than providing an independent faculty/staff perspective. Ms. Beale invited others to address this issue and noted a need for Policy members to discuss as well the suggested functions of the organization: those seem largely unworkable for a group of this nature and thus appear to be mainly “window dressing” for policies the administration plans to implement.

Ms. Clabo suggested that the reason for this kind of structure was that the majority of our staff are not represented as members of the Academic Senate but would “have issues that should be addressed by the diversity council.” [*Note Added: Representation for other represented staff was only mentioned at the SJAC as a response to Ms. Beale’s concern about bypassing the Senate; it was not specifically included in the charge or offered as an original rationale for the Council.*] Ms. Chamblee responded that the structure is not so much to be duplicative of the Academic Senate as to “provide a focal point for DEI issues on campus in ways that we have never had specifically for that in the past.” She indicated that “with all of the curricular work ... at the Academic Senate, there’s not going to be, from the best of my awareness, a great deal of overlap in the work of this [DEI Council].” [*Note Added: This statement presupposes that the Senate’s jurisdiction is limited to “curricular work”, which is a much narrower view of its jurisdiction than actually embodied by the Senate.*]

Ms. Beale strongly disagreed with both of these points. She noted that the Academic Senate easily encompasses additional viewpoints and strives to solicit ideas and issues from across the university. Furthermore, the Academic Senate took a strong role in the development of the Climate Survey and, as Ms. Chamblee is well aware, was the *only* group on campus to take an additional step in response to that survey, after discussions and presentations by Ms. Chamblee and others at the Faculty Affairs Committee, Student Affairs Committee, Curriculum & Instruction Committee and Policy Committee. The Senate, with the full support of Provost Whitfield, established an Anti-Bullying Task Force that began meeting before the SJAC process was established and yet was

ignored by the administration in formulating that process until the Senate insisted on appointing the chair of that task force as a Senate representative to one of the committees. Moreover, the various recommendations on faculty and staff hiring and retention, on curricular initiatives, on teaching initiatives, on policing and the campus safety advisory committee—all of these are matters that are within the jurisdiction of the Senate under the Board of Governors statute and will be bypassed through this Council. The communicative function is also a major part of the Senate's role: we are elected members who are charged with communicating information to our colleagues in our 'home' units. The more administrative organizations are created to take over our communicative role, the more difficult it is for the Senate to serve that function appropriately. Faculty and academic staff become overburdened and ultimately may even choose to serve on the administratively established groups rather than Senate because of the likelihood of garnering related administrative recognition.

Mr. Roth added that it is very important from the standpoint of the role of the Senate as envisioned in the Board of Governors code that the Senate not be circumvented by administrative actions. The question that must be asked is what sort of policy and prescriptions are going to come out of this and what is the process by which they are implemented. He said, "It is a problem if this Council is going to come up with various educational policy prescriptions or related recommendations which affect one way or another faculty and academic staff responsibilities and expectations, and then those are somehow 'implemented' through the Council without full participation of the Senate. ***That's basically the end of shared academic governance: it crosses a red line in the most direct way.***"

Ms. Chamblee insisted that "there is no intention" to do that. The DEI Council will not create educational policy 'without the involvement of the Academic Senate'. It's about policy and practice and engaging in equitable practice."

Ms. Beale noted that the very document distributed to SJAC states that this Council will "implement" initiatives focusing on "retention, recruitment, policy modification" using "content experts"; will establish "metrics and outcomes for scoring success" for the academic units, will consider student composition and retention. She emphasized that ***all of those issues are within the Senate's jurisdiction***. She added that "the more you curtail the Senate's role in achieving those goals, you are saying that is out of bounds for the Senate because you've established another committee to handle it, and you don't need shared governance for it."

Ms. Hoogland noted her complete agreement with the points made by Ms. Beale and Mr. Roth. That led her to ask the question—why was the Senate not involved in this in the first place? The Senate has elected members. The Policy Committee goes through a careful process to select representatives for any kind of committee, whether it is a Senate committee, the Article XXX committees, an ad hoc task force, a search committee or whatever. She stated that she did not understand why, when we have this whole body of elected members representing the entire university's faculty and academic staff, you don't trust the elected members to perform their representative function well. People have been elected to the Academic Senate by their peers; Senate members have a representative function—they are not here merely to express their individual perspectives but have a legitimate function that should be viewed by the administration as a critical resource in ensuring good policy decisions. She suggested that Ms. Chamblee, as a member of the administration, should ask herself why the administration does not trust the Academic Senate's representative function.

Ms. Chamblee responded that the SJAC process had Senate representation and she has appreciated the Senate voice on the working groups. Ms. Beale responded that having only one Academic Senate representative on each of those seven large committees is not how such a project would have been handled if the administration had come to the Senate to discuss how best to

organize concerted action on social justice issues rather than forming and reaching decisions in a top-down fashion.

Mr. Parrish added that we recognize that Ms. Chamblee can only do the best she can with the situation presented to expand the impact of her office. He stated that the way this has been handled is “in President Wilson’s lap,” since Wilson has shown that he does not have any respect for the Academic Senate and thus gives the Senate representation only grudgingly. These kinds of things are all administratively driven by the President and his chief of staff Michael Wright, whose basic concern is the marketing dimensions of the President’s presentations.

Ms. Beale followed with two contextualized questions to Ms. Chamblee regarding her view of how a Council such as the one proposed could handle the various actions that are listed on the materials presented. Ms. Beale noted that surely Ms. Chamblee’s office would be the place to produce an annual report on our actions and successes on diversity and equity inclusion issues, and it would also be best equipped to talk about the metrics that make sense for measuring DEI, while the Senate would be in the best position to provide input on many of the DEI issues that have to do with faculty and staff recruitment, student recruitment and retention, and similar items because Senate members deal with those issues with administrators on a regular basis, especially through the Policy Committee. *Does Ms. Chamblee agree that these are the routes that would need to be followed?* Nonetheless, this Council proposal is to establish a permanent committee for DEI review and implementation. Ms. Beale finds it incomprehensible how a group of 40 people who don’t have administrative jobs related to implementing these areas could possibly “implement” initiatives. *If this Council were established, what kind of regular process for DEI review would be adopted?* Surely the SJAC process would not also continue long term. Ms. Beale seeks to understand why people think this is a good idea.

Ms. Chamblee suggested that the DEI Council provides a way “to communicate between groups in the various schools and colleges” what is going on in terms of DEI initiatives. There is currently “not a lot of collaboration”. That is the value of a “cross-university Council with specific focus on DEI initiatives.” It will extend the work beyond her office. The other piece is to have “people with some background and experience in doing DEI-related work” who can help us move these initiatives forward. She agreed that much of the work would come out of her office, but she thought it would be helpful to “focus on DEI” through the Council. As to the SJAC and subcommittees, she assumed they would not “exist forever” but did not know for sure what President Wilson’s plan was for the SJAC steering committee itself.

Ms. Beale reiterated that the faculty and academic staff members of the Senate have connections with every single school and college and beyond and are expected to, and increasingly have been doing, that communicating with their peers about what they learn at the Senate. If the Senate is bypassed, it will hinder rather than help communication on these DEI issues because it again becomes administratively directed communication, not peer-to-peer communication. The proposal notably left out how the faculty and staff would be chosen by the schools and colleges, but the required coordination with the Dean makes it highly unlikely that it would be truly representative. She stated that she understands Ms. Chamblee’s goal—and it is an admirable one—of increasing communication across the university. Nonetheless, she considers that is a role clearly within the jurisdiction of the Senate. It is the reason Ms. Beale created an Academic Senate Teams site for communication and sharing of things we send to other people or raising issues of concern. It is the reason Senate documents that appoint faculty and academic staff as Senate representatives to non-Senate committees now include a statement of the expectation that they will share with the Senate what the committee is discussing so that it can be discussed more broadly within the Senate. That is what shared governance is supposed to do. It is exactly those things mentioned by Ms.

Chamblee—bringing in expert voices to bear on issues from across the university, communicating what has been developed, and working with others across the university to address shared concerns. That is the Senate’s business.

Members briefly discussed the availability of the annual affirmative action report. Ms. Chamblee noted that it is produced by General Counsel EEO and Mr. Parrish noted that it is usually on the Board of Governors agenda. It is useful because it brings into focus difficulties at departmental levels in meeting diversity goals. He commented that there were about 55,000 PhDs in the U.S. last year, of which only about 2,500 were African American. That small number makes it very difficult to recruit African American scholars to the university. Ms. Beale added that it also makes retention of those we do successfully recruit even more difficult, as they are so often picked up by higher ranking schools. We are hampered by lack of faculty titles compared to our peer departments and schools in other public institutions, as discussed earlier at the Academic Senate Budget Committee meeting with Development.

Mr. Parrish noted that certainly DEI efforts need to be in conversation constantly, and there are receptive members of the faculty and academic staff to these goals. The problem with establishing a structure like the Council is when they start instructing the academic side as to how to recruit, what to do, setting requirements. It’s an idea that sounds good on first response, but likely to become a real problem as a mostly administrative operation.

Ms. Chamblee noted that the Council idea emerged from several of the working groups, with different ideas of what it should encompass. Mr. Parrish voiced a concern that the Council may ultimately harshly criticize a particular department for not doing well enough. Ms. Chamblee suggested that her idea is not to condemn but to provide support to departments who want to make a difference in recruiting and retaining diverse faculty and staff. Mr. Parrish asked what the budget to support that work was, since it takes a budget to encourage people to recruit: the axiom goes—if you accomplish this, you will get budget support for that. Ms Chamblee responded that there is no budget at this time. Ms. Beale noted that budgetary tools such as Mr. Parrish suggested would also be extraordinarily problematic coming from such a Council, and Ms. Chamblee agreed that they should not have a role in budgets or budget incentives. But Ms. Beale noted that gets to the “implementation” point yet again: the charge states that the Council will implement retention and recruitment policy modifications. Yet those are clearly educational policies that relate to the schools and colleges and the Academic Senate’s jurisdiction—and do have budgetary implications as well. Mr. Parrish added that in public administration, a basic precept is that “budget is policy”: a DEI Council as proposed, ‘implementing’ policy without being supported with budget becomes little more than a talking shop that points fingers at people. Both Mr. Parrish and Ms. Beale reiterated that we appreciate the goal, the question is how can it be achieved. In addition to finding the composition of the group a slap in the face to the Senate, Ms. Beale thought the group as constituted would simply not be able to do the functions stated for it. Mr. Parrish noted that if the President had come to the Senate initially with the idea of setting up some kind of group to carry out this communicative and review function, there would have been support where the Senate had a real role in establishing a structure that might have genuine impact. Unfortunately, the structure just adds a couple of Senators at the tail end—the Senate would have only 2 representatives on a committee of 41! That is not the way consultation and shared governance should work. Ms. Beale stated again that this is the point she made at the SJAC meeting and originally when President Wilson first informed her about the process he was establishing for considering social justice actions on campus. Regrettably, he seemed to be saying that he just wanted to do something quickly that would show he was taking action, which comes across as a PR concern that disregards any shared governance processes.

Mr. Villarosa then stated that he agrees with the troubling nature of the Council proposal as eroding Senate responsibility, but he went on to add that Ms. Chamblee's office has not been supported with the kind of budget needed to work on these matters. Perhaps if she had more staff it would have been possible to make sure that true consultation with the Senate could have happened. The office could have considered ideas and utilized the existing governance structure, with expanded input as Ms. Beale suggested. He is concerned that a parallel organizational structure establishes a different dynamic that is problematic for all the reasons already stated.

Ms. Beale asked whether the proposal as written is expected to go forward or whether Ms. Chamblee foresees any reconsideration. Ms. Chamblee responded that it would likely have some amendment but would come up at a future meeting of the SJAC. Mr. Parrish asked whether the proposal would be put in place by the President or go to the Board of Governors. Ms. Chamblee indicated that she would work with the President to put it into effect.

Beale summarized that she sees genuine problems with the way the proposal is currently set up, which is regrettable because it is important for the university to make progress on these issues. But establishing even more bureaucracy—in a place where faculty and academic staff already feel the pressure of too much bureaucracy and administrative bloat in the growing number of AVP positions in a budget that has cut back on numbers of tenured and tenure-track faculty, cut academic staff positions and faces a shrinking total enrollment below 26,000—is extraordinarily worrisome. It does not appear that there has been sufficient consideration given to what the Council is supposed to accomplish and how it could possibly accomplish that. It could make sense for the Senate together with Ms. Chamblee's office to create a well-structured small advisory committee with her office staff and a group of 12 Senate-appointed faculty and staff (including non-academic staff) with staggered terms to provide advice and ideas for communicative strategies or areas where problems occur. That could be a very workable idea. But the idea of having a Council that “establishes metrics” by which academic units are judged and that “implements” DEI ideas is problematic. Indeed, when you consider the various suggestions in the document presented by Monica Brockmeyer, it seems even more worrisome. Having the Council review and act on score-card data on a regular basis might raise legal issues with the Michigan affirmative action legislation limitations. Having the Council have input into school/college budgetary decisions and processes, which would almost be inevitable if it had a real role in recruitment and retention, would be hugely problematic. These ideas are extraordinarily broad and completely ignore the existing shared governance mechanisms. Beale urged that there be some reconsideration before this is finalized, even in sending to the steering committee. She noted that she is the only faculty voice on the steering committee: every other person is either a university official or a person who is chairing/co-chairing a group and therefore has some vested interest in the ideas. Ms. Beale is the only independent faculty voice there, which is worrisome in itself.

Brad Roth noted that there are two kinds of issues. One is how a group like this, with 40 people, could actually do the work suggested in a productive way. The word “implementation” is problematic. It is one thing for a group to recommend ideas and suggest metrics, but for this group to “implement” policy that affects educational matters and matters affecting the rights and responsibilities of faculty would be an impossible situation. Perhaps there is a way of redrawing this to avoid encroaching on Senate territoriality, such as having its work be preliminary to review by the Senate. Beale noted that even if that implementation and charge were remedied, there would still be the problem of administrative selection of faculty and academic staff, rather than selection by the Senate as mandated by the BOG statute. Parrish commented that the administration is likely to enact the proposal because the President is already committed to it.

[Ms. Chamblee left the meeting.]

2. Proceedings of the Policy Committee

The Policy Committee approved the proceedings of October 26 as drafted and approved the proceedings of November 9 adding a phrase in the discussion of safe spaces.

3. Report from the Chair

Provost Clabo noted that the trajectory of the COVID-19 surge is clear, as the campus positivity rate has increased in 4 weeks to 5.37 percent of tests and the city has moved to 6.8 percent, both from rates around 2%. We've moved from a seven-day rolling average of 2.29 cases a day to 6.71 a day. The Governor's Order late Sunday requires ending face-to-face classes effective Wednesday the eighteenth. An announcement will come out from the President shortly to that effect, with exceptions for clinical students. Unlike Michigan, however, we are not closing the dorms and sending our students home to perhaps spread the virus there. They are permitted to stay on campus if it is best for them, with dining services provided, including free meals over thanksgiving break for people who choose to stay. Mort Harris will remain open by reservation, with machines moved farther apart and increased air circulation. Libraries will remain open at 25% capacity, and the Student Center as well, requiring ID and screener. For faculty and staff, the message is that if you do not have to be on campus you should not be here. In response to Beale's question about labs, the Provost noted that at this time they expect the labs will continue with the existing restrictions. In response to Fitzgibbon's question, the Provost noted that we have not had clusters that have been tracked and we are continuing to do contact tracing. Public health departments, however, are overwhelmed and unable to conduct effective contact tracing. The Provost expects that clinical partners will no longer admit our clinical students within weeks because of the surge and shortage of testing reagents and PPE supplies. Students tend to use more PPE than seasoned clinicians. No more than 2 households are permitted to gather, so it is important to recognize this immediate issue of the Thanksgiving holidays.

4. Report from the Senate President:

- a. Ms. Beale noted that the President had sent out an announcement about a mid-December commencement, but the Academic Senate has not been included in the planning. In May, she had agreed not to participate given the rapid turnaround for the event, but she had assumed that the Senate would continue to present the faculty and academic staff voice at the ceremonies in the future. She asked the Provost to suggest that this oversight be remedied.
- b. A recent survey was sent from EAA about academic advising regarding the three-year contract with EAA. Ms. Beale noted that the Senate would like to follow up to get more information on the kinds of services the EAA contract provides.
- c. After the last Policy meeting, the Graduate School Dean's Office contacted us regarding their desire to put in place the same grading policy for graduate students that was instituted for the Winter term. The information was shared with Policy and the full committee voted to support the grading policy extension for the Fall term.
- d. The Graduate School is establishing a taskforce to reconsider the question of who qualifies to serve as graduate faculty. Under the current policy, only tenured faculty may serve but Dean Bryant-Fredrick would like to find ways to include people who may have different titles. In some cases there are persons working in the field who teach as part-time faculty or lecturers and are the experts in the area. Students should be able to include them on their committees. The taskforce will consider establishing different types of graduate faculty to allow that expansion.
- e. As this was Angie Wisniewski's last official meeting with the Policy Committee, since she is retiring and will be using her vacation days after November 20, Ms. Beale noted her profound appreciation for her work and everything she has done. Members applauded and

noted that we do not know how we will function without Angie, who has been the solid and constant foundation of the Senate for 37 years.

- f. Ms. Beale noted in closing that there had recently been an announcement of an award given by Patrick Lindsay's office (VP for Governmental Relations)—the Arthur L. Johnson Community Leader Award. It is rather odd for the university to select someone from the external community for a leadership award. Provost Clabo indicated that the award has been in existence for a long time and was created in honor of Author Johnson's service to the university and community. In the past, the VP for Development would present the award.

- 5. Senate Plenary Session Draft Agenda: Policy briefly discussed the draft agenda for the December 2<sup>nd</sup> Senate meeting. Boris Baltus and Marquita Chamblee have agreed to participate. It is hoped that there will be detailed presentation about the DEI Council and other recommendations.

- 6. Emeritus Status: Beale summarized the reason this is coming up for discussion again. Materials distributed include the original policy approved in 1959 and the two memoranda from the School of Medicine suggesting an expansion of emeritus status, at least within Medicine, to clinical and lecturer faculty. The procedure in those proposals closely resembled promotion and tenure criteria and procedures. We discussed the issue over three Policy Committee meetings in 2013. At that time, proceedings did not detail discussions, so there is very little information from the proceedings. Also distributed to Policy was a description by Ms. Beale of those discussions: she remembers being surprised with the tenure-like process that existed. As she recalls, the entire point of the Policy Committee's review and draft of a revised policy was to avoid a procedure that resembled promotion and tenure requiring approval from the chair and dean. So we compromised in the Policy Committee draft, also distributed, by requiring either 10 years in service or tenure. Although Provost Winters had appeared to accept that policy draft, the current website entry shows an amended policy that retains the role of the departmental chair and dean as providing an "independent review and recommendation". Beale asked the Provost whether the administration is open to removing that process, which seems hard to justify for something that merely recognizes that the person has retired from being a member of the faculty at Wayne. Other than email and library privileges, there is nothing provided by the university.

The Provost thanked Policy for bringing this forward but noted that she would like to review the materials in more depth than was possible because of the time spent on the Covid-19 surge over the last few days. She added that she was aware that in many places emeritus status is a matter of course—serve X number of years and the status is given when you retire, while at others, emeritus status is given only on the basis of contribution to the university. She asked if faculty who have already received emeritus status based on that contribution criterion and process would consider their status somehow diminished by opening it more broadly without a decanal process. Charles Parrish said he did not think that would be an issue. The problem is that if it is set up as a P&T process, then people will tend to think they should make it harder to get. But it opens the door to petty politics if the person is on the wrong side of someone in the administrative line that has to approve. Linda Beale added that she thinks the Policy revision that the Senate has supported creates good will among retirees, who appreciate the small honorific. That's much better than creating ill will by refusing to grant emeritus status to someone who has been here for years. Policy agreed to bring the item back on the agenda for the next meeting.

- 7. Switching Course Offerings from Synchronous to Asynchronous: Ms. Beale noted that she had received an email from faculty in CLAS that included a chain of emails noting that the Dean's



Office was informing departmental course schedulers that any course scheduled as synchronous could not be switched to asynchronous. The problem arose for the Winter term because of a mixup that had occurred in registering for the Fall term: schedulers had listed various courses as asynchronous without checking first with faculty, and then were told that they could not switch to synchronous because students may have selected asynchronous because of their difficult schedules. For the Winter term, the departmental schedulers tried to solve the problem by assuming that they could list all courses as synchronous and then let faculty switch if they preferred asynchronous: they considered this should be okay, since this would not involve the problem of a student being unable to meet the schedule (though some students may prefer synchronous classes over asynchronous). The email stated that the Provost's Office had issued the policy against switching. This has now created problems for faculty who had spent considerable time designing their courses as asynchronous and now would have to redesign the course to be synchronous if not permitted to switch.

Provost Clabo was not aware of any policy on this and asked to be sent the email chain. Mr. Roth noted that he had also received it, and that it did say it was a Provost's Office policy. It appears that there were several departments that ran into this problem. Mathematics definitely is one. Provost Clabo indicated that whether to offer the course synchronously or asynchronously is clearly a faculty decision, though it is important that the course be listed accurately so students know what they are getting. She has heard various complaints about asynchronous classes from the events she and the President host with students. Beale agreed that students may well prefer synchronous classes, but the problem here is that apparently the people doing the scheduling did not know there was a policy, which has created a problem for faculty who had planned their courses one way and now may be forced to redesign the courses to suit another method. Provost Clabo indicated she would check with Darin Ellis and find out what the process should be for switching. Beale asked if she would consider it appropriate for the faculty who would like to switch to asynchronous to poll the registered students to see if they agree, taking care not to commit that it would definitely be doable. Provost Clabo said she thought that was a reasonable approach.

hoogland noted that she had the same impression that students preferred synchronous because of the contact, but in fact the enrollment data in her department show high enrollments in asynchronous classes and low enrollments in synchronous classes. Provost Clabo noted that enrollment for the Winter term appears to be down considerably—about 17% compared to the same week last year. When she asked for a check on whether synchronous or asynchronous were filling up best, she was told that the synchronous classes were preferred. Perhaps it is a difference from department to department. Beale noted that it could also be scheduling conflicts that lead a student to choose to take one course asynchronously so that that course and a course with a synchronous schedule can be done in the same semester.

hoogland added that she is varying her plans for her classes, doing one class synchronously on zoom but assigning students work to do on their own for the second class rather than doing two classes a week on zoom (i.e., half online as a class and half offline). That doesn't fit neatly into either the synchronous or asynchronous framework, and it appears there is not a current label for that sort of class. The Provost asked hoogland to talk to the Registrar to see if there was a way to label it for the students.

Fitzgibbon added that she runs the 3300 courses in her area. The asynchronous fill up immediately and had a waitlist, whereas the synchronous had fewer students. That may mean that for Fall 2021 these courses should move to entirely asynchronous. Provost Clabo responded that she will ask for data showing how that is working in each school, college and

department. Darin Ellis's impression was that students were choosing synchronous over asynchronous. We should know what they are choosing, but we should also see if they are happy with that choice as well. It may be that asynchronous looks appealing until they realize they do not have the contact and regular participation that synchronous provides. Beale added that the pandemic situation also creates its own context—trying to study and care for family at home may make asynchronous classes more appealing. Maybe by Fall 2021 we will be closer to normal. Provost Clabo responded that she does not think the vaccine process will go as rapidly as some media are suggesting. She is on the Governor's task force for vaccine prioritization. The December shipment to Michigan will cover only 150,000 people, which is insufficient even to reach all those providing critical care.

#### 8. New/Old Business

- a. Information from Monica Brockmeyer. Beale noted that she had asked Meihua in institutional research for information on cohorts of undergraduate students over the last 3-5 years showing ACT/SAT, GPA and FTIAC, gender, ethnicity and retention into second year. Meihua had responded that she had produced some data along those lines for Monica but that it was "proprietary" to Monica so she could not provide it to the Senate. Beale checked with Provost Whitfield, and he said that none of that information is proprietary and he would have Monica provide it. We still have not received that, nor other information that Monica has said she would provide on the test-optional procedures. Dawn Medley also agreed to send specific information when she was last at Policy but has not done so. Provost Clabo noted that she will make sure we receive the data that we have asked for.
- b. Research. The School of Medicine's hiring and salary freezes are apparently affecting what people who are in part on grants get as raises. They would normally get a raise from the clinical practice group (e.g., Wayne Health, the former UPG) and a raise on the research grant, but are now restricted from matching the practice group raise with the grant funding. Researchers are suggesting that this is affecting their ability to have those people work for them on their research. David Kessel indicated that this would be a discussion at the research meeting in December and a fuller report can be brought to Policy from that. He thinks it is connected to the de-emphasis on graduate medical education in connection with the limited resource and deficit situation of the Medical School.
- c. Heart of Detroit Scholarship Funding. Ms. Simon noted that an announcement from the Provost's Office changes the credit requirements for HOD funding. The original plan required and paid for 15 credits each semester (fall and winter), with any summer credits paid by the students. The announcement allows students to maintain the scholarship if they only register for 12 credits in fall and winter terms, but they will still be responsible for paying for any summer credits they take. Beale suggested that this seemed unfair: they were promised 30 credits of funding, albeit in the fall and winter terms, but now they are being allowed to take only 24 in the fall and winter because of the pandemic, but if they do, they will forego funding for 6 credits since they will not be funded if they take the additional 6 in the summer when they take advantage of the lower fall/winter credit requirement. Beale noted that Policy had originally suggested that requiring 12 as the minimum for fall and winter terms would be more appropriate for students who may need more support, allowing them to take 6 fully funded in the summer. Certainly, if the pandemic is justifying allowing fewer credits in the regular term, we should continue to provide the full 30 credits of support originally promised. Provost Clabo indicated she would doublecheck the information with Cathy Kay.