

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
ACADEMIC SENATE

PROCEEDINGS OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE
April 11, 2022

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

Absent With Notice: R. Villarosa

- I. Proceedings of the April 4 Policy Committee Meeting.
The proceedings were approved as revised.

II. REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

Decanal Candidates. Provost Mark Kornbluh reported five College of Engineering dean candidates will be interviewed beginning next week. Four candidates for the MISB dean have been interviewed, with varying feedback, and he is awaiting Policy's memo. He expects to bring a finalist back to campus. Naida Simon suggested we consider some of the good ideas introduced by the candidates.

Master's Enrollment. The provost and Dave Massaron, Senior Vice President of VP Finance & Business Operations, are visiting each school/college to discuss budgets. While we are using one-time funds to avoid cuts this year, it is important that we increase our revenues quickly to avoid cuts in future years. It is encouraging that we have more applications and admissions at the undergraduate level than in the past, but since it is a more competitive market, it will be important to match last year's yield. Master's enrollments are down in every college, with the law school being the only exception. Kornbluh questioned why there has been such a precipitous decline in enrollment, noting this isn't the case nationwide. Beale commented that 30 years ago we had the highest master's enrollment of any public university but apparently grew complacent and non-innovative in recruitments. Simon suggested that companies no longer pay tuition costs for their employees. Fitzgibbon stated lack of a comprehensive marketing program that highlights academics is a problem. Noreen Rossi pointed out that her graduate physiology class is half the size it was last year, but the department does not know what caused the decline. Students not having been able to visit the school or talk to the faculty for the last two years likely had an impact. Beale questioned how we compensate for the lack of in-person interaction. Fitzgibbon referred to the institutional dashboard data showing master's enrollment at 6304 in 2016 and down to 4439 in 2021 and anticipated enrollment for 2022 to be even lower. Kornbluh noted how the dashboard includes part-time and full-time enrollment: engineering has lost its full-time international students, which is the largest financial loss. He welcomed Policy ideas that might help with enrollment for next fall. In addition to the school and college websites, Kornbluh believed a portal with a concierge service was needed for graduate programs to connect prospects with a relevant program director. Rossi agreed, noting complaints from her graduate students having trouble with registration and finding that nobody returns phone calls. This is an easy way to lose prospective students: a central call center for master's students might help. Aubert suggested we accept students too late: prospects have often accepted other offers before we notify them. Kornbluh learned last week that incoming fellowship recipients had not yet been notified, though a response is required by April 15: these notifications should be going out in January or February.

III. REPORT FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT

Wilson Thank You. President Wilson sent Beale a memo thanking the Senate for the report on higher education. He described it as “thorough and well-thought-out” and noted the work that went into it, adding that it will serve as a useful guide as we transition into a different post-pandemic era for higher education.

COVID Booster Shots at CHC. The Campus Health Center will be offering the COVID vaccine booster to current students, faculty and staff ages 50 years and older or 18 years and older and moderately to severely immunocompromised if it has been at least four months since a first COVID-19 booster.

Faculty and Staff Concerns about Open Houses without Masking. Various faculty and staff have noted their concerns about being required to attend enclosed events, such as open houses and orientations, that allow student applicants who are not vaccinated or masked to attend. They note that if vaccinations are currently required and planned for fall on-campus activity, it seems unreasonable not to have some protections in place for those who work these events. Aubert noted that having masks optional when some are unvaccinated puts our staff at risk. Advisors are concerned because that orientation takes place in small labs. Lewis suggested at least having unvaccinated individuals be required to wear a mask. Aubert asked whether the mask requirement applies for these events in classrooms and labs as it does for current students. Beale emphasized that it would not be unreasonable to have student applicants wear a mask to these events unless there is a specific statement for an event to the contrary. Kornbluh will follow up. He also noted that Clabo can provide an overview from the health committee at the May plenary.

IV. COMMUNICATIONS AND REQUIRED ACTIONS

A. Academic Year 2022-23 Tuition Rates Discussion

Kornbluh described the challenge of developing a budget for next year without cuts and asked for Policy support for a tuition increase. He discussed Massaron’s materials demonstrating the compounding of income from annual tuition increases (or negative impact from lack of any tuition increases). This has been discussed with the Board of Governors in executive session to help them see the importance of tuition increases accompanied by financial aid increases (what used to be called “Board of Governors Financial Aid”). The state has authorized universities to increase tuition up to 5%. Most of the regionals’ CFOs are increasing tuition by 4.5%. The draft budget has a 4.5% increase for all tuition except the medical school, which will have a 1.5 % increase with the same percentage for in state and out-of-state tuition. Need-based aid will increase both at the main campus and medical school.

Beale said it was hard to argue against a tuition increase given the current inflationary pressures. We have customarily had increases in the past (ranging from about 2.5% - 4%), and if there is a commensurate financial aid increase, most faculty and staff will likely be supportive. Lewis questioned whether student metrics suggest such an increase will affect enrollment. Kornbluh said we will remain at the same price of the more popular regionals and below the two R1 universities, noting that competition is not the problem. The increase will make it more expensive for students who can afford to pay but will not raise the cost for those who receive the maximum need-based aid. Beavers noted that for some, Massaron’s slide about the compounding effect of tuition rates may not be persuasive, but he thinks it should be persuasive to the Board of Governors who need to think long term. We can’t postpone an increase without feeling a severe impact, especially in a state that is not inclined to support this university.

Kornbluh said the Health Affairs Committee discussed a 1.5% increase for both in-state and out-of-state medical school tuition. He thinks that the medical school's \$9 million financial aid compensates adequately, especially since the medical out-of-state tuition remains considerably lower than Michigan State's \$85,000, so it is not out of line with the market. Rossi agreed that the medical school decision to hold tuition steady for several years was a significant negative, but suggested any increase needs to be carefully messaged, to make clear that it will be accompanied by increases for those receiving aid. Beale noted that Policy had supported a switch to increase the out-of-state tuition by the same dollar amount as in-state tuition, rather than the same percentage, in the past. There was concern that our out-of-state tuition was too high, causing a potential LCME problem: while in-state students had fairly low debt, the out-of-state students had very high debt. The Board of Governors ended up doing an out-of-state tuition reduction. Kornbluh said this year it was proposed to increase both modestly and then to look at this issue further.

Aubert asked the provost to clarify the 4.5% dollar amount increase for need-based aid. Kornbluh explained as tuition goes up 4.5%, the need-based aid (but not the merit-based aid) will increase the same amount. There will continue to be merit-based fellowships and scholarships. There would be a net increase here but no added costs to students with significant need. Aubert commented that certain price points cause students to decide not to come to college. Some of her students are taking on debt and are food insecure, even when there is money for need-based aid. Beale noted articles she had read stated that slightly higher increases in tuition, more comparable to area elite schools, may suggest to parents and students that the higher priced institution is a better one, which can also attract students. It's not going to attract low-income students, of course, which is why we must increase financial aid for them.

Kornbluh spoke in favor of the strong pathways that have been built with regional community colleges. We market to high school students to attend a two-year community college and come here to get a degree, addressing the price differential. We are doing more need-based aid for community college graduates. We advertise broadly to high school students and at community colleges. Students in a major program at Henry Ford Community College or Schoolcraft College have our major information and know what classes to take. Aubert suggested that the articulation agreements with the community colleges work well: faculty and staff work with their advisors. Kornbluh added that is why we have the largest number of two-year transfer students in the state and the goal is to expand that.

Kornbluh summarized by noting that the average debt of our students is \$22,000, a very low amount compared to other institutions. The university cannot continue to operate without added investment in our facilities, which is not being covered now. We need to bring in more students who can pay, and we need to elect different legislators who will support higher education in the state.

Members also discussed related problems. Rossi suggested putting effort into helping students finish sooner. Even though they are working, they could cut one semester off by being more intense. That is six months of earning money in your field. Lewis commented that the university focusses on tuition and marketing, issues that are external to the actual education experience, when students' actual experience is not always what they hoped for. She recommended putting more energy into creating a better experience for students because that reputation precedes us. Roth said it's hard to generalize about students' experiences. He has heard the opposite from students: they consider the advertising of the institution to be poor, in that the things we do really well are not reflected there. Lewis acknowledged that there are amazing things at the university,

but basic procedures for admissions and financial aid are poorly handled. There are also scheduling issues, since students cannot plan well since it is not clear what classes will be offered in future terms. Updating our teaching is also necessary. Beale added that these internal problems do hinder students, whether it is being shuffled from one person to another or not being able to plan a coherent schedule because we publish schedules at the last minute before registration for each term. She gave an example of a student needing to pay on an installment plan, knowing there was one, but not being able to locate information about one on the website or find the correct person to talk to about initiating one. The student received multiple third-party emails, but no real information. Beale had to go to David Strauss for assistance for the student. Simon provided a similar anecdote of a student with a payment plan who was inappropriately charged late fees because the payment plan had been based on the old tuition rate. It took intervention to remove the late fees.

B. Research Misconduct Policy Revisions proposed by Research Committee.

Rossi brought the results of the Research Committee's consideration of research misconduct procedures to Policy for discussion. When Policy gave the topic to Research to consider, it suggested that our policy was defective because the same person ultimately controlled both the investigative phase and the hearing phase, resulting in the possibility of bias and bringing new charges into the hearing phase that had not actually been part of the investigative phase. Beale described the Research Committee's recommendation as instead providing an oversight step for each phase of a research misconduct inquiry: as each phase is completed, an oversight panel looks at it to see if there was bias. The Research Committee members felt this was preferable, since there would likely be insufficient expertise on the detailed issues to have separate expert panels for the investigation and hearing. Somebody in physics, she said, would have difficulty reviewing issues in microbiology to determine whether the data had been manipulated, invented or plagiarized. Rossi contrasted the situation here, where there are 50 in internal medicine, with the University of Michigan, which has 769 in their internal medicine department alone and would clearly have a large number of people to serve on the two different phases of misconduct review.

There is, nonetheless, a problem with the current research misconduct policy, since the Research Integrity Officer (RIO) is involved throughout and that office is essentially self-policing. If there were a person in the office who was biased or unfair, the procedures provide no real protections to the accused faculty or staff member. The Research Committee considered that a panel could be selected for oversight to ensure that the process was fair. Such an oversight panel would not require expertise in the particular research field, but it would be there to ensure a fair and equitable procedure. If the inquiry committee says that the matter should proceed to a hearing, the RIO should not be able to block further procedures without that process oversight review supporting that decision. Similarly, if the hearing concludes that nothing untoward happened, the deciding officer (DO) (currently Steve Lanier, VP for Research) should not be able to proceed with sanctions that override that conclusion.

Beale asked if she understood the recommendation correctly: under the draft, it appears that the oversight panel would come in at the end of each of the two phases and review the process, making a recommendation both times to the provost. Rossi said that was the way the Research Committee envisioned the process working. Beale noted that raised another issue, since at this time the provost is not involved in the research misconduct process: the DO and RIO and inquiry and investigative committees are all within the OVPR, with the VP for Research having final deciding power. Such a change would likely require some statutory provision for oversight. It appears this issue requires further discussion.

Rossi added that some of the matters in the current policy are set outside the institution. Both the RIO and DO are required to report certain types of misconduct to the Office of Research Integrity (ORI) in Washington, D.C. Another concern of the Research Committee was that a failure of those officers to make those reports may not be visible to anyone. Rossi added that there are some things that may be misconduct but are not reported to ORI. That is set by ORI and there is nothing we can do about that.

Beale agreed that both failures to report and carrying a matter further than justified because of bias are problematic. According to the bylaws, when Policy asks a standing committee for a report and has questions on the report received, Policy must send a written statement back to the committee noting its concerns and ask the committee to consider how to address the additional issue. Beale suggested a Policy subgroup meet to determine what to ask research. Roth asked Beale if there was anyone on the law faculty that would be able to assist. Beale said she would consult with Kathy White, who has experience in dealing with these issues. This likely means that the research misconduct policy changes will not be ready for the May plenary session.

C. May Plenary Agenda.

Beale reviewed the must-do agenda items: approval of the proceedings, reports from the chairs of standing committees, and President Wilson's year-end report. She noted the value of having a COVID update from Dean Clabo, and her willingness to provide that. The group decided it was likely too early to have an update on university research and core facilities on the agenda, since we still have not been able to have the discussion with OVPR at Policy. In addition, the questions about the research misconduct policy mean it should wait until the fall. The Code of Conduct issue will depend on the Provost's further discussion with OGC, the graduate faculty issue will also depend on further discussion with the Graduate School, and the Center Review Proposal (item D, below) may also not be ready.

D. Making the Center Review Process More Substantive.

Policy supports the idea of making the review process more substantive by adding a step prior to the review by Policy or the Provost of requiring a review of the self-study by experts (either internal to Wayne State but not connected to the center under review or external to Wayne State and not connected to the center under review). Ideally, this review step would apply to centers reviewed by both the CIAC-I and CIAC-II committees. Kornbluh will draft a proposal for discussion, and Policy can also raise the issue with Lanier when he visits the Policy committee. It is unlikely that this proposal will be ready for the May plenary.

E. Charter for the Center for Emerging and Infectious Diseases.

Beale prefaced her criticisms of the report with a statement that Policy will almost certainly support issuance of a full charter to the Center, but she added that the charter approval process should bring clarity to a number of issues that show in the self-study report. She had focused on the executive summary and various sections most relevant to evaluating the work of the Center. There seem to be a number of short-comings in the material provided. For example, we usually want to know about the existence of similar centers in other R1 universities, but this self-study does not mention such centers though it did claim to be Michigan's first center in an urban setting. Beale was also struck by the multiple areas of "focus" claimed for the center: she wondered if the center can achieve such diverse goals consistently and whether the center education and training goals were already activities that the medical school itself was undertaking. Because the medical school is so complex, these issues are difficult to evaluate. For example, the charter describes an activity undertaken in 2019 through 2020

as though it were an activity of the center, yet there was not even a temporarily chartered center until 2021. The study also provided a budget for the Sapphire grant, but it did not even include a useful budget for the center (not even for the first year just ended of its temporary charter). The executive summary stated that the center receives money from the medical school, but it does not say how much, for how long, or whether it is one-time funding or long-term funding. This makes the lack of clarity about actual center undertakings (versus already planned activities on existing grants or through the medical school) problematic: it simply is not clear what the center actually adds to the mix.

Rossi commented on the mention of a memorandum of understanding (MOU), but she noted that the documents were not attached to the proposal and was not sure that they actually exist at this time. Beale assumed this referred to MOUs that the university already has in place but may not specifically benefit this particular center or its functions. Rossi also wondered whether the other entities “participating” in the center are contributing physical plant or laboratories and whether the various directors of the center hold faculty or administrative positions at the university.

Kornbluh agreed it was very hard to discern the difference between the center’s mission and the School of Medicine’s mission. He suggested that Policy prepare a memo in which we request a concise explanation of functions uniquely carried out by the center as part of its mission, as well as the budget and resource information showing amounts from the university and outside entities.

F. Voluntary Faculty Appointments.

In the context of noting the lack of clarity of individuals who might have a role in the center, Rossi raised a concern about the difficulty of determining who serve as voluntary faculty in the medical school, since the faculty in departments do not approve them. Typically, chairs sign off on without any discussion with faculty: even departmental staff do not know who is serving. There is apparently no master list. The Office of Faculty Affairs has attempted to provide a list because we are supposed to evaluate them on a periodic basis. There are currently full-time affiliates who will be sent registered letters from the Department of Medicine asking them to respond or face termination. Kornbluh asked if the status of voluntary faculty has a time limit. Rossi responded that renewals are not always reviewed on a regular basis: it is a matter that must be clarified. Because of the imperative to have more places for students to go, last year the School of Medicine asked that the Department of Medicine approve 300 physicians from MHP, a physician’s group in southeast Michigan, as voluntary faculty: the request stated that the chair approval was sufficient, without any faculty committee review. Kornbluh asked whether the chairs should at minimum be required to report such contracts to departmental appointments committees and the medical school’s faculty senate executive committee. Rossi presumed that such appointments do go through the executive committee, though she was not certain, but added that her concern is that chair approval may mean failure to do an adequate background check. In one case, she merely googled one of the voluntary faculty she was supposed to approve and discovered the person had been banned for life from Medicare for billing dead people. She wrote a letter addressed to the Office of Faculty Affairs and to the dean at the time suggesting better background checks prior to sending students to work with voluntary faculty who might have questionable ethics. She recommended cleaning up the roster and establishing a better procedure for appointing and tracking voluntary faculty. Kornbluh requested a copy of Rossi’s letter so he can follow up.

G. Student Code of Conduct Proposal (OGC revision).

Policy discussed the suggested revisions from Office of General Council to the ad hoc committee's academic misconduct revisions. Beale said the main area of concern is part D under 10.1 and part 4 under 14 in which the OGC suggests that collection of numerical data in school/college reports to the provost is sufficient. That data would merely indicate whether there have been grade modifications by chairs or deans and, if so, how many. It would provide no information on rationales for the overrides of faculty expertise on the questions of cheating and plagiarism within the faculty's field. This goes against the primary goal of revising the statute to ensure that there is real faculty oversight of the process in departments and schools/colleges so that faculty are aware how administrators are handling the incredible discretionary power they currently have in this area.

Roth explained that this was a package deal: the ad hoc committee's demands on process were modest because the primary purpose of the revisions was to create faculty oversight—i.e., to ensure that faculty in departments and schools/colleges know how their administrators are handling grade overrides. Eliminating that oversight provision makes the rest almost meaningless. Kornbluh and Beale both noted that the discretion given to deans to overturn these faculty decisions seems unreasonable, unless there have been real circumstances where faculty have let bias enter into their decisions. Roth said part of the reason why we need the oversight and accounting for cases is to get a better sense of the problem. There are circumstances in which it could be appropriate to overrule a faculty member's decision if the faculty member is engaging in the exercise of a devolved administrative power here, but there is reason to be concerned that chairs and deans have other extraneous considerations that could cause them to be lenient for reasons that don't conform to concern for academic standards. Roth did not understand the OGC justification for not seeing anything other than numbers. Beale commented that her understanding is that other schools provide the nature of the issue and the rationale for the override. Without oversight, the decanal power is enormous, as an incident of cheating in a school several years ago showed when several students worked together and multiple faculty discovered the cheating, but the dean overrode their grade adjustments. Perhaps Policy should push for removing that discretionary power completely. Kornbluh will discuss again with OGC, with the proposal that either oversight is necessary, or the discretionary power should be removed completely. We will still hope to get this issue on the agenda for the next plenary.

Lewis noted the negative consequences that come from a dean overturning a decision of a faculty member and suggested the provost's earlier idea of requiring an independent hearing officer might be a better way to handle this. She wondered if this policy proposal was to address a particular dean. Beale said there have been multiple circumstances in which the issue has been brought to Policy's attention. Even if it happens that a dean overrides a decision because a faculty member's decision was based on prejudice, that is something that the faculty ought to know has happened in their school and that it was an appropriate decision to override. She added if they are given that power, we ought to know when it is exercised, whether for good or bad reasons. Roth added that most of these cases are handled through the informal process: Policy and faculty members in the departments and schools need to have information about that. In the past, it seems to have been assumed that there was no need for due process for faculty in the 10.1.B provisions: the assumption was that the faculty and administrative interests were in sync, so that once the issue came to the dean, the dean would represent that shared interest. That is not necessarily the case.

Policy discussed in this context the mention of the Ombuds office and the current configuration of the "ombudsperson" in the Dean of Students Office, with Naida Simon handling many of the issues. Roth explained that regardless of how the office is configured, there needs to be some

place an accused student can go to get guidance as to how to deal with the problem. Kornbluh suggested we amend the document to provide correct identification. Rossi questioned if an ombudsperson could have other titles. Beale commented that last year Policy asked Interim Provost Clabo to move to a truly independent Ombuds office at the university that could deal with both faculty and student issues, but the idea was rejected. Beale wondered if the Dean of Students Office is the right place for the ombuds role for students because the Dean of Students is necessarily an advocate for students. Simon stated that she is not sure there isn't a conflict of interest. Lewis thought the Student Senate should be involved, suggesting it was unfair to the students to have faculty/staff making decisions. Several members suggested that was a procedure that had been rejected at most universities for some time, because of the legal issues involved in student judicial boards. Kornbluh recommended Simon talk to David Strauss and suggest appropriate terminology for the person who would not be signing anything, but rather explaining the process. Because it is process oriented, he thinks it appropriate that someone within the Dean of Students Office explain the process to students in a fair way.

H. Graduate Faculty Status Proposal at Graduate Council.

Kornbluh stated that he will ask Graduate Dean Amanda Bryant Friedrich to reach out to Beale and set up a meeting to discuss this proposal.

V. REPORTS FROM LIAISONS

Student Affairs Committee. Ahmad Ezzeddine, VP of Academic Student & Global Engagement provided an update on changes within his division. APEX and Warrior VIP will be incorporated into a new program called Warrior 360, directed by Darryl Gardner and Latonia Garrett. Transfer Credit is leaving the Office of the Registrar and moving to Student Success. Darryl Gardner's portfolio will now include Federal TRIO, and Mark Jackson will move from APEX to Federal Trio. Institutional Research and a unit of C&IT will now merge and include data governance. The Student Center Building will report to the Dean of Students Office except for the retail enterprise and summer conferences. The goal is to break down silos to better serve our students and to expand, not reduce, student support beyond what the university currently does. Federal TRIO will be more of a pipeline to central campus. Summer K-12 programs, Math Corps and others will be part of an expanded pipeline to college enrollment at Wayne State. Ezzeddine and his directors need about 30 more days to finalize these changes, including the schools/colleges in the discussion.

Ericka Matthews-Jackson provided an update on fall 2022 FTIAC trends. Submitted applications are up 7% (n=15,055), with 46% of applications test optional (n=6,947). This is holding as steady as last year when 45% of all applications were test optional. Admits are up 5% (n=9,241) but orientation reservations are down 35% and enrollment deposits are also down. The Heart of Detroit Pledge deadline was extended to April 1, 2022, as an unlimited partnership with Detroit Promise. Cathy Kay said that a new scholarship software program called Scholarship Universe (SU), a scholarship-matching tool for admitted students, would better connect student to internal and external scholarships. The SU software will go live this summer, after the launch of a software training library and tutorial. Many other Michigan universities already use this software, and it works well with Banner. FAFSA Fridays will return through July, but FAFSA numbers for incoming students are down. For the 2020-21 academic year there were 30,414 potential and current students; for 2021-22 there were 27,862; but for this year to date there are only 24,974. Congress has increased the maximum Pell grant by \$400 to \$6,895, a 6.2% increase.

Michael Quattro, Direct of Educational Outreach & Transfer Initiatives, spoke about Transfer Initiatives: Supporting Student Success (pre-transfer through completion). For Fall 2022 applications are up 3.63% and admits 2%. The university has an Equity Transfer Initiative with Jackson Community College and Oakland Community College. At Jackson Community College they will stress Business, Public Health, Engineering Tech, Criminal Justice and Mechanical Engineering. They are also working to add Schoolcraft and Washtenaw Community Colleges to the Equity Transfer Initiative. The Transfer Student Success Center (TSSC) will control transfer credit as of April 4, 2022, hire two new transfer advisors (academic services officers), and have both day and night transfer success appointments: a future home remains to be determined. Articulation agreements do not always offer a clear path, so the university needs to let students know what is needed when they transfer. We need to change the narrative to include the student voice; communicate a clear, student-friendly model; create a seamless transition with multiple entry points; foster engagement and collaboration; expand transferability including stackable credentials; and improve communication and tracking. A newsletter will provide updates to transfer students. Staff are continuing to visit community colleges, advising at the community colleges and communicating updates to community college students. Three extension centers (ATEC, Schoolcraft and University Center at Macomb) continue to provide a point of engagement. There will also be Transfer Ambassadors with a Transfer Club and highlighting student spotlights.

Darryl Gardner gave an update on how our graduation rates are trending, as shown in the chart below.

Graduation Rate Gains Over Time

Graduation Rate Gains	2022*	One Year Ago	Two Years Ago	10 Years Ago
Overall	57.4%*	55.8%	51.9%	26.0%
Black Students	36.0%*	34.6%	24.8%	7.6%
Hispanic/Latinx Students	48.4%*	38.4%	35.2%	16.7%
First Gen Students	50.8%*	44.6%	43.0%	18.4%
Low Income Students	51.0%*	47.3%	44.8%	16.1%

*Unofficial based on degrees certified though 3.25.2022. Official graduation rates will be reported in the fall of 2022.