WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
ACADEMIC SENATE

PROCEEDINGS OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE
January 10, 2022

Present: D. Aubert; L. Beale; P. Beavers; M. Kornbluh; J. Lewis; N. Rossi; B. Roth; N. Simon; R. Villarosa; A. Wisniewski

Guest: Amanda Bryant-Friedrich

1. Proceedings of the Policy Committee Meeting of December 13. The committee approved the proceedings as modified.

2. President's Report.

   a. Course Modality. The health committee is looking at ways to have more in-person education if the pandemic surge continues. Of particular concern is teaching by students in the teacher education program.

   b. Senate Ad Hoc DEI Committee. Linda Beale met with Marissa Henderson and Scott Tainsky who are the new co-chairs of the Senate's ad hoc Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Committee. They talked about what needs to happen going forward and the relationship between the Senate and the administration's DEI Council regarding jurisdiction—i.e., that the recommendations from the administration's DEI Council should be sent to the Senate DEI committee and shared with appropriate Senate standing committees and then come to Policy for submission to the Plenary session for a vote. The Senate committee met once in the fall semester and prioritized three items: student success, hiring to create a more diverse faculty and staff, and cultural awareness workshops. Beale noted that we need more thorough student success data for the various programs such as APEX, Heart of Detroit, and Warrior Way Back, as well as a better understanding of how financial aid is working for underrepresented and disadvantaged students. The co-chairs and Beale discussed the difference between training and education and the recommendations of the social justice action committee. The group also discussed the need to add bylaws provisions to make the DEI a standing committee of the Senate. Beale recommended that she and the co-chairs serve on the bylaws subgroup and that the co-chairs select an additional member of the DEI committee to serve.

   c. Return from Sabbatical. Ewa Golebiowska has returned from sabbatical and has asked to serve on the Faculty Affairs Committee. Policy Committee agreed to the appointment.

   d. BOG Student Affairs Committee Alternate. Policy Committee had appointed Kelly Dormer to serve as the alternate to the Board of Governors Student Affairs Committee. She is no longer eligible to serve because she has taken a position in the Provost's Office. Brad Roth volunteered to serve in her place as the faculty alternate. Naida Simon serves as the academic staff representative to the committee.

   e. Proposal for Changing from Per Credit Hour Tuition to a Block Tuition Model. CFO/Senior VP Finance and Business Operations David Massaron and Provost/ Senior VP Academic Affairs Mark Kornbluh are considering switching from a per-credit tuition policy to a block model effective fall 2023. Other universities have moved to block tuition. Kornbluh is

convinced this will help with student success. The administration is studying if we can afford to make the change.

On the agenda for the Board of Governors meeting of January 28 is the proposal from Kornbluh to allow the university to charge different tuition rates for some programs.

f. School of Medicine Financial Accounts. There is an audit of the various funds in the School of Medicine underway. Dean of Medicine /VP Health Affairs Mark Schweitzer will share with Policy Committee and the School of Medicine Budget Advisory Committee the full accounting once that audit is complete.

g. Senate Assistance. The secretary IV position has been upgraded to administrative assistant. The position will remain posted until a suitable candidate is identified.

h. Enrollments. The latest report on enrollment for winter term 2022 continues to show a decline compared with winter term 2021, especially in graduate enrollments.

i. Parking Charges during Remote Work. Faculty and staff who have parking tags are concerned that they are paying for parking on campus in January although classes are not meeting on campus. Beale asked the Provost if there would be an adjustment in the parking fees because people are working remotely. He indicated he would check into this.

j. CHEGG. Faculty have been receiving solicitations to provide their teaching materials to Chegg, a digital "student assistance" platform, for payment. The Provost and the Academic Senate will send a joint message to faculty that the platform has been used for cheating and plagiarism and encourage faculty not to sell their material to the platform. Jennifer Lewis would like the Curriculum and Instruction Committee to take up questions about Chegg and Bartleby Learn.

k. Strategic Plan. Beale distributed the most recent draft of the strategic plan received from Michael Wright, Chief of Staff. She noted that she had sent some suggested revisions to the draft to the strategic plan steering committee. Kornbluh said that a majority of her comments were accepted. The strategic plan will be on the agenda for the January Board of Governors meeting.

l. Centers and Institutes. The Policy Committee has been concerned for some time that the BOG statute on Centers and Institutes (BOG Statute 2.23.01 Centers and Institutes; Policy on Creation, Operation, Review and Discontinuance) has not been consistently followed. We have sought a full list of both university and school/college centers and institutes with the dates they were originally chartered. Policy Committee reviews both university centers and school/college centers when they are proposed, but only reviews university centers for 6-year charter renewals. There were a number of school/college "center" websites for centers that had not gone through the formal approval process, and Laurie Clabo began a review. Provost Kornbluh has continued the review, and the goal is to have all university charter renewals done in a timely fashion and to be ensure that all centers receive a first-charter review as required under the statute.

m. Administrative content-centered control of Student Senate access to the student listserve. In the fall term the Student Senate passed a statement regarding the Israel-Palestinian conflict and wanted to use the university student listserv to send it to their constituents. The President refused to allow the statement to be sent over the university listserve, based on

the content which he considered "inflammatory." The decision was later justified as not allowing the Student Senate a privilege not permitted to other student groups. That justification is nonsensical, since the Student Senate is the shared governance representative body, like the Academic Senate is for faculty. That is a unique characteristic that clearly justifies ability to communicate with those represented. This has been temporarily tabled but will be brought back to the Senate for further discussion in the future.

3. Chair's Report.

    a. Certificate Program Statutory Changes. Kelly Dormer is looking into changes to be made in Board statutes governing certificate programs. This will be discussed with the relevant standing committees and Policy Committee before being presented to the Board.

    b. The Proposed Code of Business Ethics. The administration accepted much of the Policy Committees comments on the draft. Kornbluh will forward the new version to Beale for review.

    c. Student Support Programming. Kornbluh noted that he will report to the Board on the status of the APEX program and the Warrior Way Back program. The Vision and Impact Program (VIP) will be expanded to provide additional support to students, but APEX will be phased out. Beale noted that the Senate has sought thorough data on APEX for several years without success. Kornbluh said that the programs would be restructured and no positions would be eliminated. More support will be given to students through the Black student cultural center. Advisors will work with at-risk students.

4. Pathways to Faculty Program: Dean of the Graduate School Amanda Bryant-Friedrich joined the meeting to inform the committee about the program and to get feedback. The program is designed to allow people to come to the university after they have obtained their terminal degree. Many departments are interested in pursuing the positions that will become available through the program. The hiring process is in 2 stages. The positions will be funded for 1 or 2 years after the post-graduate degree, followed by funding for 3 to 4 years at the professorial stage, for a total of 5 years of funding. The purpose of the program is to hire people who are members of marginalized groups. The departments are being asked to create an atmosphere and environment that welcomes faculty from different backgrounds and to provide resources the faculty will need to succeed.

Each department has to identify 5 mentors for each individual who is recruited. The *peer mentor* and the *career mentor* will have the most contact with the mentee. The peer mentor is a junior faculty mentor or someone who was tenured recently who will give the person the unwritten rules of the unit. The career mentor will be the person who advises the mentee on their research or who guides them on their scholarly work. These 2 individuals guide the team members. The next 2 team members are advocates. They are advocates with a degree of separation between them and the mentor. The *internal advocate* advocates within Wayne State for resources, opportunities and various things that a junior faculty member might need, so must stay in tune with what is going on with the trainee. The *external advocate* is very important. The role is to find opportunities and make sure that the trainee is aware of opportunities to present their work and find available funding. The external advocate should have standing in the scholarly community such that they sit on editorial boards, review panels and grant study sections. The peer mentor and the career mentor will be involved in the selection of the external advocate. The advocate has to be aligned with the professional pathway. The internal advocate will probably be chosen within the department. The fifth person is the *sponsor*. The

sponsor is internal to Wayne State and has the power and authority to sponsor people. They usually will be a chair or a dean or someone at that level. If the mentee is willing to teach they have to be introduced to teaching at the post-doctoral level. The person will be protected from teaching for specific time limits varying by disciplines to make sure they have the opportunity to be successful. People in units will need some preparation to be aware of the pitfalls that come with being the one person or one of a few people from a marginalized group within a unit.

A committee will vet the proposals from departments. The committee will be led by the associate dean for post-doctoral affairs and consist of 2 department chairs, 2 faculty members (one of which will be an assistant professor who went through the post-doctoral transitional program), the vice president for research, and the senior associate provost for faculty affairs and associate vice president for academic personnel. The provost will make the final decision on the 5 programs that will be given the opportunity to search. The searches will be done at the program level because it is important that this program be owned by the departments. The search process will be heavily monitored in the way people are recruiting. They are to be looking for candidates, not waiting for people to apply. There will be training in conducting the searches to make sure that anyone who interacts with the university has a positive experience from the first day. The people selected to participate in the program will be brought in as a post-doc or a post-graduate trainee. Provost Kornbluh added that departments may form partnerships in the recruiting process.

In response to a question, Bryant-Friedrich said that the description of the program would be in accord with the language in the state of Michigan's constitution regarding discrimination. The program is targeted for people from historically marginalized groups and people from underserved socio-economic groups.

Bryant-Friedrich said that the first 2 years would be at the post-graduate level. Then the person would be transitioned into a tenure-track line. There will have to be clear guidelines. We need a holistic perspective because we want to make sure that we are doing everything to transition the person to be successful. The language states that the person will be transitioned into a tenure-track position, not that the person will be considered for a tenure-track position. Kornbluh added that the program will give the recruits clear information on what they need to do to transition to a tenure-track position. Once the proposals are chosen, the process would go to the typical department hiring committee for tenure-track faculty. The goal is that five searches will be carried out every year for 5 years.

Beale stated that faculty in a unit where a proposal is being submitted should be required to approve the proposal *before* it is submitted to the vetting committee. Otherwise the dean in a non-departmentalized college or a chair in a departmentalized college could send it forward without faculty approval, which could result in a problem for the guarantee of a tenure-track position upon satisfaction of the set criteria. Kornbluh and Bryant-Friedrich agreed this step must be added to the process.

Noreen Rossi asked if individuals currently at the university could apply for the positions or would the positions only be posted for external hire. Kornbluh said the positions would be posted for a national search but someone already at the university could apply. Beale suggested that this needs to be stated clearly in the posting and all information about the program.

Ricardo Villarosa asked about the formal classification. Kornbluh said it would be a title that is appropriate to the particular discipline. Most would be post docs, some would be visiting assistant professors or another appropriate classification.

5. <u>Relationship between the Graduate Council and the Academic Senate</u>: Beale stated that there are various issues on which the Graduate Council acts that are not only graduate issues but are broader educational policy issues. Such issues should be sent from the Graduate Council to the Academic Senate before they are sent to the administration. The Senate is also in the process of considering needed changes to its bylaws, though it is somewhat behind the Graduate Council in the process. One change might be to explicitly state in our bylaws that the educational policy role of the Academic Senate requires that educational policies developed by the administration's Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Council or by the Graduate Council come to the Academic Senate prior to their being sent to the President and, if appropriate Board of Governors. Bryant-Friedrich noted that the Graduate School has sent proposed revisions to its bylaws to the members of the Graduate Council for a vote in January, but has not proposed changes to the interaction of the Grad Council and the Senate.

   Brad Roth mentioned that some years ago when new graduate faculty standards were promulgated by the Graduate Council, there was strong resistance from the Graduate School dean and the Graduate Council to our position that the change was an issue on which the Academic Senate had the right to act. Board of Governors statutes clearly state that such issues are within the jurisdiction of the Academic Senate. Roth hoped a similar conflict would not occur in the future. Dean Bryant-Friedrich wants to avoid that type of conflict and thinks it is important how the conversation is carried out. Graduate faculty status is still a contentious issue, and the Dean agrees that the Graduate School has to work with the Senate.

   Beale noted that the Senate is charged with dealing with broad educational policies so recommendations on educational policies from the Graduate Council should come to the Senate for action at the plenary, just as General Education reforms come from the committee charged with General Education oversight to the Senate. Bryant-Friedrich and Beale will consider having a place on the agenda of a Senate plenary meeting where the chair of the Graduate Council Executive Committee could make a report to the Senate.

6. <u>Grading Policy</u>: Naida Simon brought to the attention of Policy Committee that the Mathematics Department has a policy in 3 courses (MAT 1070, 1800 and 2010) that the student must achieve a certain percentage on the final exam (60%, 50% and 50%, respectively) to pass the course with at least a C-. Failure to do so will result in a grade no better than a D+ notwithstanding how the student did on previous work. Two students brought the problem to Simon's attention. The course has a group final—i.e., every section takes the same final exam. A student who had done very well in the first two exams earlier in the term flunked the final exam and ended with a grade of D+. If the grades were averaged as was stated in the syllabus, the student would have received a grade of C+. In another section of the same course a student sent an email to Simon stating that she thought the final exam was unfair because topics that were not covered in her section of the class were in the final. Nonetheless, this student did very well because she had taken Calculus I in high school and knew how to answer the questions in the final. For the fall term, the department waived the 50% policy and students were told their grade would be what they received after the final exam without applying the 50% policy.

   Beale saw the issue as a wider problem in multi-section courses that use a common syllabus than the examples given above. If every instructor did not cover the material in the final exam the exam is not fair. If students are graded under a policy that is different from the policy stated

in the syllabus, it is not fair. Beale noted that if there a single exam for multi-section courses, the instructors should all be required to verify that they have covered all the material in the exam. The policy for exams must be consistent with the syllabus. Simon looked at the grades for the two sections; half of the students in each section failed with marks of D, F, or W. When the grades were changed many more students passed. Many of the students had an A going into the final based on their EAA grade.

Noreen Rossi said that at the Medical School each faculty member who taught a course picks questions for the final from a question bank. They check that the material was covered in that particular class of a course. She thought that might be a good solution to the problems presented.

Lewis reminded the committee that 6 or 7 years ago the math general education requirement was put on hiatus for a significant period because of such issues. The course instructors need ongoing professional development. It is a much bigger problem than having a formula of what is in the syllabus and whether it is consistent across all sections of a course. We need to go back to first principles and think more broadly about what it means to get an education. What does it mean to learn math and for what purpose and how do you demonstrate that knowledge? Are our instructors adequate for the students and are they looking for them to learn? Many instructors of multi-section courses do not have an education in instruction.

Beale noted that in working on student success, we have to look at the programs and see, especially in multi-section courses, if we are doing what we should be doing. Lewis suggested that Senate members could have a discussion of what it means to be educated in the 21st century. Beale commented that the Curriculum and Instruction, Faculty Affairs, and Student Affairs Committees might consider running a symposium around the issue.

Simon also noted that there were continuing issues around course modality. A synchronous course is a course with all instruction and all exams, including the final exam, online. The class has a specific timeframe. A hybrid course is one where some classes or exams are online and some in person. Nonetheless, the registrar has made exceptions where courses listed as sync course have been allowed to schedule in-person exams. This is not fair to students who signed up for sync courses not expecting to have to travel to campus. The problem may be that faculty are not clear about the differences between the modalities and the need to determine in advance if they want an in-person exam for an otherwise sync course (which converts it to a hybrid course).

7. Ad Hoc Senate Committee on Student Data Privacy: Beale asked PC members to send her nominations of people to serve on and chair this ad hoc committee.

8. Ad Hoc Senate Committee on Anti-Bullying: Policy Committee received the committee's Statement of Values and recommendations to discourage bullying behaviors. These will be on the agenda for the February 2 plenary session. Brad Roth will work with Jennifer Wareham to draft a resolution to be put before the Senate for action.

9. The Future of Higher Education: The Senate standing committees discussed what they saw as the future of higher education post-pandemic and wrote various reports that have been shared with the Policy Committee. Beale indicated she would do an initial draft combining the various statements of concern, opportunity and recommendations into a Senate report that can be put on the agenda for the February 2 plenary session. The Senate-approved report would be sent to President Wilson, Provost Kornbluh, and the members of the Board of Governors. It can be

advisory to the Provost and the Vice President for Finance and Business Operations as the strategic plan is implemented.

10. <u>February 2 Plenary Session</u>: The agenda for the meeting was revised to limit the number of topics covered so that the Pathway to Faculty program can be adequately covered. It was noted that nominations are being accepted to fill the seat on the Policy Committee left vacant when Kelly Dormer resigned from the Senate.

Approved with amendments at the January 24, 2022 Policy Committee meeting.