WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

ACADEMIC SENATE

PROCEEDINGS OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE

February 1, 2021

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

1. <u>PC Proceedings December 7, 2020, January 11, 2021, and January 25, 2021</u>

    The proceedings for December 7, 2020, January 11, 2021, and January 25, 2021 were approved as amended.

2. <u>Report from the Chair</u>:
    a. <u>Partial Return to In Person Classes</u>. Today is the date to which remote instruction was extended, with the expectation that in February a limited number of courses that were scheduled for face-to-face could resume in person classes. This is taking place, and the university will conduct mandatory random testing across all of those sections, for both faculty and students. Individuals will receive notice from the campus health center to book an appointment within a one-week timeframe. This is essential to continue our good record on COVID-19 handling. The University has a 0.95% positivity rate, and the city of Detroit a 5.1% positivity rate. Compare that with MSU that has a positivity rate today of 13.1%. Members discussed the problem that occurs when other university insist that students come back to campus (often for residence hall revenues) even when classes are online, or require faculty to teach in person when the situation isn't suitable. Wayne State University is "leading with the science" and the results show. Our housing occupancy rate is at about one-third.
    b. <u>Vaccine</u>. Vaccinations on campus have slowed because of a lack of new doses. This week, the Campus Health Center will give second doses to those who received their first does a few weeks ago. We did not get additional vaccine to administer last week and we expect that we will not this week. The Michigan Health Department's doses are going to nursing homes, homeless shelters and the TCF Center for Detroit residents over the age of 65 rather than to us. A message will go out soon encouraging the Wayne State community to sign up for vaccination wherever possible, through your personal provider or through the local health department.

3. <u>Report from the Senate President</u>:
    a. <u>Board of Governors Committees</u>. Beale noted that the Board of Governors had established the committee assignments for Board members, including re-election of Marilyn Kelly as Chair and election of Mark Gaffney as Vice Chair. The Bylaws Review Committee started a few years ago by Sandy O'Brien will continue, but it is unclear whether there has been any progress on a variety of issues. This list includes an Advocacy Committee, which appears to be something new. It is not clear what it will cover, though one presumes it would be advocating on behalf of the university to the State. The Senate does not have representation on a number of the committees—advocacy, bylaws, health affairs oversight or the two subcommittees of the Board. We only have representatives on Budget, Personnel, Student Affairs, and Academic Affairs. Perhaps we should ask for a representative on the Advocacy Committee.
    b. <u>Bold Moves Proposals</u>. Beale provided an update on the Bold Moves process. The committee received a list of about 60 proposals. Beale considered that there were ten that stood out and

perhaps five others with potential that might be combined with other proposals. Many of the proposals were unclear and vague and contained a lot of jargon but no clear statement either of the problem intended to be addressed or the means by which the proposal meant to address it. The discussions have been fairly good, though Susan Burns and some of the Development staff sometimes have favorites that have not made sense to the two faculty on the group.

c. Child Care Committee. Loraleigh Keashly has asked to come to Policy to discuss developments in the university's childcare committee. We will try to schedule that for the eighth or the fifteenth. We do not have anyone from Policy serving on that committee, so it is unclear what kind of proposals they are working on at this time.

d. Fundraising Levels for Faculty Titles. Another issue we need to bring back to Policy is the question of Development's commitment to raise funding for a larger variety of faculty titles. Susan Burns had told us she was amenable to expanding the university's rather rigid policy (high endowments required) but that she wanted to finish the capital campaign first. We are through the capital campaign and are in the silent phase of the next capital campaign, and she is again deflecting discussion with claims that we do not need to do anything differently. At the Budget Committee on Development last fall, for example, she indicated that our peer universities do not have any more than we do, so she doesn't think it is an issue. Note that she was claiming CMU was a suitable peer university—which is ludicrous for either the Law School or the Chemistry Department. Benchmarks have to be in terms of specific fields, not entire regional Michigan schools. She also continues to say that it is "hard to get donors interested." Beale noted that whenever she has talked to potential donors, they have liked the idea. Beale suggested that we should bring her to Policy so that we can have another discussion. This is an important reputational issue when Wayne faculty speak at conferences, and it is a recruitment issue— especially for faculty of color—when we try to entice faculty to come to Wayne. Provost Clabo agreed that we should continue the discussion with Burns. Beale suggested that perhaps Policy should draft a new proposal for additional types of titles with somewhat different criteria than the proposal put forward by us several years ago. We may want to bring that proposal to the full Senate for a vote to give it more substance.

e. Centers. Beale noted that she continues to be concerned about the lack of review of Centers. We have now gone some time with no CIAC I or CIAC II reviews, and there seem to be a number of instances of the use of "center" when there has been no charter process. At Bold Moves, one that was included in a proposal was Engineering's IndustryX Center, for which a website exists. This is a proposal that curricula be developed with industry consultation for specific career needs within an industry—one would think that idea should receive discussion at various levels before a center to expand that method is approved. Beale noted that she has asked for a list of all currently chartered school/college or university centers and the schedule for 5-year reviews.

f. Henry Ford Health System Agreement with Michigan State. Beale mentioned the various news stories about a deal being reached between Henry Ford and Michigan State. This could have a significant impact on the School of Medicine, especially if we lose additional medical student slots currently at HFHS. The description of the deal appeared somewhat different from the original proposal with Wayne State, including different levels of initial funding.

g. Spreadsheet on Faculty Data. Beale asked whether there was more information about the spreadsheet that Charlie Parrish brought to our attention at the last meeting. Clabo indicated this was voluntary data collected as part of the GEARS grant to increase equity among female and underrepresented minority STEM faculty. Clabo indicated that the committee that developed the data collection project has AAUP-AFT representation. She suggested that Parrish speak with Boris Baltes about the nature and purpose of the data collection.

h. February 8 PC meeting. Beale noted that the candidate that had caused a shuffling of the time for the February 8 meeting had withdrawn so we will meet at the regular time.

4. Ombuds Committee: Policy discussed the need to finalize the membership for the special Ombuds Committee. We have two representatives selected from Curriculum & Instruction and from Student Affairs. The Faculty Affairs Committee needs to name an appointee to finalize the committee makeup. renee hoogland added that the committee would meet on February 10th.

5. <u>Budget Planning Council.</u> Beale noted that it is time to select the two Senate representatives to the Budget Planning Council (BPC) in addition to the Senate President and Budget Committee Chair. Last year, John Heinrichs (Business) and LiWay Lee (Economics, CLAS) served. LiWay has taken early retirement and John would prefer not to serve again this year. The committee agreed on nominees. Beale will contact them to see if they are willing to serve.

6. <u>Emails Regarding Security Training</u>:   Brad Roth had shared a PowerPoint from a colleague demonstrating how the emails being sent to faculty to urge them to undergo email security training appeared to clearly be phishing emails. The emails are generated by a third-party contractor, and mistakenly say—in multiple emails sent to goad faculty to undergo the training—that the training is mandatory when it is not. Beale noted that she and many other faculty likely simply deleted the emails as spam or sent them to C&IT to alert them to the spam! It is irritating to get multiple repeat emails all saying that faculty must complete mandatory training when it is not actually mandatory. It is also frustrating for C&IT to arrange for emails to be sent that are so poorly written: that ensures people will ignore them now and in the future. Naida Simon added that there is another problem with the way the C&IT spam alert works: people send emails asking if they are spam, but never get a reply from C&IT to let them know. Beale noted the contrast when she contacts Law's IT person who always responds to let us know. Paul Beavers described the training, which he took to make the nagging messages stop, as "awful, not relevant to the academic experience, and designed for industrial employees." Fitzgibbon agreed, noting that it was difficult to pass because it treated it as important to learn the names of the various types of spam, even though we do not need that information and it does not increase the security of our emails for us to know those names. Even a woman who works for a large IT security firm took the training and failed it twice! Clabo agreed with all the comments and apologized for the problem. The C&IT team will try to prevent this kind of thing occurring again. Beale asked that they be alerted to create responses to people who send abuse@wayne.edu a query about an email. If we do not hear something back, we still do not know whether to open the message or not. Beavers suggested that people crafting emails asking anyone on campus to take particular actions need to think about how the email will look to someone unfamiliar with the office that is sending it. A similar email arrived about changes to the travel cards and asked recipients to click on a link on the Wayne Travel webpage, but there was no such link. These people need to be instructed how to avoid the errors of appearing to be a phishing message.

7. <u>Ad Hoc DEI Senate Committee Initiative</u>. Beale noted that we seem to have reached consensus on a version that everyone accepted and that we can present to the Senate for Senate feedback. She asked Roth to present it at the Senate plenary session and he agreed.

8. <u>Charge to Standing Committees on the Future of Higher Education</u>. Beale noted that in the three weeks this has been out, no one has provided any comments on the text or issues that they think their committees will be interested in. Beale will present it, and again the idea is to get feedback from Senate members, including any specific ideas they think should be included in the set of questions, or even volunteers who want to serve on working groups on particular subjects. Simon added that she will address this with her committee on the seventeenth and again in March. Beale noted that it may be important for committees to break into subgroups on particular issues, so that some can do research or check with peers, etc. She added that she had edited the wording about the resources, because the Inside Higher Ed article provided by the Provost's office makes some rather derogatory suggestions about the faculty. She indicated that she had gathered questions from various reading she had done and discussions she had participated in on listserves. The questions try to cover a range of issues—types of students, unconventional degrees, badges and certificates, the idea of "competency-based degrees". Some of this goes against the foundational idea of a university: we don't exist merely to award people a piece of paper providing a credential for a job that they held before they came to the university. But we likely need to address these issues, or they will bubble along and be put forward by the administration.

Parrish suggested that the charge is too ambitious an undertaking for the Senate committees to be assigned. People will "wander off into all kinds of different things with extremely uneven responses. I

don't even know what you mean." Beale noted that no committee is being "assigned" any specific part of the topics: the charge is saying that this is something that the Senate should do as the voice of the faculty and staff on educational policy. She had raised it at the December 2 plenary session because it had seemed important to be considering these issues, and then after that President Wilson had called to say that he wanted to ensure there was some process for thinking about what direction the university should take "post-pandemic." If the Senate does not take this task on, there will be another group, like the Restart or Social Justice Action Committees, that will be assigned the task and have only minimal Senate representation. This is the kind of issue that the Senate should be considering—how courses are delivered, what our students should get out of their education, what new groups of students we should be reaching, etc. These are all within the question of what our educational policy should be. Parrish objected, noting that he hasn't seen any ideas from President Wilson, and even if the Senate does all this work, why should Beale think the President will give our work consideration. Beale responded that it is important that the Senate be a collaborative body on this issue. The President has now specifically asked for our thoughts on these issues, so we should be responsive: that is what we have asked him to do. Parrish continued to suggest that we wait to see what the President is going to propose. Beale responded that would run counter to everything we have said about the importance of consultation: it would make no sense for us to encourage the President to seek input from some other group, instead of the Senate.

Fitzgibbon noted that it is important that we should develop some thinking on these issues rather than leave it to the President to develop proposals through some other route. Hoogland added that it seems reasonable to try to collaborate with the President on this issue. It Is important that the Senate makes sure it has input on what happens post-pandemic. If there is an opportunity to do so, we would be foolish not to. Fitzgibbon added that she would not like to be told "we are going to do this and that," without having had any input in the development of the ideas. Parrish suggested that if there is something specific, we can react to it. Beale countered that it would be foolish to merely be reactive to whatever Roy or the administration suggests. Roth agreed. If we do not take the lead on this issue, we will be accused of simply not being willing to consider doing anything differently: that just gives the administration an opportunity to impose their ideas on us. There is clearly no way we will consider every idea that is on the charge document, but it serves to orient the discussions that take place within the committees. Those discussions are going to take place, so it is worth having some guidance about what issues to consider. We create a record indicating that we have been discussing these ideas in committees and these are the kinds of proposals that make sense to us. We have to be ready, he suggested, for the onslaught that we are going to face.

hoogland commented that it would be helpful if the document could be sent to all the standing committees, so that each can focus on the issues that are particularly relevant for it and start thinking about it. Policy cannot do this—this is work at the Standing Committee level. Because not all these issues are relevant for every committee, we should get the charge out to get the discussions started. Beale agreed. This is not a charge to Policy but to each of the standing committees. Simon noted that she would send the document with an agenda, for discussion. Her committee is primarily academic staff, while renee's is primarily faculty. Each group will likely have different perspectives. There are some ideas on the list that most of us are likely opposed to, but we need to begin discussing it. Clabo added that these kinds of questions are clearly within the purview of shared governance. The President has done exactly what the Senate has requested by reaching out to ask that the Senate consider major issues around the structure and delivery of academic programs that will face post-pandemic pressures to change. This is an opportunity for the Senate to bring forward their best ideas about what's important. Essentially this is asking each of the committees to develop a position paper on the topics that seem most important to them.

Beavers suggested the document should tell the standing committees to consider what issues to make important statements about. Beale noted that the document is intended to provide some overview to

our diverse group of members in a diverse group of standing committees. It asks the committees to talk about the issues that matter to them and see what they think is truly important in their area. The idea is to provide some long-term recommendations by mid-October (though Beale indicated to the President that might be too early to be doable). We have typically given committees charges that we expect them to consider during the year. We did not do that this year. This is a bigger issue than any one of our committees could handle alone.

Villarosa agreed that we shouldn't be reactive, and that this charge to the committees put the Senate in a better position than, for example, it was in on the diversity issue, where we had not taken any action on the record and now are making a substantial move by creating an ad hoc DEI Senate committee, with the aim of creating a standing committee. Is the President planning a process for an administrative 'restart-type' committee as well and do we know the timing for that so that we can be sure we are aware what is going on? Beale responded that the discussion with the President was about the Senate's committees taking this on as within the Senate's jurisdiction. He was supportive of that. Now, it would be expected that the Council of Deans might be holding discussions about similar issues, but at least in the conversation, he agreed with the suggested Senate process. Villarosa noted again that there might be some parallel administrative conversations going on that we would need to connect to. Beale responded that we have administrative liaisons on the committees to help ensure that such dialogue occurs.

The group then discussed the timing issues, noting that there are some shorter-term issues and some that are longer term. hoogland suggested that she would like to have a rough picture by the beginning of the summer, and that there is nothing in the document that prevents communicating some ideas earlier. Clabo agreed that there may be tactical decisions about the fall that need to come sooner and longer-term issues that will tie into the next strategic plan.

Beale noted that she would like to share this with the plenary at the February 3 meeting so that all the members have an idea of the issue being brought to their committees. Policy agreed to make an explicit mention of short-term and long-term considerations in the document.

9. Reports from Liaisons.
    a. FSST. Simon reported that FSST met on January 20 for a discussion about STARS 2.0 and the SLATE update. STARS stands for "student tracking and retention system" but the person presenting from C&IT, Heather King, did not know that. They want to create a one-stop shop for undergraduate, graduate, and medical students with centralized advising notes. Beale asked whether everyone who is advising a student would see all the notes that any adviser has taken. Simon said yes, noting that currently it is frustrating to advise a student but be unable to know what they have been told by other advisers. Another change is to align it with the "student journey model." SLATE is third-party software that was supposed to make undergraduate (LAB) and graduate (GAB) admissions simpler. Graduate Admissions people hate it. It runs in the Amazon Web Services cloud. Beale noted that as Graduate Studies Director at the Law School until this year, she was quite dissatisfied with the old system. She asked Clabo whether there had been many complaints about the SLATE system. Clabo noted that there are always grumblings when there are changes, but she will watch to see if complaints mount. Beale added that she understands that the SLATE platform is supposed to help units communicate more frequently to students who are in the pipeline. One problem with that is those communications can come across as impersonal.
    b. Elections. Simon also reported on the elections committee. The plenary session will elect a replacement for David on policy. The hearing panel elections are also coming up, but Rohan has to be able to work with the DOSO person who runs the software. The plan is to run the hearing panels starting in mid-February and then run the at-large election right after that. Villarosa added Rohan to the group and will help him to the extent possible. Beale noted that Angie has agreed to help if there are questions.

Parrish asked who the nominees for the PC position are, and Simon responded that at this point they are Noreen Rossi and Avraham Raz. She has informed both to prepare a three-minute talk. After some discussion, it was agreed that Christine Knapp would run the election and Naida will ask one of the other members of the committee to serve as timer for the speeches and the election poll. Rohan will be the one to launch the poll and show the results. Beale noted that in a practice with Rohan there was a glitch with zoom polling. She has asked Law's IT person to stand by for assistance if that recurs during the meeting.

c. Student Affairs Committee and Curriculum & Instruction Committee. Fitzgibbon added that the Student Affairs Committee met on the 20th with Michelle Bruner, academic success, and Amy Cooper, student learning communities. Michelle updated the group about students in the first-year seminar (the Wayne Experience), for which there were 60 sections last fall and 21 sections this winter, with two sections for sophomores. They have hired and trained 48 instructors. There was some concern that transfer students should have an opportunity to take the course if they want to. The learning communities have been around since 2006 but have had a flat budget. There are 37 and one in the School of Medicine. There are 45 faculty and staff coordinators, 212 peer mentors and 6000 students involved. These students tend to achieve better results in courses and have a sense of being supported. The communities have been creative in pulling students together in this online environment. It was impressive. Roth noted that C&IC met jointly with Student Affairs for that meeting so there is nothing to add on that.

d. Student Code of Conduct Revision Subcommittee. The group held its first meeting and named Roth as chair. The group will invite David Strauss and Nikolina Camaj to the next meeting and work from there.

e. UROP. Roth added that the UROP subcommittee has met with the folks who were part of the vetting process, but this time there was enough funding to fund all of the applications so the only issue was whether any should not be funded. All were funded. They are working to revise the applications that should go live very soon for the next round (possibly February 12). Beale asked whether Lanier provided funding for UROP. He did not, since he claims that his position is that his funding is only if there is insufficient funding otherwise. Beavers noted that we need to follow up on this lack of funding. Beale suggested that the Budget Planning Council will be one place to do so.

10. New Business.

a. Faculty Reimbursement for Online Teaching. Members asked whether there was funding to reimburse faculty who spend their own funds for supplies necessary to enable their online teaching. Clabo indicated that the CARES Act funding did not cover that, but she will check. It is likely that it is being handled on a school/college basis. Beale said her understanding was that various supplies would be reimbursed if people submit receipts, but maybe some schools/colleges are not doing that. Clabo will check with the deans.

b. Plenary. Clabo noted that she will not be available for the plenary until about 2:20 or 2:25. renee will substitute, as Vice Chair.

Approved as amended at Policy on February 8, 2021