WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

ACADEMIC SENATE

PROCEEDINGS OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE

February 22, 2021

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

Guests: Loraleigh Keashly, Tim Michael, Sharon Lean, Sarah Doyle, Anna Miller, Bonnie Wu

1. CAMPUS CHILDCARE COMMITTEE UPDATE

Associate dean Loraleigh Keashly thanked Policy for inviting members of the childcare committee to attend. The Academic Senate worked to have a substantial childcare survey done in 2014-15, which led to recognition of unmet needs and the university committee that currently exists. The committee conducted a second survey that provides information on pre-pandemic, pandemic, and post-pandemic needs. The focus of the presentation is post-pandemic data. More than 5000 faculty, staff and students participated in the survey, with a third of the sample having children under the age of 18 at home. The committee focused primarily on families with children up to five years old, since that came out as a high need from the original survey and committee work. Families with older children, though, do have significant needs.

Beale noted that the slide showed percentages by each responding group, making it difficult to get a sense of the overall need. Keashly responded that the report from the Center for Urban Studies, which conducted the survey, is huge and has not bee completed digested, but there are additional groupings of data that can be done. She indicated she would send the slide set to Beale for the Senate records.

Keashly noted that 17% of the sample were single parents, the majority of which are women (19% of student responders, 10% of faculty, and 18% of staff). There was also data regarding children with special needs, since they require more specific (and expensive) childcare options. Keashly showed slides reflecting the various kinds of care (home-based, after-school, drop-in, etc.) that each group wanted. Beale again found that difficult to assess as presented. It seems clear, though, that students are most interested in drop-in care. Keashly agreed. They found that what was in use before the pandemic and what people are interested in now has changed: there is increased interest in co-working spaces and drop-ins and in-home care. Beale asked whether the difference between own-home care and home-based care was that the latter is care provided in a relative or other person's home. Keashly said yes, often a parent or relative but also one of the home-based care sites regulated by the state.

Another question in the survey was what amount of childcare would be needed. The majority want full-day care, but after-school care remains a significant need as well. Employees are also interested in evening and even overnight care. As for their biggest concern regarding childcare and returning to campus, several themes stood out: availability of affordable care; pandemic protection, managing responsibilities, quality care while learning virtually, flexibility of work schedules. The cost is clearly one of the most important issues. There are free programs, and students are the ones most likely to be aware of, and take advantage of, those programs. There are significant numbers of staff and students

who do not know about the possible subsidies. Nonetheless, about a third of the respondents indicated that they did not anticipate having to pay for childcare. Presumably that is because they have somebody at home who can provide the care or they already have access to one of the free programs. The group has not yet analyzed that answer in detail to see whether there is a change from pre-pandemic or what kind of childcare that group is using. Nonetheless about 60% of students and almost 660% of staff said that managing the cost of childcare is difficult for them. Not surprisingly, student said if they had access to more childcare they would be able to spend more time studying and get their degree sooner, while staff said that they would be more comfortable working more and more likely to get promotions.

Emergency and sick care was another significant issue. Two thirds of respondents said that they stayed home if a child was sick, with employees using sick leave, vacation time, compensatory time or making an arrangement with a supervisor to make up the time. Students and staff both indicated days missed or late arrivals

because of this issue. That can be disruptive for them and for the institution.

The survey asked if people were aware of the various partnerships and initiatives on campus, but a sizeable proportion do not know about these opportunities, from flexible spending accounts to Family Medical Leave Act to the employee assistance program. The university's "children in the workplace" policy is not helpful (https://policies.wayne.edu/appm/3-0-13-children-in-the-workplace). Most people do not know that the university has a policy. It was enacted in April 2016 and undergoes its five-year review this year. But it does not permit employees to bring children unless the day is specifically designated as appropriate for that purpose. There is a childcare resources website that is a direct product of the committee and is getting considerable traffic (https://wayne.edu/childcare-resources).

The survey also asked about Merrill Palmer Skillman and the College of Education's early childhood center program: about one-third knew of the former and one-quarter knew of the latter. This is not surprising, since each of these centers can handle only small numbers of children: the demand far outstrips the capacity. At this point, the committee is in conversations with the Woodbridge Neighborhood Development Corporations that owns a decommissioned Detroit Public school building. They are interested in including a childcare center in the renovated building. Tim Michael explained that the building is on Hancock--west of Trumbull, just one block south of Warren.

In summary, Keashly noted that there is a strong need for toddler (0-5) care and after-school care. The special needs children are an important consideration because of their unique requirements and financial cost. People always ask whether we are going to get a childcare center on campus, but that will not meet all the needs. Most do not have flexibility with infant care, because of the state regulations or for part-time schedules with drop-ins. Beale asked whether there are slots for children with special needs requirements in the area at this time. Anna Miller responded that the main means of addressing those needs is through the public school system. If students come into a pre-school program, teachers may refer them to an assessment for an early special education program. Even if someone works at the university and has a child in a program near work but live in Macomb County, they must go to that school district for the evaluation of any developmental delays or disabilities. Helping parents navigate this is challenging. Beale added that if people think it is not being addressed, it could be because there are no appropriate resources or because they do not know how to locate them. Keashly noted that was a good question and the committee should identify those places with the greatest resources.

Beale noted that the original discussion several years ago at Policy was that there should be here, as on a number of other public university campuses of our size, a better childcare option for students and employees that would include drop-in, younger kids, and after-school. Have you given up on that idea

or decided that it is not appropriate, or have you decided that it is not achievable? Keashly answered that people have different needs so one childcare solution will not solve all problems. Her goal is to provide information about the different options available. Clearly there are benefits of having a childcare friend/family supportive campus. The impact on employees and students is clear, and appropriate childcare would facilitate better engagement of university members.

The last slide covers next steps that the committee would like to bring about. First is revision of the children in the workplace policy, and the committee has set up a meeting with Carolyn Hafner at HR to discuss this issue. Before the pandemic, flexible work schedules were difficult, but now people have realized that folks can in fact do their jobs from home and want choices about days of work. Villarosa noted the discussion in the HR Restart committee about those issues as well. Keashly added that concern for co-working spaces has grown in part because of the realization of changes that may be permanent. The College of Education has identified space to be opened as a co-working space, and Sharon Lean and Sarah Doyle are heading the co-working space working group. The group asked the Council of Deans to consider what possibilities for co-working spaces may exist in the spaces they control. That may be an early win in this area. Beale asked which groups are most interested in co-working spaces: she assumed it might be more a desire of graduate students and staff, versus faculty or undergraduate students. That was one of the problems with the data, which do not seem to distinguish between graduate and undergraduate students even though one would expect they have different needs.

A second step is connecting those with needs with those who can provide for that need. That is the purpose of the Childcare Resources website. The committee is also exploring with Rob Thompson of C&IT the creation of an app that can allow people to connect. Michigan has one called "family helpers" app that is only open to University of Michigan people. People can post services or offer arrangements for sharing. It may be best for the university to develop its own app. There is also another app called Komae, that facilitates connections among parents in a community. There are also care provider services such as cure.com, collegenannies.com.

Another recommendation is to create a childcare coordinator position that would be aware of funding options and community resources. There was such a position in the 1970s. It would signal that the university cares about these issues. Beale suggested that this kind of information would also be appropriate for an Ombuds role.

A further recommendation is to develop the partnership with Woodbridge if possible. Creating some funds to subsidize childcare is another recommendation, perhaps through reimbursement up to a certain amount annually. There is a Bold Moves proposal from Rebecca Sokol on that issue. Her vision is to raise sufficient money to provide free childcare for a pilot group of about 250 student families. Perhaps the union negotiations can also include some support for childcare in this way. Parrish asked whether the group had developed any budget "ask" along these lines for any of these recommendations. Keashly said not but understood that it would be helpful to develop a budget. Beale noted that if there isn't information on the size of commitment needed, it is hard to get the university to focus. Simon asked whether the committee had considered that a childcare subsidy could reduce a student's financial aid. Clabo agreed that it is important to quantity this so that it is not merely a statement of values but a specific request for a budget. Beale added that cost-of-attendance calculations will come into play for financial aid, but it might be possible to show that students with families have a higher cost-of-attendance because of their childcare needs. It is generally possible to customize cost of attendance. Fitzgibbon asked whether peer institutions have information about the impact of a childcare subsidy on financial aid. Keashly noted that an HR staff at Michigan has been helpful and that they have a reimbursement provision for some students. Beale thought it was a question of adequately establishing

the cost of attendance. Villarosa suggested that budget modeling would need to consider students and faculty who want only a partial week.

Rossi asked whether there is any information whether students have dropped out because of lack of adequate childcare. That would be something that would attract donors, when we are trying to create greater equity at the university. Keashly noted that there have been national studies showing student parents cut back, take longer to degrees, or stop altogether.

Lean added that she had been involved with the issue since the original committee that the Senate created and through Graduate Council. There has been a "budget neutral" mandate to the committee. Having a professional person as coordinator would help move this forward. The tasks would include navigation and maintaining the website, but also moving the ideas forward. Parrish suggested that President Wilson might be supportive but yet may not take the step of providing actual budgetary support.

Provost Clabo thanked the Childcare Committee members for their helpful presentation on the survey data.

[Members of the Childcare Committee left the meeting.]

2. SJAC POLICING SUBCOMMITTEE

Bonnie Wu served as the Senate representative to the SJAC Policing Subcommittee. She reported that the committee began meeting at the end of July and held weekly meetings for a few months, ending in November 2020. There were eleven members. The group was chaired by Victor Green, Director of Community Relations, and included Chief Holt, Senate representative Associate Professor Bonnie Wu, Chair of the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice and Professor Brad Smith (appointed by President Wilson), a representative of the TRIO office, two community members, a representative from the Office of General Counsel, a Student Senate representative, and Marquita Chamblee, ex officio. A draft report was distributed to committee members for comments, but the final report was not shared with committee members, so it is not clear whether the comments were incorporated. Accordingly, Wu's report is based on the draft rather than the final report. She added that there were parts of the draft report that had not even been discussed by the SJAC policing subcommittee.

The charge to the committee was quite broad: to examine current policies, procedures, practices of the campus police (quoting part of the charge as: "examination of current policies, procedures and practices of Wayne State law enforcement officers, exploration of engagement of the Wayne State police department with the campus community as well as the external communities surrounding the campus, and making recommendations for positive engagement with these communities"). That could take a full academic year to do, so it was not possible for the committee to evaluate every single policy. That led to the first recommendation that the campus police should undergo regular accreditation by the Michigan Association of Police Chiefs. Policing scholars tend to view this accreditation as a benchmark of police professionalism. Accreditation includes a review of departmental policies and procedures, to see if they comply with best practices and a visit every three years to determine if the police are abiding by their own rules and procedures, in order to ensure professionalism.

The second recommendation was to enhance and improve the role of the Campus Safety Advisory Council. Most people are not aware that the group exists or informed about its charge. The SJAC subcommittee recommended that there be information prominently displayed on the university's

website about the Council and its duties. Further, the committee noted that the Campus Safety Advisory Council was designated by the Board to serve as the campus police oversight committee under the Michigan statute passed in the 1990s. Nonetheless, it does not comply with that statute: the statute requires an elected membership comprised of two faculty, two students, and two staff and charges the group with oversight of complaints. The SJAC policing subcommittee recommended that the Board statute be revised to comply with state law and that the Council be expanded to include two community members, since the campus police patrol areas outside campus such as Woodbridge.

Beale noted that the Campus Safety Advisory Council includes various officers of the university that are not part of the campus police oversight committee under the statute. That creates a problem because the oversight committee was intended to be independent of the police and able to review complaints against the police. Beale had discussed this issue with President Wilson, when she insisted that the SJAC Policing Subcommittee needed to have a Senate representative, which Wilson's and Wright's emails had originally not included for Senate representation. Beale had raised this issue with Jennifer Wareham who spoke with Wilson's faculty appointee to the committee about it and the importance of the subcommittee addressing the issue. Wu noted that was one of the questions she raised about the final draft, because the Campus Safety Advisory Council does *not* have police oversight in its charge. The policing subcommittee, regrettably, did not engage in well-organized discussion, and that issue was particularly unfocused. Much of the discussion was unproductive and meetings were mainly information-sharing about what the department does. Then the report was drafted in a rush to satisfy the deadline, without satisfactory comments and review. hoogland added, as a member of the Campus Safety Advisory Council, that Chief Holt had been explicit in stating that the Council does *not* have an oversight function. He objected vehemently when Student Senate President Stuart Baum said that the Council had been designated by the Board as the oversight committee under the Michigan statute (which is accurate). As Bonnie notes, hoogland continued, the Council just passively listens to reports from administrators and has no say in any way about the way that the campus police operate. Villarosa provided a link to Northern Michigan's "legislatively mandated" oversight committee (https://www.nmu.edu/policedepartment/oversight-committee), and hoogland noted that was similar to what exists at University of Michigan at Flint.

Parrish asked who chaired the Advisory Council. Clabo reminded the group that the discussion was about the SJAC subcommittee's policing recommendations and should not confuse that with the oversight committee. Beale noted that there is no actual oversight committee. After the Michigan legislature enacted a law requiring one, the Board of Governors passed a statute that simply had the existing Campus Police Advisory Council (that had not been meeting, apparently) take on that role, even though it did not comply with the membership required under the Michigan law and did not have a charge to conduct oversight.

Wu added that the policing subcommittee recommended that the Campus Safety Advisory Council hold at least quarterly meetings and that its name be changed to the Campus and Community Safety Advisory Council in consideration of adding community representation. But that Council does not have oversight responsibility, so that issue still remains. Beale indicated that she had hoped the SJAC policing committee would recommend creation of an oversight subcommittee of the Council with the appropriate elected membership as required in the statute to which complaints would come, without the participation in the oversight group of Chief Holt or other administrators not included under the

Michigan statute. She and Stuart Baum had discussed this at some length in the 2019-2020 academic year.

Wu noted that the SJAC policing committee also discussed the citizen complaint process. The website is not user friendly and it is difficult to determine how to make a complaint. The recommendation is a redesign and include a flowchart detailing the complaint process. There should also be a link to the Office of Equal Opportunity for those who wish to file a harassment or discrimination complaint. The SJAC policing committee recommended the department continue to follow its "early warning system" whereby the department would identify problem officers and give progressive discipline and additional training. Beavers commented that without the mandated oversight group, the early warning identifications of problematic officers are a completely internal process of the police department, whereas a genuine oversight committee would provide more awareness about the issues. Wu responded that the Chief provides a report to the Council but it isn't clear how complete those reports are. As a person who is a policing scholar, she thinks that external oversight can be very effective, but internal oversight also can work fairly well because the people care about their supervisors and commanders and what they will think of their performance. There is thus no clearcut evidence that citizen oversight is effective. It is primarily the leadership that makes the difference: if the police chief is progressive, that will get the message across. Beavers agreed that oversight is a kind of "failsafe" that can at least create some awareness outside of the department about procedures and perspectives. Wu agreed that checks and balances are deterrents on police at different levels of managers. Beale worried that the current process is without oversight and does not comply with the Michigan statute, since the Council just passively receives a report from the Chief.

Wu noted that another recommendation was enhanced training in implicit bias, de-escalation, and procedural justice. The report also recommended an evaluation of the depth to which racism has infiltrated the police department: there needs to be ongoing learning about culture and racial sensitiveness and there needs to be accountability and relationship building. The university's HR office should follow how well officers are progressing on those issues.

Another issue addressed was the turnover in the campus police personnel. The department is diverse in hiring and promotion of minorities and women, but many well-trained officers then move to other departments after a few years. Various members suggested there were insufficient data on this issue to include in the report, but it isn't clear whether this recommendation was retained or not. There were also hiring recommendations in the report—to increase recruitment of Detroit residents. Again, there is not sufficient information to know if this recommendation is needed (such as how many officers live in the city; how many lived outside the city when hired).

A final discussion was community outreach. The report draft praised the department for its outreach, including community activities, senior welfare checks, food box delivery, town hall meeting participation and interaction with the Union, Student Senate, Academic Senate, OEO and community groups.

Beale asked whether an issue (discussed with Jennifer Wareham last week) regarding campus police charges being higher for Black student organization events than for white student events had been raised. Wu said there was no discussion of that issue, but the student representative missed some of the key meetings. Beavers asked about facial recognition technology, which is being used on campus. This is something around which the oversight role could be very important, as there is a growing movement

against the technology in the United States. Wu agreed, saying there had been no discussion but as a person from China who has seen the use of cameras in public spaces, she is aware of how detrimental that can be in terms of surveillance. Beale added that makes the point about the need for a genuine campus police oversight committee even stronger, whether it is a subcommittee of the existing Campus Safety Advisory Council or a separate committee. It does need to be established as required in the Michigan statute. Beale suggested that the Policy Committee consider this further, perhaps with the goal of drafting a resolution to go before the Senate asking the President and Board of Governors to create a genuine oversight committee.

Provost Clabo thanked Professor Wu for her helpful report on the SJAC policing subcommittee's draft recommendations.

[Associate Professor Wu left the meeting.]

3. P.C. PROCEEDINGS FEBRUARY 15, 2021

The committee deferred approval of the proceedings of the 15th to email, since not all members had a chance to review the minutes.

4. REPORT FROM THE CHAIR
   a. Public Health News. Positivity in the city of Detroit is down to 2.9%. On average, in the last 10 days on campus, our positivity rate is less than 0.2%. Last week we had two confirmed cases all week and three presumptive cases. This is the lowest number we've had in any week so things continue to be moving in the right direction. Again, our testing pipeline is wide open. We just got 32,000 antigen kits, plus we have the rapid PCR testing in 45 minutes on campus. There is no expense to faculty and staff and students. As for the vaccine, there is no change: we still have no new vaccine doses. This is happening elsewhere, as Dr. Schlissel sent out to the U of M campus yesterday saying, that they have none and do not expect any in the foreseeable future. The Detroit Health Department requests that university people go to TCF. At the moment, it is clearly not the city's priority to get vaccine to Wayne State: they are r focused on the mass vaccination efforts. Parrish asked if only Detroit residents can use the TCF. Clabo answered that students or those in clinical practice in Detroit can, but otherwise people should go to their county of residence. The governor did drop the age to 60 with comorbidity conditions.
   b. Funding for the Social and Behavioral Determinants of Health. Clabo noted that the funding in the Provost's Office from Provost Whitfield's commitments for small research seed grants is $60,000 for 2021, $50,000 for 2021 and $50,000 for 2023. A few deans have added some additional money, bringing seed grants for 2021 to $70,000.
   c. Centers. Clabo is meeting with each of the deans and checking websites to collect all references to centers and then make sure it is consistent with the definition in the statute. She added that her understanding is that centers that fall under the Board of Governors statute have an independent operating budget, so in her view a center of excellence within a school/college that does not have an independent operating budget doesn't fall under the statute. She agrees that it is important to follow the appropriate processes, so they are gathering dates of charters, last review, etc. Beale noted the documents she had provided to Clabo regarding centers in 2011-12 indicating the establishment of staggered terms for the CIAC review committees, with three members appointed annually so that there would not be a need to establish an entirely new committee each time from

which panels could be drawn. We need to restart those appointments, either this semester or for sure before the fall 2021 term.

5. <u>REPORT FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT</u>
    a. <u>STEM UROP Program</u>. Beale noted that she had asked Steve Lanier for further information about the program he'd announced but had received no response.
    b. <u>Commencement</u>. The university plans a virtual commencement ceremony for May 5, but parts will be recorded in early March. Since they are only recording a single speech for all the groups, she requested that Brad Roth represent the Senate if he was willing: he will be known by more students. He has agreed to do so, if they will provide regalia and if the taping will be adequately socially distanced.
    c. <u>Pay Gap Committee</u>. The Senate representative to the committee has written indicating that Kim Morgan wants the committee to meet again. This discussion began at the Senate and union but was ultimately incorporated into a committee under the presidential Committee on the Status of Women. Beavers mentioned that there had been a Google poll: his sense was that Morgan planned to ask the committee to write a statement to go to the administration and the union for consideration during the contract negotiations. Policy members discussed this idea and concluded that it would be inappropriate for either the Senate representatives (and, according to Union representatives in Policy, the Union representatives) to participate in such a statement at this time. The committee has already provided its recommendations, and both sides are aware of them. The Union representatives will make that clear if the committee does meet. Beale will write the Senate representative to be sure that he understands that this is the Senate's position on this matter as well.

6. <u>Graduate School Grading Policy</u>. Beale shared the document from the Graduate School regarding the plan to put in place for this winter term the same grading policy adopted for last fall. Essentially, they will receive a regular grade but have the option of taking a "no pass" if their program agrees to this approach. Beavers asked whether most programs adopted the grading policy. Beale said that she understood there were a few that did not, and relatively few students took the option. Law had a slightly different policy for LL.M. students, which apparently the Graduate School allowed. Villarosa asked what Law was doing about J.D. grading this term, and Beale responded that there has been no decision of which she is aware at this point. Her students appear to want grades rather than the pass/no credit mandate. The committee approved the grading policy unanimously.

7. <u>Senate March 3 Agenda</u>. Beale noted that the Graduate Dean had agreed to attend the plenary at 1:30 to talk about the challenges and opportunities for the Graduate School. Amanda's presentation will be useful. The draft agenda had suggested inviting Loraleigh on the childcare committee's ideas, so Beale asked what the committee's views were on that at this point. Most felt that the presentation of the survey information would raise more questions than it could answer. Clabo noted that the Childcare Committee received helpful feedback today about quantifying some of the requests and prioritizing. The group concluded that the item will not be retained for the Academic Senate plenary session agenda.

    The other item for the Senate is a Senate statement about the DEI Council proposal. This is regrettably drafted in ways that make it appear as a substitute for the Senate on a range of educational policy issues that we deal with all the time—from hiring and retention metrics for faculty to recruitment, retention, graduation and underrepresented minority metrics for students. The worry is not any advisory capacity the Council may have, but rather the call for an executive committee and a variety of standing committees to "implement" recommendations and "develop" metrics that are clearly educational policy items. Beale suggested that the Policy Committee needs to draft a statement that can be presented and voted on at the March 3 plenary session. Beale asked members to consider what kind of careful statement we might ask the Senate to pass. The DEI Council will likely function as an advisory

committee to Marquita Chamblee, though it may be too large and somewhat awkward to function well that way. Roth noted that the most worrisome idea in the proposal is that the Council would "implement" ideas. Beale agreed, adding that the "metrics" proposals were similarly worrisome to her, since discussion at the SJAC suggested that the Council would "establish" metrics—something which is clearly educational policy within the Senate's jurisdiction. The statement will need to reinforce the idea that educational policy issues must come to the Senate for review and recommendation to the President and Board of Governors.