

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
ACADEMIC SENATE
PROCEEDINGS OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE
February 15, 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

1. Campus Safety Advisory Committee Update.

Professor Jennifer Wareham noted that the committee's last meeting took place in late November 2020. The committee typically meets twice a year, in the Fall and Winter semesters. There were additional meetings last year because of the Student Senate's interest in clarifying the way certain issues are handled. In a typical meeting, the Chief of the campus police (Chief Holt) explains any updates to procedures and provides a statistics report. In November, Chief Holt informed us that people in the area objected to the process for handling complaints, because it seemed adversarial (the officer who responded to the call would go to their address and record their complaint in person). The response was to establish an electronic platform for filing a complaint and arranging for a person to visit to start the investigation process. The statistics show that there are relatively few complaints. This is especially true now because of COVID, though domestic violence issues have increased. This is something that Wareham's department has seen nationwide.

Beale asked about the issue that had been raised by several professors and students regarding the way the Board of Governors had approved the existing campus "advisory committee" as fulfilling the new Michigan statutory requirement for a "public safety oversight committee, for which the statute provides a specific membership and role, which are both different from the membership and role of the Campus Safety Advisory Committee. Wareham noted that she and hoogland drafted a recommendation for altering the procedures to make them more consistent with Michigan and Michigan State. During the summer they met with members of those committees and learned that their campus safety advisory councils serve as an oversight committee by not having the Chief or other administrator present or running the meeting. Here, the Chief and the President's Chief of Staff and marketing VP Michael Wright dictate the agenda, run the meetings, and control the discussion of the committee. Faculty and students are relegated to a role of listener. The Student Senate President Stuart Baum objected to that process. However, when the Social Justice Action Committees were established with one on policing, Beale and Wareham discussed how best to proceed and Beale suggested it would be reasonable to see if the SJAC subcommittee dealt with the issue. Wareham shared the letter regarding the concern with Bonnie Wu, the Senate representative on the policing subcommittee, and with Brad Smith, a presidential appointment to the policing subcommittee. Beale noted that Bonnie Wu is scheduled to come to Policy on the 22nd to discuss this issue and whether the SJAC took into account the need to restructure—perhaps by having a subcommittee of the advisory council that adheres to the Michigan statute. Beale talked with President Wilson about this when the SJAC subcommittees were established, because he had not agreed to have a Senate representative on the policing subcommittee. He ultimately agreed given the discussion that had already taken place at Policy regarding the advisory committee and the Michigan statute. Beale had to miss one of the "umbrella" SJAC committee meetings that was scheduled in conflict with another meeting, so it is not clear whether the policing

recommendations have been addressed. At any rate, Bonnie Wu will be able to provide us a more complete picture at the next Policy meeting.

Parrish asked what would be required to institute a change. Beale suggested it would likely require a Board of Governors statutory amendment, since they had resolved it in a way that does not directly comply with the Michigan statute. They simply took the existing campus safety advisory committee and designated it to serve as the policing oversight committee, without conforming to the membership and role provided in the statute. Parrish asked whether Policy had discussed it. Beale stated that she thought the issue had been discussed at Policy when Stuart Baum first raised it and again when Wareham raised it, which was at the time that the Policing Subcommittee had been established. Wareham added further that the campus police are supposed to be merely ex officio to the committee, but Michael Wright attends as the representative for the Chief and actually serves as chair of the committee.

Beale added that the point of having this on the committee today and next week is to learn what the status of this issue is, now that the SJAC committees are finalizing their recommendations. With this update, it appears that the policing subcommittee did not even ask to speak with the campus safety advisory committee members, which suggests the issue was not dealt with. Parrish asked whether there was a request for any action from Policy. Beale responded that we will have to determine what the status is and then consider what action to take.

Fitzgibbon asked why Michael Wright is acting as chair of the campus safety advisory committee. Wareham responded that the committee had been part of the campus policy for years before the Michigan statute for an oversight committee was passed. But the committee did not meet regularly until a year or so ago. Wright is the one who had called the meetings, and there are no written charges with stated goals or procedures for the advisory committee. So Wright just runs the meeting. Wareham noted that she would prefer to see an agenda driven by someone other than President Wilson of the police chief's representative.

Hoogland noted that the committee was just a passive presentation by the Chief without any input from faculty or students at all. That was a problem that the students pointed out. Even discriminatory events that happen on campus were dismissed by Wright as falsely presented or irrelevant. That led to a discussion about how the committee should function so that the meetings would be more meaningful. Baum pointed out repeatedly that the committee does not satisfy the Michigan statute. Many meetings would get cancelled by the administration. The committee members invited someone from University of Michigan at Flint to discuss.

Wareham added that one of the things the students noted was that an event sponsored by a minority student organization is required to have a larger police presence, for which the students foot the bill. To them, it feels discriminatory, though Chief Holt responded that he "wants more of [his] officers there just to make sure everything is good so that we don't have any problems." His policy is to add officers whenever there's any type of altercation on campus, with multiple squad cars reporting to the incident. But for students, they get anxious when they see that, thinking something seriously violent must have occurred or someone has been killed. He says he does it because he wants more officers there to hold each other accountable. Villarosa added that from the perspective of student organizations—whether

it's for a step show late in the evening or the "crossings" celebrated in Gullen mall by the historically Black sororities and fraternities—there is a much larger police presence, which Dean of Students Office (DOSO) knows not from seeing it but from the charges to the student organizations or DOSO. Beale noted that if Black-sponsored events always get more police, that's an effect that appears to come from an underlying assumption that those events are going to be more problematic, which clearly would strike students as discriminatory. Wareham said that the Chief claimed it was the time of the event and the number of people expected to be there. It's possible that if you control for those aspects, the data would show it is not racial bias but it is unclear. Beale agreed that having data on whether the larger police presence was correlated with late night and large crowds would be helpful. Villarosa said all DOSO sees is the total bill with no breakdown: that would have to be provided by the police. Wareham noted that if there is a followup conversation with Chief Holt about this, the Criminology and Criminal Justice Department could do a statistical analysis for them and maintain confidentiality. Villarosa suggested that Wareham could reach out to DOSO about this, since David Strauss had wanted to get that data. Beale asked Wareham if she would be willing to follow up with David Strauss: if the data show that there is a correlation with timing and size of crowd, that would be reassuring to those student groups. But if the data demonstrates discrimination, that would be a matter for further consideration.

Parrish asked whether the committee had discussed this matter with the Chief. Wareham indicated that a student raised it at the meeting and the response was as she noted earlier.

2. Academic Senate Ad Hoc Anti-Bullying Subcommittee Update.

Wareham noted that materials from the committee had been provided to Policy with the agenda. The process began last year, when Policy charged the ad hoc group to develop a policy with detail regarding definitions, who investigates, what action should be taken and similar issues. The group began with a review of the literature and existing policies at other four-year institutions in the US and, especially, in Michigan. Then the group discussed what they thought the policy should look like. They were aware of an issue at the University of Michigan with their definition of bullying. At a point when they felt they had established a reasonable working approach, Roth met with Lou Lessem, who was discouraging about any attempt to define bullying as anything different from Michigan's definition after it settled the Speech First case against it. Michigan had a definition in its student code of conduct that Speech First challenged as a violation of First Amendment rights. Michigan settled rather than argue the lawsuit and changed the definition to the one used by the State for K-12 education. They also removed all mention of a disciplinary body or any formal action that they had included in their policy. The committee then met with Lessem and had a candid conversation. He implied that neither the administration nor the Board of Governors would support anything other than the policy that Michigan settled on. Accordingly, that is the current draft shared with Policy—a definition of bullying consistent with Michigan's, removal of any formal procedures for how accusations of bullying should be investigated and of any potential disciplinary actions. Now the policy provides for informal discussions. Because Speech First objected to use of the term "civility", the committee has taken that out of the Wayne State draft as well. They have a section three that makes clear that a supervisor's reprimand of a person under her authority is not bullying, since a supervisor needs to be able to tell a subordinate how to do their job correctly. Excluded from the bullying policy is any situation protected by freedom of speech. There are also links to other policies that could govern a bullying situation, such as harassment or discrimination. Section five provides an informal process for resolving complaints about bullying—people that a bullied person can speak to (a chair or HR representative). We would like to have the university create a website dedicated to bullying and provide more information and educational resources, links to training, and information about informal approaches to conflict resolution. We would also like the administration to provide support for training, both in terms of financial support and personnel that can help with this. All

of these needs stem from the campus climate survey that indicated that bullying is a significant issue here and perhaps one of the reasons people leave Wayne State. Our charge called for a final policy proposal by March, but we think we may need an extension to complete this.

Hoogland asked about the statement at the end that the right “cannot impair the Constitution.” Wareham noted that individuals are not necessarily protected constitutionally from bullying behavior. Bullying may be demeaning remarks, preventing someone from coming to a meeting, scheduling a meeting so that someone cannot attend (i.e., with intent to exclude). There are a variety of behaviors, and some of those are protected if there is a gender or race basis for the behavior. There, discrimination laws protect. But much of what we think about bullying is not constitutionally protected—i.e., the claim based on the Michigan settlement is that ‘freedom of speech’ permits bullying behavior unless laws about discrimination and harassment are implicated. This could apply to bullying behavior by faculty in a faculty meeting or by a student in a class.

Beale asked for an explanation of what the “informal process” means. It sounds like there could be considerable space for inconsistency and bias in handling such issues informally. Roth pointed out that the group had spent a lot of time trying to specify in helpful ways where the lines would be with respect to these questions. But the General Counsel’s office essentially shot down the effort for two reasons. First, there is substantial risk aversion as a result of the Michigan case, with a fear that anything added beyond what Michigan accepted in the settlement would put Wayne State in legal jeopardy. Second, the University of Michigan had a definition of bullying in their code that was really poorly crafted, invoking the dictionary, which put them in a bad position from the start. Then they also had implicitly coercive interventions—not strictly punitive. As for the case, the only determination made was that Speech First had standing to bring the suit claiming the University of Michigan’s bullying policy was a violation of free speech rights. There was no adjudication of the “chilling effect on free speech” claim, but the university’s general counsel decided to fold altogether—not only removing their own bad definition of bullying to claim that without the definition there’s no case, but also dropping the entire idea of any implementation of an anti-bullying standard. The settlement agreement just provides some support services. Roth indicated he was astonished that the university so thoroughly capitulated at the preliminary standing determination, but our General Counsel is not willing to step any further out than Michigan did. So we are left with proactive measures against bullying like bystander education that can be enrolled voluntarily, support for people who are being mistreated, etc.

Villarosa added that University of Michigan cannot even have a referral process to an office such as OEO that could help file a discrimination claim in some bullying cases. Also, he clarified that Boris Baltus conducted an initial conversation with Lou Lessem. Parrish asked whether there will be a designated person. Villarosa noted that the initial committee draft had not been shared once the meeting with Lou Lessem made clear that substantial changes would be needed. The question now is what can be done from an educational and supportive standpoint, which is a different model than what had been discussed.

Beale asked that the group do the best possible and include the rationale in the report. She also suggested a hypothetical involving a department where a junior male professor makes it hard on a female professor whenever she says something in a meeting—a snarky comment, or criticizing her material when she seeks academic advice. She discusses it with the department chair and the department chair says there is nothing I can do about it. What happens under your scenarios? Wareham responded that she should be able to make a complaint to HR because that involves gender

discrimination, if she can establish a pattern of gender bias. But of course if the two are the same gender, same sexual orientation, same race, same religion, it would not be a discriminatory action. In that case, there is nothing formally that can be done. The group had drafted some formal consequences, but now have their hands tied because of the Counsel's position. The union also constrains possibilities. The stance now is to focus on education and training, and development of a website. Peers within a department will hopefully start standing up for each other and advocate for the person being bullied.

Rossi noted that Beale's hypothetical is a real situation that occurred in the Med School in August 2020. The answer given at that time by the General Counsel's office was the same as what he has said after the Michigan case—that nothing can be done unless it clearly violates a constitutional protection. This has caused much consternation among faculty, particularly female and minority faculty. This is usually repetitive behavior, so the chairs and chiefs need to be educated and the culture needs to change. That requires education. There is a meeting coming up in the hospital on dealing with microaggression from patients and staff. If someone is in leadership, they should be required to take mandatory training to learn how to deal with bullies, whether at faculty meetings when someone is denigrated or their ideas are pushed aside or, worse, usurped by the other side. Clabo agreed, noting a time when Nursing had academic debate shift to "I'm smarter than you and your ideas are not worthwhile." The dean and faculty assembly chair put the issue of civil debate and bullying on the agenda for a full discussion. Everyone felt awkward, but over time, the debate became more substantial and the behavior did change.

Parrish noted that chairs in the medical school seem to behave more egregiously in this way than others. There was a case where a female faculty member was followed around by an associate chair. This is an authority problem more than anything else. Parrish pointed out that another problem with the Michigan situation was that the first two times that the code of conduct was enforced was against African American students who had been involved in name-calling incidents with other students.

Beale concluded the discussion, noting that we are apparently left with the "risk aversion" approach. Educating will be helpful, but it is worrisome that when there are real instances of repeated bullying and intimidation nothing can be done if they don't fall under constitutionally protected categories. She noted that bullying and intimidation are actually ways of chilling the free speech of the persons bullied, so it is rather ironical that the result of the Michigan case is that those who bully in order to prevent the free speech of the bullied will be protected by the First Amendment and allowed to bully, unless it constitutes unconstitutional discrimination.

Rossi added that the idea that it takes time to make a culture change will not satisfy the bullied person. You want it fixed now, but culture changes in behavior take time. This is where having an Ombuds might be useful—an office where faculty could at least share their concerns and seek advice about how to handle it. Beale agreed that would be useful and hopes that will be possible as part of the report coming from the committee.

Roth read paragraph three of the settlement agreement where they indicate that the university could have a CCS that cannot impose discipline, cannot require participation, has a purpose only to support students, faculty and staff to connect to resources, and to contribute to the maintenance of respect and understanding among members of the university community.

[Prof. Wareham left the meeting.]

3. P.C. Proceedings February 15, 2021.

Beale noted that these proceedings are less detailed than some. It did not seem that it would be as useful to delve into the detail of the discussion, such as the student death announcement, as we have in some instances. The meetings were approved without amendments.

4. Report from the Chair:

- a. Public Health News. Clabo noted that the country has dropped below 100,000 for its 7-day average for the first time in three months. Positivity rates remain low, at 0.19%. The university is conducting considerable testing (1000-1300 a week), and cases are also staying in the range of 12-16 per week or about 2 a day. We remain one of the few institutions that has not contributed to a major community outbreak. The partnership with the health department has strengthened the relationship between the university and community.
- b. Vaccine. The country is providing 1.6 million shots a day. Campus Health Center, however, again has no new doses to offer this week. The university is in discussion with the Detroit health department, but they are still focused on the mass vaccination efforts in the large centers.
- c. School/College reviews. Clabo expects to have the final reports on the reviews of CFPCA and Engineering within the next month.
- d. Fall Scheduling. There will be a discussion at the Academic Restart meeting about scheduling for the fall. Parrish noted that it has been chaotic up to now, with considerable confusion about what the Provost Office has said and what it means. Clabo responded that she is going to Restart to hear what people have to say. She has been to the chair chats, and people seem comfortable. Clearly, we are living in a pandemic that is fraught with ambiguity and it is impossible to predict exactly what the Fall semester will look like. We can only do the best we can. She hopes that the discussion tomorrow leads to some communication that helps to 'close the loop'. She stated that the fall schedule has been pushed back. Members asked about that, since no one had seen a message changing the schedule after our discussion on that point on the 15th, when the understanding had been that a message about the delay would go out that day. Clabo said she would make sure a message goes out today that extends the deadline.

Roth reiterated a point made last week: faculty need to understand what TR means and whether the rooms are intended to be allocated based on social distancing requirements or not. Additionally, if we may expect normal TR usage of classrooms but we are forced to do social distancing, faculty need to know if they will be allowed to remain in SYNC rather than engage in what for many will be an unacceptable modality of engaging with students in "pods" where the pods rotate between face-to-face but the faculty member is always face-to-face with one pod and simulcasting on Zoom with the other pods. People—both chairs and faculty—need to know if that is being contemplated. That is going to be a major issue for faculty, if by agreeing to teach TR they are letting themselves in for a situation where they might have to agree to the pod/simulcasting arrangement which is unlikely to work well for many fields. Clabo indicated that she would like to have that discussion at Restart.

Villarosa raised the issue about the capacity of rooms and whether scheduling is supposed to take that into account. Beale noted that Provost Whitfield would typically invite Ashley Flintoff to attend to provide that information when we discussed these types of issues, and suggested it would be helpful to do that for tomorrow's Restart meeting.

5. Report from the Senate President:

- a. OVPR TownHall on Research Cores. Beale noted the announcement sent out, which is the first time she has seen this. There have been significant complaints about the staffing of the cores and whether they meet the needs of researchers. There are about 13 cores and this is a joint meeting that will discuss cores in general and then break out into separate meetings for particular cores. This seems to be an important informational exchange that should help faculty know what is available and perhaps provide Lanier some indication of the problems seen by faculty.
- b. CFO. Although Rebecca Cooke had said she was retiring, President Wilson apparently persuaded her to stay on. Bill Decatur will not be filling in as interim after all. Presumably that will put her in the lead of the RCM Steering Committee, if it starts up as Laurie had mentioned a week or so ago. Clabo responded that the RCM process had again been put on hold due to the transition back to Cooke as CFO. She indicated she would let Beale know for sure after her meeting with Cooke this week.
- c. Reconnect Transfer and Behavioral Health announcements. Beale noted the recent announcement of yet another financial aid program for undergraduate students who transfer in from community colleges. This program had not been discussed in any way at Policy beforehand. She asked whether this will require additional funding and if so what the source of the funds is. Additionally, Beale noted the announcement that came out of the Provost's Office regarding startup funds for projects in Behavioral Health. That is something that was included in the Bold Moves initiatives, so it was surprising to see that there was already funding from some source to cover this.

Clabo responded that Ahmad Ezzedine would be the best source of information on the Reconnect program. She understands that it represents a "rebalance" of financial aid, using some for transfer students that had previously been used for undergraduates. It is important because of the changing demographics and the shrinking pool of FTIACs. Beale commented that we had also been losing transfer students over the last few years. The question is what the ultimate impact on financial aid would be—the statement seems to be that this is not an increase in financial aid monies but a reallocation away from FTIACs to transfers.

Parrish asked whether there had been any planning in response to the governor's proposal to give free tuition to students attending community colleges. Clabo answered that this is in part a response to that. WSU has devoted most of its energies to recruitment of FTIACs, yet four-fifths of our Black students come to us as transfers. So we need to pay attention to those—not just those who go straight from high school to community college and then to us, but those that complete their community college degree that we can attract, perhaps to build a pathway to graduate school. We owe that to the City of Detroit and these young people, to help them increase their social mobility and create a path to professional degrees. Beale added that Policy has been talking about the need to reach out better to transfer students for the last six or seven years. Clearly, our masters numbers have gone down. The Graduate Dean has been talking about that, and she has agreed to come to the plenary in March. Hopefully we will hear more about her ideas for reaching out and increasing graduate recruitment. Simon added that the AGRADE pipeline isn't well used and Clabo agreed. It is more a pathway than a pipeline because it is too clunky, under-marketed, and we need to do it better. Much of this is faculty dependent—letting students know that they can be successful in graduate school.

Beale reminded Clabo that the other question was about Behavioral Health. Clabo noted that this was a working group similar to the "Big Data" hires Provost Whitfield did. The idea is to provide some seed funding from the Provost's Office such as those Big Data hires received. This is funding that had already been committed for the next iteration of hires, which was to be in the field of social and behavioral determinants of health. Mark Greenwald chairs the faculty committee, and the RFP calls for small projects. Beale asked what the total funding available was. Clabo indicated that she thought it was less than 50 thousand.

- d. Mental Health Day Announcement. Beale noted that the announcement talked about employees and students but did not use the word “faculty” at all. Faculty in fact are feeling considerable stress at this point. Similarly, the announcement from the Provost’s Office today talks about the role of the faculty in addressing student health, providing ‘tips’ for faculty to discuss. That seemed somewhat worrisome, since faculty are often told to be cautious on giving personal advice, since they may exacerbate rather than help. This ‘tip’ sheet discusses three categories of stress, but it is not clear whether faculty can recognize whether something is in the mild versus moderate level. As LLM director, Beale noted she had spent many hours talking with individual students about their issues and concerns. Nonetheless, this seemed to lay a responsibility on faculty that many would be hesitant to assume. Clabo responded that the flyer had been developed by the CAPS program to help faculty know how they can help their students during the pandemic. But of course there is a slippery slope between providing support and not attempting to provide mental health treatment. It described referral accurately and some faculty are responding with thanks. Beale noted that Brad had discussed earlier the need for a website that had the information collected and in one place, and that clearly is helpful. The concern is whether faculty, who are not experts in the field, can appropriately categorize the students’ levels of stress. Hoogland added that it is very different when teaching SYNC: all you can go by is whether students submit work. You can ask “are you okay? are you busy?” but it is different from being in the classroom with them regularly and getting to know them well. In reading the flyer, Hoogland said, she felt concern that she was being asked to take on a large responsibility. It is one thing to email them and ask if they are okay, but if they don’t respond, it is not clear what the next step should be.

Clabo noted that it would be appropriate to submit a care report to DOSO. Villarosa agreed, noting that there isn’t a threshold for a CARE report. The CAPs information isn’t a charge to faculty to cross a line into professional territory but to provide information for faculty. Beale protested, though, that the document included in a noteworthy place in the upper right-hand corner the statement “student mental health is your concern.” That was misleading compared to the actual content: it seemed to suggest that faculty are supposed to be doing mental health assessment as part of their job. It may well be concerning to some faculty to be told that. That is the issue that struck Beale on reading the document.

Roth applauded CAPs for this outreach since this is a big improvement over the way that office responded twenty years ago to these issues. Beale agreed that having the list of resources would be helpful. Villarosa added that the office also offers training for faculty.

6. Senate March 3 Agenda. Beale noted that the Graduate Dean had agreed to attend the plenary to talk about the challenges and opportunities for the Graduate School. She will come at 1:30. Amanda’s presentation will be useful. Some of the things we were just talking about in terms of transfer students and increasing the relationship between graduate school and the schools and departments for recruitment of masters, and even doctoral candidates, are things she’s been considering. The last Graduate Council meeting they firmed up the committee to look at expanding graduate faculty status to allow people that have not been included before to serve on committees but will not likely be finalized by this March meeting. Roth commented that he was happy to see the Graduate School moving towards expansion, since it had become more restrictive, which seemed problematic. Beale said that the Graduate Dean wanted it to be more inclusionary, so that students have more helpful perspectives for moving forward with their projects.

The draft agenda had suggested inviting Loreleigh on the childcare committee’s ideas, but we will have to wait until after next week’s meeting to decide if we think that would be helpful. The floor is open for other suggestions.

7. Lecturer Non-Renewals. Beale noted that we had discussed this topic last week, and at this point non-renewal notices have gone out to many lecturers who have never been non-renewed before—i.e., 100% of the lecturers in CLAS and a few other schools whose terms end this year, including senior lecturers that teach core courses required for Gen Ed, received non-renewal notices. Students were shocked to learn that Richard Pineau (Senior Lecturer in Math) had received a non-renewal notice: they created a petition that received about 1000 signatures in less than 24 hours. The petition calls it inappropriate for one of the best math teachers in the department to be cut. Again, we discussed this last year with Provost Whitfield, and he took action to ensure that there were limited non-renewals rather than a blanket approach used to create maximum budget flexibility. That's an inappropriate way to deal with lecturers, since the non-renewal notice in the contract is intended as a protection, not a hammer.

Parrish noted that these are being used to allow “flexibility” without any thought to the evaluation of the lecturers. It is only administrative convenience—a “meat axe approach.” Beale noted that it is unlikely that those with administrative responsibilities will work ‘for free’ during the summer once given the non-renewal. You cannot expect them to go beyond their contract in performance in this kind of situation.

8. Liaison Reports.

- a. Faculty Affairs.

Hoogland reported that Faculty Affairs (FAC) met last week. Ashley Flintoff provided an update on State Hall, noting a two-year period for the renovation. The Board of Governors approved funding for the design phase at the January 29 meeting. The elevators are done, but it appears that the building will not be available for classroom use, unless perhaps the first floor area will be useable. The design work will focus on all but the fourth floor, but there will be some superficial remodeling there as well because those rooms were not satisfactory. Facilities will continue reviewing the renovation ideas with the State Hall Renovation Advisory Committee, which includes a number of Senate representatives (including Hoogland). Parrish reported that Dean Schweitzer announced at a School of Medicine town hall that they would build a new research building to replace Scott Hall in the area across the street from the Welcome Center. It isn't clear that there has been consultation and agreement from the administration on that issue.

Hoogland noted that FAC had also discussed the Ombuds office. Beale added that she had sent the names of the three Senate representatives, including Tom Pedroni for FAC, to the Provost's Office. FAC also briefly discussed the DEI ad hoc committee, the higher education charge to the standing committees, and the emeritus status issue sent to FAC for discussion and recommendation.

- b. Elections.

Simon announced that the Elections Committee is running two elections. The first is the hearing panels election. It will stay open until March 2. The at-large election will follow.

- c. Senate Higher Education Charge to Standing Committees.

Regarding the Senate's future of higher education initiative, Beavers added that he is trying to get copies of the Chronicle article on higher education, but it is not available to libraries at this time. They are hoping to make money on individual sales. Beale asked if perhaps the Provost would fund a copy for each committee chair to have for the committees' discussions. Clabo agreed to do so.

- d. Research Committee.

Rossi indicated that she is meeting with David Kessel the next day regarding plans for the Research Committee. She hopes to have a report for the next meeting.

PC Proceedings for February 15, 2021 approved as amended via email after the February 22, 2021 meeting.